
Subject: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 07 May 2007 18:21:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Read this

<http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>

then this:

<http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>

And you shall understand...

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Mon, 07 May 2007 19:40:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

HI DC,

Actually yes that way the virus can eradicate itself with out all the extra work.

Chris

DC wrote:

> Read this

>

> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>

>

> then this:

>

> <http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>

>

> And you shall understand...

>

> DC

>

--

Chris Ludwig

ADK Pro Audio
(859) 635-5762
www.adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Mon, 07 May 2007 19:54:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>HI DC,

>

>Actually yes that way the virus can eradicate itself with out all the
>extra work.

>

>Chris

Sooo, you agree that humanity is a virus?

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Mon, 07 May 2007 21:00:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

HI DC,

No I believe humans do not need any help or encouragement when it comes
to self destruction.

I think the Paul Watson is as has delusional as they come but has the
perfect right to have a gun. He can use it to defend him self against
the human race. With Americas justice system it should hold up just fine
when he says he defended himself because he felt "imminent threat" to
his person and property. Well at least it will if he is from a pro gun
state.

Chris

DC wrote:

> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>> HI DC,

>>

>> Actually yes that way the virus can eradicate itself with out all the
>> extra work.

>>

>> Chris
>
>
> Sooo, you agree that humanity is a virus?
>
>
> DC
>

--

Chris Ludwig

ADK Pro Audio
(859) 635-5762
www.adkproaudio.com
chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 07 May 2007 21:06:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well...I personally think that dropping the population below 1 billion would be a good thing as long as that 1 billion included me and my crew. I figure that's gonna happen without my help sooner or later. Ever watch what happens when rats (or other) species get too overcrowded? Ugly stuff to be sure.

A nice little pandemic would be much more PC.

At least this guy could think for himself though and stop copping this reasoning from The Matrix.

;o)

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:463f6e43\$1@linux...

>
> Read this
>
> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>
>
> then this:
>
> <http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>
>
> And you shall understand...
>

> DC

>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [TCB](#) on Mon, 07 May 2007 21:20:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

As George Carlin once said, human beings are the only species in the world that systematically tortures and kills its own kind.

TCB

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

>

>Read this

>

> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>

>

>then this:

>

><http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>

>

>And you shall understand...

>

>DC

>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 07 May 2007 21:33:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ya' know....I had never heard of this group until now. I just went to the Sea Shepherd website. I can't really see a damn thing there that I disagree with. Their founder may be a bit over the top, but I can understand his anger and frustration and I figure he and I are about as eye-to-eye as two individuals could get on lots of things. They are \$100.00 richer right now thanks to PayPal. If I had \$10k + to donate, I would.

Deej

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:463f6e43\$1@linux...

>

> Read this

>

> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>
>
> then this:
>
> <http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>
>
> And you shall understand...
>
> DC
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 07 May 2007 23:08:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

.."TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:463f982d\$1@linux...
>
> As George Carlin once said, human beings are the only species in the world
> that systematically tortures and kills its own kind.
>
> TCB

.....and we are the only species who volunteer for it as well...I mean,
there are actually people out there who want to be president, or to be on
American Idol.....and there are lots of folks who are suicidally
emotionally invested in both.

;oP

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 00:10:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ok, so you think the guy is a fool, but you don't think anyone
should have the right to defend themselves against misanthropic
lunatics.

Well everyone gets an opinion...

DC

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>HI DC,
>

>No I believe humans do not need any help or encouragement when it comes
>to self destruction.
>I think the Paul Watson is as has delusional as they come but has the
>perfect right to have a gun. He can use it to defend him self against
>the human race. With Americas justice system it should hold up just fine

>when he says he defended himself because he felt "imminent threat" to
>his person and property. Well at least it will if he is from a pro gun
>state.
>
>Chris
>
>
>DC wrote:
>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>> HI DC,
>>>
>>> Actually yes that way the virus can eradicate itself with out all the

>>> extra work.
>>>
>>> Chris
>>
>>
>> Sooo, you agree that humanity is a virus?
>>
>>
>> DC
>>
>
>--
>Chris Ludwig
>
>ADK Pro Audio
>(859) 635-5762
>www.adkproaudio.com
>chrisl@adkproaudio.com

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 01:44:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

HI DC,
Everyone should have the right to defend them selves against anyone they
think are lunatics. I should be able to shoot to maim or kill anyone
that I feel are a physical threat to me, my family, my friends or most

important of all my comfortable surrounding.. My bright and shiny objects are mine objects are mine all mine....
There is no protection by having the gun you are just giving into propagating a cycle of violence, fear and despair. The people you feel you need protection from are a product of the same violence, fear and despair.
Chris

DC wrote:

> Ok, so you think the guy is a fool, but you don't think anyone
> should have the right to defend themselves against misanthropic
> lunatics.
>
> Well everyone gets an opinion...
>
> DC
>
>
> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>
>> HI DC,
>>
>> No I believe humans do not need any help or encouragement when it comes
>>
>
>
>> to self destruction.
>> I think the Paul Watson is as has delusional as they come but has the
>> perfect right to have a gun. He can use it to defend him self against
>> the human race. With Americas justice system it should hold up just fine
>>
>
>
>> when he says he defended himself because he felt "imminent threat" to
>> his person and property. Well at least it will if he is from a pro gun
>> state.
>>
>> Chris
>>
>>
>> DC wrote:
>>
>>> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> HI DC,
>>>>

>>>> Actually yes that way the virus can eradicate itself with out all the
>>>>
>
>
>>>> extra work.
>>>>
>>>> Chris
>>>>
>>> Sooo, you agree that humanity is a virus?
>>>
>>>
>>> DC
>>>
>>>
>> --
>> Chris Ludwig
>>
>> ADK Pro Audio
>> (859) 635-5762
>> www.adkproaudio.com
>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com
>>
>
>

--
Chris Ludwig
ADK
chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
(859) 635-5762

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 02:09:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>There is no protection by having the gun you are just giving into
>propagating a cycle of violence, fear and despair. The people you feel
>you need protection from are a product of the same violence, fear and
>despair.

Bullshit.

You want real despair, just find yourself at the end of a knife,

and all those evil guns are gone. See how far your rap gets you then.

Read the Clancy book and tell me it is far-fetched...

Without the second amendment, all the other amendments are just suggestions.

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Rich Lamanna](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 02:17:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Who the hell put this guy in charge? That's such a romantic, fanciful and insane view. If they're coming for me, I'm ready. Damn, I wish I had the bread for that Semmerling LM-4, I guess I'll have to settle for the Colt Defender or the SPRINGFIELD 1911A1 GI MICRO 45ACP.

Rich

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:463f6e43\$1@linux...

>

> Read this

>

> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>

>

> then this:

>

> <http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>

>

> And you shall understand...

>

> DC

>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 06:04:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi DC,

DC wrote:

> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>

>

>> There is no protection by having the gun you are just giving into
>> propagating a cycle of violence, fear and despair. The people you feel
>> you need protection from are a product of the same violence, fear and
>> despair.

>>

>

>

> Bullshit.

>

well everyone gets to have an opinion.

> You want real despair, just find yourself at the end of a knife,

> and all those evil guns are gone.

I've never said to take away anybody's guns. Guns are just inanimate objects like knives, clubs, rocks, sticks. Only thing that could possibly be considered "evil" is the person using it.

> See how far your rap gets

> you then.

>

>

Not sure what Rap Music has to do with it other than being less violent than country music and rock and roll.

> Read the Clancy book and tell me it is far-fetched...

>

Sounds to me more like the Turner Diaries is more up your ally if you believe this kinda of literature. You should get the video game that's been out for it. You'll get to shoot a lot of guns in it.

> Without the second amendment, all the other amendments

> are just suggestions.

>

Without the second you wouldn't have anyone to shoot if they infringed on your 9 other rights. The lack of fair enforcement or of the 3rd to 10th have a lot more to do with your need to evoke the 2nd. If the 1st one is infringed upon by anyone then all the rest aren't worth shit anyways. But the first one is the one that anyone in a position of power will more likely take away because it keeps people from asking questions.

> DC

>

>

Chris

--

Chris Ludwig

ADK

chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>

www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>

(859) 635-5762

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 06:43:19 GMT

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

I want a Kimber Gold Match. yeah baby...

DC

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

>Who the hell put this guy in charge? That's such a romantic, fanciful and

>insane view. If they're coming for me, I'm ready. Damn, I wish I had the

>bread for that Semmerling LM-4, I guess I'll have to settle for the Colt

>Defender or the SPRINGFIELD 1911A1 GI MICRO 45ACP.

>

>Rich

>

>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:463f6e43\$1@linux...

>>

>> Read this

>>

>> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>

>>

>> then this:

>>

>> <http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>

>>

>> And you shall understand...

>>

>> DC

>>

>

>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 07:07:05 GMT

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>I've never said to take away anybodies guns. Guns are just inanimate
>objects like knives, clubs, rocks, sticks. Only thing that could
>possibly be considered "evil" is the person using it.

And of course, should one find oneself in a situation in which "evil" has
lost its "quotes" then one might be well served by such a tool.

>Sounds to me more like the Turner Diaries is more up your ally if you
>believe this kinda of literature. You should get the video game thats
>been out for it. You'll get to shoot allot of guns in it.

And if you think the Clancy book is not eerily predictive of that article
I linked to then you have not read it. Why would you mistake
mainstream writing like Tom Clancy for the Turner Diaries? odd...

>> Without the second amendment, all the other amendments
>> are just suggestions.

>With out the second you wouldn't have anyone to shoot if they infringed

>on you 9 other rights. The lack of fair enforcement or of the 3rd to
>10th have allot more to do with your need to evoke the 2nd. If the 1st
>one is infringed upon by anyone then all the rest aren't worth shit
>anyways. But the first one is the one that anyone in a position of power

>will more likely to take away because it keeps people from asking questions.

There is no other way to rescue rights from a tyrant, as history has
shown. This is why the founders put the 2nd amendment in there. It is
a right, not subject to government. It is fundamental.

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 07:09:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BTW, the thread was about the article I linked, not guns. Pretend I never
mentioned guns if it helps with your digestion, but that article is truly

frightening.

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 08:36:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Actually, though this guy is obviously disturbed, I don't think the humans-as-disease-on-earth-as-organism is all that far-fetched as a crude analogy. And like viruses or bacteria that cause disease in our bodies, humans will die off if they "kill" the host, or if the host's defenses get the better of them. Nature has ways of dealing with overpopulation. If we don't control it, nature will. No worries.

As far as the 2nd Amendment . . . listen, guns don't kill people, it's the bullets. :)

S

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:463f6e43\$1@linux...
>
> Read this
>
> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>
>
> then this:
>
> <http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>
>
> And you shall understand...
>
> DC
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 13:51:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>Actually, though this guy is obviously disturbed, I don't think the
>humans-as-disease-on-earth-as-organism is all that far-fetched as a crude

>analogy. And like viruses or bacteria that cause disease in our bodies,

>humans will die off if they "kill" the host, or if the host's defenses get

>the better of them. Nature has ways of dealing with overpopulation. If we

>don't control it, nature will. No worries.

It's insane, and will lead to bad policy. The real problem with humanity is not recognizing the inherent absurdity of teaching itself that the earth is better off without it. Well how do you know, really? You just believe it.

It is a perverted faith by which the left comforts itself of a supposed superiority while accomplishing nothing but strife and misery. It is the basic health and wealth of the free market that allows us even to consider such nonsense. It's a bauble, an expensive indulgence that serves as a status symbol for the guilt-ridden. Read the Clancy book. It is not a political diatribe, it is a story of what could happen should these people gain power.

>As far as the 2nd Amendment . . . listen, guns don't kill people, it's the

>bullets. :)

<http://amazon.com/gp/product/0226493644>

Hitler took guns away from the Jews first...

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 14:59:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spammersinthetroposphere.com> wrote in message
news:46408072\$1@linux...

>

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

>>Actually, though this guy is obviously disturbed, I don't think the
>>humans-as-disease-on-earth-as-organism is all that far-fetched as a crude

>

>>analogy. And like viruses or bacteria that cause disease in our bodies,

>

>>humans will die off if they "kill" the host, or if the host's defenses get

>

>>the better of them. Nature has ways of dealing with overpopulation. If

> we

>>don't control it, nature will. No worries.

>

> It's insane, and will lead to bad policy. The real problem with humanity

> is not recognizing the inherent absurdity of teaching itself that the

> earth

> is better off without it.

Hmmmm.....I don't think there's much doubt that when man overpopulates an area, everything, including man, suffers in a pretty big way.

Well how do you know, really? You just believe

> it.

Having inhabited this place for well over half a century, I can go back to places that I knew 40 years ago and look at what has happened since then and see it for myself.

> It is a perverted faith by which the left comforts itself of a supposed

> superiority while accomplishing nothing but strife and misery. It is the

> basic health and wealth of the free market that allows us even to consider

> such nonsense.

Don, you have known me for quite a while and I think you could say that though I seem sorta' nuts sometimes, I'm definitely not a leftist. I also believe in the free market. I also own guns (quite a few). I also believe that the reason that the climate is changing is because there are too many of *us* and we have chosen to use the cheapest fuels we can find to power our industries. It's not the fuels that are evil, per se, it's the amount of them necessary to keep the economic juggernaut in full swing. The economic juggernaut is not just the US. It's global now, like it or not. We could do some things that would be painful in the short run and beneficial in the long run and keep our economy here afloat while we transition to new energy sources but we are not doing these things. Whether it would make much difference if other parts of the pwrld don't do the same is certainly a valid question, but since we are *free market* kinda' folks, if we did develop new technologies, we could market them.

It's a bauble, an expensive indulgence that serves as a

> status symbol for the guilt-ridden. Read the Clancy book. It is not a

> political diatribe, it is a story of what could happen should these people

> gain power.

>

Hmmmm.....I don't feel guilt ridden at all. I just see things as I think they are. I also don't think humans are inherently evil. Too many horses will overgraze a pasture and turn it into a wasteland. Too many rats in an enclosed space will result in all sorts of aberrant behaviour, finally ending in some major *ratricide*.

>
>>As far as the 2nd Amendment . . . listen, guns don't kill people, it's the
>
>>bullets. :)
>
> <http://amazon.com/gp/product/0226493644>
>
> Hitler took guns away from the Jews first...
>
> DC

Agreed. I believe in the 2nd amendment. Some jerk breaks into my place and he's toast. Plain and simple. I also believe that we should allocate a few thousand square miles of some national forest for the trophy hunters. A pair of them would be allocated 10 square miles and they would be required to hunt each other. The corpse of the loser is then shipped to a taxidermist to be mounted for the hunters trophy room and now that he (or she) has proved that they can point and shoot, the survivor's gun would be forfeit for the remainder of the hunt and they would then receive a hunting license that would entitle them to a knife and two weeks to build their own weapon from whatever resources that might be handy in order for them to attempt to hunt and kill an animal with their contraption so they could further assert their manliness.

;o)

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 15:23:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:
>Maybe a more pertinent piece of contemporary fiction would be "The
>Road" by Cormac MacCarthy -- there's a cheerful view of the
>post-apocalyptic future for ya...

That guy used to live here until he got pretty well-known in the past few years, and got sick of people driving by his house & staring in & peeking over his fence, etc, trying to catch a glimpse of the famous guy lol I think he retreated to Santa Fe now.

Neil

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [duncan](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 16:01:25 GMT

Did I miss something? Was the 2nd Amendment repealed? I mean, you guys still have your guns, right? And, has Clancy suddenly turned into something other than a highly successful writer of fiction? Maybe a more pertinent piece of contemporary fiction would be "The Road" by Cormac MacCarthy -- there's a cheerful view of the post-apocalyptic future for ya...

-- chas

On 8 May 2007 04:21:55 +1000, "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote:

>
>Read this
>
> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>
>
>then this:
>
><http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>
>
>And you shall understand...
>
>DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 16:19:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The book is a page turner in the Clancy tradition and not apocalyptic nor about guns. Someone used the mention of guns to change the subject. The book almost predicts the rise of people like the mook who was the subject of the article I linked. The book is a great read. Solid adventure writing.

DC

Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:
>Did I miss something? Was the 2nd Amendment repealed? I mean, you
>guys still have your guns, right? And, has Clancy suddenly turned
>into something other than a highly successful writer of fiction?
>Maybe a more pertinent piece of contemporary fiction would be "The
>Road" by Cormac MacCarthy -- there's a cheerful view of the

>post-apocalyptic future for ya...

>

>-- chas

>

>

>On 8 May 2007 04:21:55 +1000, "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote:

>

>>

>>Read this

>>

>> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>

>>

>>then this:

>>

>><http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>

>>

>>And you shall understand...

>>

>>DC

>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 16:50:20 GMT

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

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>Hmmm.....I don't think there's much doubt that when man overpopulates

>an area, everything, including man, suffers in a pretty big way.

>

>Well how do you know, really? You just believe

>> it.

No humanity = no one to believe anything. Therefore believing in the benefit of human extinction is a pernicious irrationality and a conceit intended to prove one's own moral standing while knowing it is all a sham.

We have not come anywhere close to overpopulating anything, and Malthus was discredited generations ago.

>Having inhabited this place for well over half a century, I can go back to

>places that I knew 40 years ago and look at what has happened since then

and
>see it for myself.

You see changes you do not like. Man, remember the freeways out here? It was way better in 63, trust me. This does not constitute overpopulation because we don't like it.

Since '63, we have done stupid stuff like build metro-link rail systems that even when full, use more fuel and pollute more than cars to carry the same number of people...

Oh and we HAD to have a new LA subway that is way under-used while the freeways have been neglected for 30 years...

Ideology corrupting policy.

We have had successes too. The cars are so clean today that the air here is actually better than in the 1970's when there were far fewer people.

>Don, you have known me for quite a while and I think you could say that
>though I seem sorta' nuts sometimes, I'm definitely not a leftist. I also
>believe in the free market. I also own guns (quite a few). I also believe
>that the reason that the climate is changing is because there are too many
>of *us* and we have chosen to use the cheapest fuels we can find to power
>our industries. It's not the fuels that are evil, per se, it's the amount
of
>them necessary to keep the economic juggernaut in full swing. The economic
>juggernaut is not just the US. It's global now, like it or not. We could
do
>some things that would be painful in the short run and beneficial in the

>long run and keep our economy here afloat while we transition to new energy
sources but we are not doing these things. Whether it would make much
>difference if other parts of the world don't do the same is certainly a

>valid question, but since we are *free market* kinda' folks, if we did
>develop new technologies, we could market them.

Well, you know where the next logical move is, don't you? Since the envrios, yuppies and NIMBY's won't let us build drilling platforms or refineries, and photovoltaics cost more to make and install than the power they replace, while sh*theads like Ted Kennedy won't even allow windmills to "blight" their view, and our deadbeat president will NOT do anything to force the development of new resources?

You know what's coming don't you? That's right. Nuclear plants...
Or, we can kill a couple of billion people off.

Great evil is always just below the surface of all demagogues, be they left or right.

Yes, things can get worse. A lot worse.

>Hmmm.....I don't feel guilt ridden at all. I just see things as I think

>they are. I also don't think humans are inherently evil. Too many horses

>will overgraze a pasture and turn it into a wasteland. Too many rats in an

>enclosed space will result in all sorts of aberrant behaviour, finally

>ending in some major *raticide*.

Funny, the "rats" in NYC seem to be doing fine. No raticide at all. Hell, even Calcuttans seem to get along most of the time. Maybe, umm, we're just not rats? I think your model lacks some sophistication here...

>I also believe that we should allocate a few

>thousand square miles of some national forest for the trophy hunters. A pair

>of them would a allocated 10 square miles and they would be required to hunt

>each other. The corpse of the loser is then shipped to a taxidermist to be

>mounted for the hunters trophy room and now that he (or she) has proved that

>they can point and shoot, the survivor's gun would be forfeit for the

>remainder of the hunt and they would then receive a hunting license that

>would entitle them to a knife and two weeks to build their own weapon from

>whatever resources that might be handy in order for them to attempt to hunt

>and kill an animal with their contraption so they could further assert their

>manliness.

>

>;o)

You know, I tried and tried to become a vegetarian. I really believe in it.

I would like my lunch to not involve this:

<http://www.meat.org/>

wouldn't you?

Are you a vegetarian? If not, the system you support with your money and choices is far, far worse than hunting. The hunters I have known have been honorable people. I have no use for it myself, but I believe that it should continue as long as there is meat for sale.

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 18:15:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> We have not come anywhere close to overpopulating anything

I disagree with this. There aren't that many places on this planet that are really favorable for us. These areas must have a water supply, first and foremost. From water comes everything else, if there is adequate and favorable surrounding land to grow food. At this point, you can eliminate approximately 95% of the earth's surface from our life support system without using some sort of technology to change this...which we have done. Thing is, when we do this, we start jacking around with the life support system that lots of other species depend on for their existence as well. Some of these species regulate the environment that we must have in order to survive. If we jack around with the fundamental life support system by thinking we can alter it for our own purposes, we are pissin' in the wind.....and yeah, I know that the entire population of the earth could fit in New Jersey if they stood shoulder-to-shoulder.....though I know some Jerseyites that might object.
;o)

> You see changes you do not like. Man, remember the freeways out
> here? It was way better in 63, trust me. This does not constitute
> overpopulation because we don't like it.

Perhaps not.....but it does constitute a lower quality of life for most

everyone, which produces stress, which contributes to the degradation of just about any living organism.

>

- > Since '63, we have done stupid stuff like build metro-link rail
- > systems that even when full, use more fuel and pollute more than cars
- > to carry the same number of people...

Hehehe!!.....but hey!!!!.....it's PC so at least everyone can share the commonality of the fuckup. Group hug? ;o)

- > Oh and we HAD to have a new LA subway that is way under-used
- > while the freeways have been neglected for 30 years...

Well, of course....but if you guys can get a bunch of wooden desks down there to hide under, you can use it for an air raid shelter when the Rooskies bomb us. Remember that?

;o)

>

- > Ideology corrupting policy.
- >
- > We have had successes too. The cars are so clean today that the air here
- > is
- > actually better than in the 1970's when there were far fewer people.
- >

Remember when we were driving down the Hollywood freeway with the top down last year? I thought I was going to suffocate from the fumes. Now think about how much nicer that would have been if those *other* folks would have been riding the metro or subway.

>

- > Well, you know where the next logical move is, don't you? Since the
- > envrios, yuppies and NIMBY's won't let us build drilling platforms or
- > refineries, and photovoltaics cost more to make and install than the power
- > they replace, while sh*theads like Ted Kennedy won't even allow windmills
- > to "blight" their view, and our deadbeat president will NOT do anything
- > to force the development of new resources?

Agreed. If we kill all the lawyers, they won't be able to survive. that might be a good starting point.

>

- > You know what's coming don't you? That's right. Nuclear plants...
- > Or, we can kill a couple of billion people off.

Now you're starting to get my drift. A couple billion won't do it though. I

think mother nature has a few surprises in store for us. We've got a new, improved batch of bugs now with frequent flyer miles and they're coming soon to a theatre near you.

- > Great evil is always just below the surface of all demagogues, be they
- > left or right.
- >
- > Yes, things can get worse. A lot worse.

I don't think this guy's philosophy is evil. It's just pragmatic. I don't see it happening in any kind of *actionable* scenario.....not while I've got firearms at my disposal.....which might be just the ticket. If everyone had firearms and we get pissed off enough, statistically, half of us are toast anyway. It's a start at least and we can at least do the right thing and take responsibility for it. We can even find a religious loophole to justify it, I'betcha'.

- > Funny, the "rats" in NYC seem to be doing fine. No ratricide at all.
- > Hell,
- > even Calcuttans seem to get along most of the time. Maybe, umm, we're
- > just not rats? I think your model lacks some sophistication here...

Well, that's because there are plenty of people there to keep them well fed. We, OTOH, occasionally require liebenstraum, but in only the best places, of course.

- >
- > You know, I tried and tried to become a vegetarian. I really believe in
- > it.
- > I would like my lunch to not involve this:
- >
- > <http://www.meat.org/>
- >
- > wouldn't you?

Yes.

- > Are you a vegetarian?

No.

If not, the system you support with
> your money and choices is far, far worse than hunting.

Agreed. This system needs to change in a big way. In order to avoid these horrors, we will need lots more land for agricultural grazing, etc, which takes it out of the moneymaking/development/living space cycle. Can't have that now can we? Where would we all live? If there were fewer people, there might be fewer protein factories. Being naturally omniverous creatures, I

can't really see the earth's population going vegan. Less humans=more humanity?

The hunters I

- > have known have been honorable people. I have no use for it myself, but
- > I believe that it should continue as long as there is meat for sale.

Please reread my post. I'm talking about *trophy* hunters.

>

> DC

>

Deej

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 19:37:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

- >At this point, you can eliminate
- >approximately 95% of the earth's surface from our life support system
- >without using some sort of technology to change this...which we have done.

I think you have your percentages way off, and where does the idea come from that we are not supposed to use technology? We were -designed to design things-. The idea that we are apes with big brains who, if we were not so uppity, would be living in tipis and dying at 27 is utter rubbish.

I guess it depends on where you are coming from...

>Thing is, when we do this, we start jacking around with the life support

>system that lots of other species depend on for their existence as well.

>Some of these species regulate the environment that we must have in order to

>survive. If we jack around with the fundamental life support system by
>thinking we can alter it for our own purposes, we are pissin' in the
>wind

Well we have to be careful don't we? But we are supposed to be stewards, not servants of the earth. Too many enviros are Gaian lunatics.

Would you settle for fusion plants, hydrogen cars, and careful nuclear waste storage?

Technology has had undeniable benefits and has solved thousands of the scourges of humanity that our ancestors died from. Now, we are in the stage of learning how to balance things out. Hell, there are lakes in Russia that are so radioactive that they will kill you in 30 minutes of exposure...

Ain't it a bit disingenious for US of all people, these big-brained audio engineers and computer people, to be whining about technology? Seems silly to me. We do need to make wise decisions and often do not, but I will tell you this much; I believe that testing H-bombs in the atmosphere was really stupid and that we are also stupid today when we won't let a family build a house because someone found a fungus-loving spotted dung beetle somewhere near the property. Also, notice that those prohibiting the new house ALWAYS have their nice little Ranchette already, don't they?

>.....and yeah, I know that the entire population of the earth
>could fit in New Jersey if they stood shoulder-to shoulder.....though
I
>know some Jerseyites that might object.
>;o)

Depends on how many palms were greased.. snork..

>> You see changes you do not like. Man, remember the freeways out
>> here? It was way better in 63, trust me. This does not constitute
>> overpopulation because we don't like it.

>Perhaps not.....but it does constitute a lower quality of life for most
>everyone, which produces stress, which contributes to the degradation of
>just about any living organism.

As an NYC native I can't imagine such a thing, but I guess it is what you are used to. At any rate, quality of life issues are not something to advocate mass extinctions over...

>> Since '63, we have done stupid stuff like build metro-link rail

>> systems that even when full, use more fuel and pollute more than cars
>> to carry the same number of people...

>Hehehe!!.....but hey!!!!.....it's PC so at least everyone can share

>the commonality of the fuckup. Group hug? ;o)

I like subways a lot... But subways are a reality, not an idea, and the reality has to *work* dammit... They are finally getting serious about fixing the freeways out here, but it is too little too late to prevent horrible commutes for people. CA used to have the best drivers in the country. Now, it's just idiots playing bumper cars.

>Well, of course....but if you guys can get a bunch of wooden desks down

>there to hide under, you can use it for an air raid shelter when the

>Rooskies bomb us. Remember that?

>

>;o)

Well, it sure worked for the Brits didn't it? With this guy Putin, I think another dangerous version of Russia is a real possibility.

>Remember when we were driving down the Hollywood freeway with the top down

>last year? I thought I was going to suffocate from the fumes. Now think

>about how much nicer that would have been if those *other* folks would have

>been riding the metro or subway.

It would have been worse. Metrolink, even when full, pollutes MORE than the number of cars needed to carry those people...

If we want to accomplish what you have in mind, the rail system must be electric, not diesel and that means nuclear plants...

>Now you're starting to get my drift. A couple billion won't do it though.

I

>think mother nature has a few surprises in store for us. We've got a new,

>improved batch of bugs now with frequent flyer miles and they're coming

soon

>to a theatre near you.

Yeah, and the idea that this is Gaia's Revenge is the result of waay too much LSD...

Epidemics tend to be self-limiting. Remember the anthrax scare?

>I don't think this guy's philosophy is evil. It's just pragmatic. I don't

>see it happening in any kind of *actionable* scenario

I think he is certifiable and has brainwashed himself to hate his own kind. Those sort love all animals except humanity, and given power will kill as many of us as they can.

>It's a start at least and we can at least do the right

>thing and take responsibility for it. We can even find a religious loophole

>to justify it, I'betcha'.

Be clear on one thing. Christians believe the end of the world is not something we can stop. We need to try to, since we do not know when it will be, and we need to always be good stewards of the earth, and we need to NEVER try to bring about war or any other misery to try to assist God to fulfill prophecy, (what an absurd idea!). You are right though, people will try to find a religious justification for their own evil and have done so many times.

>Well, that's because there are plenty of people there to keep them well fed.

Ain't technology cool?

>> Are you a vegetarian?

>No.

>>If not, the system you support with

>> your money and choices is far, far worse than hunting.

>Agreed. This system needs to change in a big way. In order to avoid these

>horrors, we will need lots more land for agricultural grazing, etc, which
>takes it out of the moneymaking/development/living space cycle. Can't have
>that now can we? Where would we all live? If there were fewer people, there
>might be fewer protein factories. Being naturally omniverous creatures,
I
>can't really see the earth's population going vegan. Less humans=more
>humanity?

As always, how do we get there? The euros are committing cultural suicide with 1.1 babies per couple and many do not bother with marriage, while the muslim immigrants have 4.5.

See where this is heading?

The new clothing store; Burqa Bob's!

Our prices are INSANE!!

>Please reread my post. I'm talking about *trophy* hunters.

I dunno. I don't want a bunch of dead animal heads on the wall, (I do have a pair of Louie Bellson's drumsticks up there though) but I doubt that most hunters are jerks. I don't know many, admittedly.

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [JeffH](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 20:49:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>>Are you a vegetarian?
>

BUt if we all become vegetarians, global warming would increase!!!
Think about it...The source of our CO2 control would be our main course.
Greenhouse gases would increase the more we ate. Herds of cattle and flocks of chickens would decrease, therby further reducing the available fertilizer which help grow... you guessed it, the plants that protect us from greenhouse gases.

;-P

Hoov

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 21:19:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LOL.

If we eat all of the plants, global warming will be the least of our worries. Good thing plants are renewable...

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Jeff Hoover wrote:

>
>>> Are you a vegetarian?
>>
>
> BUt if we all become vegetarians, global warming would increase!!! Think
> about it...The source of our CO2 control would be our main course.
> Greenhouse gases would increase the more we ate. Herds of cattle and
> flocks of chickens would decrease, therby further reducing the available
> fertilizer which help grow... you guessed it, the plants that protect us
> from greenhouse gases.
>
> ;-P
>
>
> Hoov

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [duncan](#) on Tue, 08 May 2007 23:39:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

My bad -- leapt to an assumption based on the subject line of the post...

-- not trying to take away anyone's guns, but I do want to severely restrict your right to read "beach" books...

chas.

On 9 May 2007 02:19:29 +1000, "DC" <dc@spammersinthejungle.com> wrote:

>
>The book is a page turner in the Clancy tradition and not apocalyptic
>nor about guns. Someone used the mention of guns to change
>the subject. The book almost predicts the rise of people like the
>mook who was the subject of the article I linked. The book is a great
>read. Solid adventure writing.
>
>DC
>
>
>
>Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:
>>Did I miss something? Was the 2nd Amendment repealed? I mean, you
>>guys still have your guns, right? And, has Clancy suddenly turned
>>into something other than a highly successful writer of fiction?
>>Maybe a more pertinent piece of contemporary fiction would be "The
>>Road" by Cormac MacCarthy -- there's a cheerful view of the
>>post-apocalyptic future for ya...
>>
>>-- chas
>>
>>
>>On 8 May 2007 04:21:55 +1000, "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>Read this
>>>
>>> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>
>>>
>>>then this:
>>>
>>><http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>
>>>
>>>And you shall understand...
>>>
>>>DC
>>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Rich Lamanna](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 04:43:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, Kimber Arms, nice stuff, but expensive.

Rich

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:46401c07\$1@linux...
>
> I want a Kimber Gold Match. yeah baby...
>
> DC
>
>
>
> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:
> >Who the hell put this guy in charge? That's such a romantic, fanciful and
> >insane view. If they're coming for me, I'm ready. Damn, I wish I had the
> >bread for that Semmerling LM-4, I guess I'll have to settle for the Colt
> >Defender or the SPRINGFIELD 1911A1 GI MICRO 45ACP.
> >
> >Rich
> >
> >"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:463f6e43\$1@linux...
> >>
> >> Read this
> >>
> >> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>
> >>
> >> then this:
> >>
> >> <http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>
> >>
> >> And you shall understand...
> >>
> >> DC
> >>
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Rich Lamanna](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 04:45:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> As far as the 2nd Amendment . . . listen, guns don't kill people, it's the
> bullets. :)

Sarah, you're a very, very clever and funny woman. You got me laughing at
that one.

Peace,
Rich

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:464037ff\$1@linux...

> Actually, though this guy is obviously disturbed, I don't think the
> humans-as-disease-on-earth-as-organism is all that far-fetched as a crude
> analogy. And like viruses or bacteria that cause disease in our bodies,
> humans will die off if they "kill" the host, or if the host's defenses get
> the better of them. Nature has ways of dealing with overpopulation. If we
> don't control it, nature will. No worries.

>

>

> S

>

>

> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:463f6e43\$1@linux...

>>

>> Read this

>>

>> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>

>>

>> then this:

>>

>> <http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>

>>

>> And you shall understand...

>>

>> DC

>>

>

>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment

Posted by [JeffH](#) on Wed, 09 May 2007 06:33:20 GMT

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

My wife used to work for them machining the bolts, pre-bankruptcy.

Definitely not high on the price performance ratio, but beautiful rifles

Hoov

Rich Lamanna wrote:

> Yeah, Kimber Arms, nice stuff, but expensive.

>

> Rich

>

> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:46401c07\$1@linux...
>
>>I want a Kimber Gold Match. yeah baby...
>>
>>DC
>>
>>
>>
>>"Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:
>>
>>>Who the hell put this guy in charge? That's such a romantic, fanciful and
>>>insane view. If they're coming for me, I'm ready. Damn, I wish I had the
>>>bread for that Semmerling LM-4, I guess I'll have to settle for the Colt
>>>Defender or the SPRINGFIELD 1911A1 GI MICRO 45ACP.
>>>
>>>Rich
>>>
>>>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:463f6e43\$1@linux...
>>>
>>>>Read this
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20070506180903.aspx>
>>>>
>>>>then this:
>>>>
>>>><http://www.amazon.com/Rainbow-Six-Tom-Clancy/dp/0425170349>
>>>>
>>>>And you shall understand...
>>>>
>>>>DC
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 04:21:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

HI DC,

Ok back on topic.. :)

DC wrote:

> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>

>
>> I've never said to take away anybody's guns. Guns are just inanimate
>> objects like knives, clubs, rocks, sticks. Only thing that could
>> possibly be considered "evil" is the person using it.

>>
>
> And of course, should one find oneself in a situation in which "evil" has
> lost its "quotes" then one might be well served by such a tool.

>
>
I don't think the person that is attacking me or that I'm attacking is
evil. If they are directly mine or someone else's life and the only way
I have to stop them is to kill or injure them I think is perfectly
exceptable and a normal reaction for our species. We are hoarding
pack/tribal creatures that have been lucky enough to our brains become
our main survival tools. Our environmental manipulation was/is one of
our methods of survival. Our tool making ability only made this process
faster and more powerful. With the speed of technology in the past few
centuries I think has made the previously excellent survival mechanism
start to work against use. We need to either to alter this behavior
ourselves or wait for evolution, nature or whatever you want to believe
to get around to changing it. This may involve removing us out of the
picture. Personally I think we should alter our now self destructive
behavior. We have been here a far shorter time than any other species.
I can only hope that this is just the very beginning for use and we will
last as long as the dinosaurs. Heck even lasting as long as some of the
proto-humans would great. Many species have died out in the past from
natural disasters, plagues, overgrazing, over population. We have as
far we know developed the unique ability of being self aware so we can
potentially change our minds and methods of dealing with the world.

>
>> Sounds to me more like the Turner Diaries is more up your ally if you
>> believe this kinda of literature. You should get the video game that's
>> been out for it. You'll get to shoot a lot of guns in it.

>>
>
> And if you think the Clancy book is not eerily predictive of that article
> I linked to then you have not read it. Why would you mistake
> mainstream writing like Tom Clancy for the Turner Diaries? odd...

>
>
>
A radical group of people that feel that the dominant government/society
is destroying their beliefs and way of life. They believe that the only
way to stop this is by committing terrorists acts on a large scale
against their protagonists killing thousand if not millions of their
enemies to bring about their vision of the world.

Luckily Clancy did not write the Turner Diaries because would probably be influential on enough actually make a difference. It has only influenced fringe groups so we've only had a Oklahoma city bombing so far. The book is poorly written almost as bad a Mein Kampf. Another book that I'm glad Clancy didn't write. :)

>>> Without the second amendment, all the other amendments
>>> are just suggestions.
>>>
>
>

And very good ones at that. but like the 10 commandments they should have been more detailed.

>> With out the second you wouldn't have anyone to shoot if they infringed
>>
>
>
>> on you 9 other rights. The lack of fair enforcement or of the 3rd to
>> 10th have allot more to do with your need to evoke the 2nd. If the 1st
>> one is infringed upon by anyone then all the rest aren't worth shit
>> anyways. But the first one is the one that anyone in a position of power
>>
>
>
>> will more likely to take away because it keeps people from asking questions.
>>
>
>
> There is no other way to rescue rights from a tyrant, as history has
> shown. This is why the founders put the 2nd amendment in there. It is
> a right, not subject to government. It is fundamental.
>

Thankfully we didn't make our right to bare arms the same as England's.
They only allowed Protestants the right.

> DC
>

Chris

--

Chris Ludwig
ADK

chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
(859) 635-5762

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 05:14:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

> I don't think the person that is attacking me our that I'm attacking is

>evil. If they are directly mine or someone else's life and the only way

>I have to stop them is to kill or injure them I think is perfectly
>except able and a normal reaction pf our species. We are hoarding
>pack/tribal creatures that have been lucky enough to our brains become
>our main survival tools. snip...

We will not agree on solutions because we utterly disagree on these
premises. I reject this view of life on its face, as you surely do mine.

>A radical group of people that feel that the dominant government/society

>is destroying their beliefs and way of life. They believe that the only

>way to stop this is by committing terrorists acts on a large scale
>against their protagonists killing thousand if not millions of their
>enemies to bring about their vision of the world.
>Luckily Clancy did not write the Turner Diaries because would probably
>be influential on enough actually make a difference. It has only
>influenced fringe groups so we've only had a Oklahoma city bombing so
>far. The book is poorly written almost as bad a Mein Kampf. Another book

>that I'm glad Clancy didn't write. :)

Even using Clancy in the same sentence is silly. Does doing so, strike
you as clever?

You should read Rainbow 6, you have got it totally wrong. In this case
it is the radicals who are planning a giant die off in the name of Gaia,
not
the government.

The closest thing to Mein Kampf in this whole discussion is right here:

http://www.seashepherd.org/editorials/editorial_070504_1.htm I

>>> Without the second amendment, all the other amendments
>>> are just suggestions.

>And very good ones at that. but like the 10 commandments they should
>have been more detailed.

And of course, you know better than the author of either... Amazing.

>Thankfully we didn't make our right to bare arms the same as England's.

>They only allowed Protestants the right.

I'm sure there is a point in here somewhere...

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 14:34:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

HI DC,

DC wrote:

> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>

>

>

>> I don't think the person that is attacking me our that I'm attacking is

>>

>

>

>> evil. If they are directly mine or someone else's life and the only way

>>

>

>

>> I have to stop them is to kill or injure them I think is perfectly

>> except able and a normal reaction pf our species. We are hoarding

>> pack/tribal creatures that have been lucky enough to our brains become

>> our main survival tools. snip...

>>

>

> We will not agree on solutions because we utterly disagree on these
> premises. I reject this view of life on its face, as you surely do mine.

>

>

>

Thankfully we can both can disagree in peace because we live in America.

>> A radical group of people that feel that the dominant government/society
>>
>
>
>> is destroying their beliefs and way of life. They believe that the only
>>
>
>
>> way to stop this is by committing terrorists acts on a large scale
>> against their protagonists killing thousand if not millions of their
>> enemies to bring about their vision of the world.
>> Luckily Clancy did not write the Turner Diaries because would probably
>> be influential on enough actually make a difference. It has only
>> influenced fringe groups so we've only had a Oklahoma city bombing so
>> far. The book is poorly written almost as bad a Mein Kampf. Another book
>>
>
>
>> that I'm glad Clancy didn't write. :)

>>
>
>
> Even using Clancy in the same sentence is silly. Does doing so, strike
> you as clever?
> You should read Rainbow 6, you have got it totally wrong. In this case
> it is the radicals who are planning a giant die off in the name of Gaia,
> not
> the government.

Yes I know what the book is about and what I was getting at apparently unsuccessfully was that you can replace the government with anything you want including Gaia. The people in both books are under the delusion that they are doing the right just thing and are saving their world. Those are only similarities I see in them at all. Having Clancy not writing these books is because being a good author he would have made the books far more influential than they were.

>
>
> The closest thing to Mein Kampf in this whole discussion is right here:
>
> http://www.seashepherd.org/editorials/editorial_070504_1.htm I

>
>
>
He sound more like a Manson or Jim Jones type to me not Hitler.
>>>> Without the second amendment, all the other amendments
>>>> are just suggestions.
>>>>
>
>
>> And very good ones at that. but like the 10 commandments they should
>> have been more detailed.
>>
>
> And of course, you know better than the author of either... Amazing.
>
Ummm never said that nor implied it. Both documents are some most
concise ones ever written.
The people they are written for have the habit of interpreting them for
whatever ends they feel like.
The 2nd amendment and the 6 commandment being the simplest and most
straight forward line written in either document.
They are also arguably both suffer from the most re-interpretations.

>
>
>> Thankfully we didn't make our right to bare arms the same as England's.
>>
>
>
>> They only allowed Protestants the right.
>>
>
> I'm sure there is a point in here somewhere...
>
>
> DC
>
>
Chris

--
Chris Ludwig
ADK
chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
(859) 635-5762

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 15:27:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don,

This article down to and including the sentence:

"It's a train that carries all the earth's species as unwilling passengers with humans as the manically insane engineers unwilling to use the brake pedal."

.....appears to be deadly accurate. The remainder is simply a pragmatic argument based on statistics. Do you dispute the statistics? If so, can you disprove them. Has anyone even tried? Is there even any point in it? If not, why would you dismiss this as being Hitlerian? He's not advocating the survival of one group of *superhumans* over another group of *subhumans*. I'd say he's pretty egalitarian for a Nazi. I personally don't think there's a chance in hell that things are going to change for the better here unless we drastically reduce the number of *us* somehow and I also believe that our biological imperative to breed and survive will eventually be the end of us but I think that this will be taken out of our hands if we don't take some steps that, by virtue of our very instinct to survive at all costs, we will never be willing to take.

Beware the microbe.

;o)

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:4642aa36\$1@linux...

>

> Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>

>

>> I don't think the person that is attacking me our that I'm attacking is

>

>>evil. If they are directly mine or someone else's life and the only way

>

>>I have to stop them is to kill or injure them I think is perfectly

>>except able and a normal reaction pf our species. We are hoarding

>>pack/tribal creatures that have been lucky enough to our brains become

>>our main survival tools. snip...

>

> We will not agree on solutions because we utterly disagree on these

> premises. I reject this view of life on its face, as you surely do mine.

>

>

>>A radical group of people that feel that the dominant government/society
>
>>is destroying their beliefs and way of life. They believe that the only
>
>>way to stop this is by committing terrorists acts on a large scale
>>against their protagonists killing thousand if not millions of their
>>enemies to bring about their vision of the world.
>>Luckily Clancy did not write the Turner Diaries because would probably
>>be influential on enough actually make a difference. It has only
>>influenced fringe groups so we've only had a Oklahoma city bombing so
>>far. The book is poorly written almost as bad a Mein Kampf. Another book
>
>>that I'm glad Clancy didn't write. :)
>
>
> Even using Clancy in the same sentence is silly. Does doing so, strike
> you as clever?
> You should read Rainbow 6, you have got it totally wrong. In this case
> it is the radicals who are planning a giant die off in the name of Gaia,
> not
> the government.
>
> The closest thing to Mein Kampf in this whole discussion is right here:
>
> http://www.seashepherd.org/editorials/editorial_070504_1.htm I
>
>
>>>> Without the second amendment, all the other amendments
>>>> are just suggestions.
>
>>And very good ones at that. but like the 10 commandments they should
>>have been more detailed.
>
> And of course, you know better than the author of either... Amazing.
>
>
>>Thankfully we didn't make our right to bare arms the same as England's.
>
>>They only allowed Protestants the right.
>
> I'm sure there is a point in here somewhere...
>
>
> DC
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 18:14:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>Don,

>

>This article down to and including the sentence:

>

>"It's a train that carries all the earth's species as unwilling passengers

>with humans as the manically insane engineers unwilling to use the brake

>pedal."

No it doesn't. That is the part you extract because you care so much about this issue. In reality, the article boils down to this

There is NO way to implement the recommendations of Watson without a regime that would make the Nazi's look polite.

And this is the subtext of all these ideas: the individual behind them is unbalanced, seeing humans as "no more intrinsically valuable than earthworms". This is, of course, absurd. Ironically it takes a human, with all the benefits of our big brains, our schools, our science, and our reasoning and writing skills, to say such stupid shit. The statement itself proves him to be wrong and a fool since the earthworm cannot assent to it, nor dispute it. Watson is a moron and a misanthrope.

<http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/individualProfile.asp?ind id=1217>

<http://www.activistcash.com/biography.cfm/bid/3370>

There's lots more.

If you would like a serious discussion of these important issues, we will have to find a different starting point, one informed by rational beliefs and willing to examine contradictory evidence.

>.....appears to be deadly accurate. The remainder is simply a pragmatic

>argument based on statistics. Do you dispute the statistics?

Abso-fuggin-lutely. I dispute anything out of Watson's mouth.

>If so, can you

>disprove them. Has anyone even tried?

I looked around. There is no specific scientific refutation of the piece out there yet. It is too new. There will be one.

>but I think that this will be taken out of our hands if we don't take some
>steps that, by virtue of our very instinct to survive at all costs, we will
>never be willing to take.

I, of course have a different view of the future of humanity.

But even within your perspective, we would have to commit genocide on all the people who will never accept the brave new world you try to convince them of. Do you have no love for those billions of souls? Is love and respect reserved only for animals? Can you not see how psychotic Watson's ideas are?

>Beware the microbe.

Yes, and the rest of the seven deadly plagues as well....

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 18:41:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:464360f7\$1@linux...
>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>Don,
>>
>>This article down to and including the sentence:
>>
>>"It's a train that carries all the earth's species as unwilling passengers
>
>>with humans as the manically insane engineers unwilling to use the brake
>
>>pedal."
>
> No it doesn't. That is the part you extract because you care so much
> about this issue. In reality, the article boils down to this

>
> There is NO way to implement the recommendations of Watson
> without a regime that would make the Nazi's look polite.

Assuming that a *regime* is necessary to pull this off instead of coming together and trying to work some sort of common-sense solution.

>
> And this is the subtext of all these ideas: the individual behind them is
> unbalanced, seeing humans as "no more intrinsically valuable than
> earthworms".

I'll bet that an earthworm would differ with you. I think that we place far too much importance on ourselves, which is natural to us since we have evolved to the point that we have invented God in our own image..

This is, of course, absurd. Ironically it takes a human,
> with all the benefits of our big brains, our schools, our science, and our
> reasoning and writing skills, to say such stupid shit.

We say lots of stupid shit besides this Don.

The statement

> itself proves him to be wrong and a fool since the earthworm cannot
> assent to it, nor dispute it. Watson is a moron and a misanthrope.

>
> <http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/individualProfile.asp?ind id=1217>

>
> <http://www.activistcash.com/biography.cfm/bid/3370>

>
> There's lots more.

>
> If you would like a serious discussion of these important issues, we
> will have to find a different starting point, one informed by rational
> beliefs and willing to examine contradictory evidence.

I'd certainly be willing. I'd say the larger question is why does it take someone with such extremist views to rattle our cages to the point where the problem is discussed in a serious manner.

>
>>.....appears to be deadly accurate. The remainder is simply a pragmatic

>
>>argument based on statistics. Do you dispute the statistics?

>
> Abso-fuggin-lutely. I dispute anything out of Watson's mouth.

>
>>If so, can you
>>disprove them. Has anyone even tried?

>

> I looked around. There is no specific scientific refutation of the piece
> out
> there yet. It is too new. There will be one.

Well.....it could also be that the reason there is no refutation
is.....?

>>but I think that this will be taken out of our hands if we don't take some
>

>>steps that, by virtue of our very instinct to survive at all costs, we
>>will

>
>>never be willing to take.

>
> I, of course have a different view of the future of humanity.

>
> But even within your perspective, we would have to commit genocide on
> all the people who will never accept the brave new world you try to
> convince them of. Do you have no love for those billions of souls?
> Is love and respect reserved only for animals? Can you not see how
> psychotic Watson's ideas are?

>
I don't advocate genocide. I do advocate a refocus on what is good for the
survival of the ecosphere, which happens to include us, and I think there
are ways to start changing this stuff....but we need to start taking this
very seriously

>
>>Beware the microbe.
>
> Yes, and the rest of the seven deadly plagues as well....
>
> DC

I think a good start would be a bit of common sense as far as our breeding
and end-of-life thinking goes. Our religions tell us to "be fruitful and
multiply". These religions were born of a time when we weren't necessarily
at the top of the food chain. This philosophy is utter insanity nowadays.
Also, on a more personal note, something that really sticks in my craw is
the strange affinity we have for prolonging life when it isn't desired by
the living (and yes, I have experienced suicides and know the devastation
this causes). As I get older, I often wonder when I will get to the point
when I'm so damn miserable I'll be ready to move on. I'm only 57 but I have
lived a lot in those years and I have already decided that the living death
that is a nursing home route isn't for me. It just ain't gonna happen, nor
would I desire to inflict my decline on a family by being set in a hospital
bed in their living room (which I have seen happen as an alternative to

nursing homes) . I'll likely choose my own way if it isn't chosen for me. My mom is to that point right now. We have had some open and frank discussions about this but her religion tells her that to end her life on her own terms is a sin and she will burn in hell. She is 85, still active and she is praying for a swift and merciful end when it comes so she won't be required to experience this final indignity of losing all control over her body as she becomes an total invalid. I doubt I'll have these reservations. I really don't think it's *humane* to force elderly and sick folks to carry on if they are ready to leave this life. It has been stigmatized though by certain religions to the point where there is the certainty that eternal life in a burning hell is waiting for us unless we eke every last bit of misery out of this life, and by doing so, prolong the misery of our loved ones as they try to mitigate it, which they cannot do. Maybe I will just move to Oregon when it comes time to take a powder...of course, I'll have to make it look accidental so my life insurance company will still pay off. Maybe a nice cocktail of Oxy and Succinylcholine would do the trick.

Regards,

Deej

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 19:40:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>Assuming that a *regime* is necessary to pull this off instead of coming
>together and trying to work some sort of common-sense solution.

Ok, you call Bush and Blair, and I will call Ahmadinejad and Olmert. We can all get together. I will let you present their population reduction targets to them.

And of course, that assumes that Watson we right. I don't buy it without a non-insane source.

>> And this is the subtext of all these ideas: the individual behind them is
>> unbalanced, seeing humans as "no more intrinsically valuable than
>> earthworms".

>I'll bet that an earthworm would differ with you. I think that we place
far
>too much importance on ourselves, which is natural to us since we have
>evolved to the point that we have invented God in our own image..

Wait a minute! Not much of a brain there... How would it differ?

As far as inventing God in our image, that is theology, (and bad Tull lyrics)
and if you want to discuss that, I will, but trust me, that is not an unassailable
position...

>This is, of course, absurd. Ironically it takes a human,
>> with all the benefits of our big brains, our schools, our science, and
our
>> reasoning and writing skills, to say such stupid shit.

>We say lots of stupid shit besides this Don.

Yeah, and a whole bunch of it came from an education that taught us that
misanthropy is enlightened...

>I'd certainly be willing. I'd say the larger question is why does it take

>someone with such extremist views to rattle our cages to the point where
the
>problem is discussed in a serious manner.

It isn't. Not yet. So far it is just a dispute, not a discussion. You
and I go back
and forth, the right exposes him for the fool he is, the mainstream left
gets
quiet, while the hard left tries to turn the discussion back to the actual
"facts"
he quotes. No one listens. This subject is not getting the hearing it
deserves,
and that is indeed a problem.

>Well.....it could also be that ther reason there is no refutation
>is.....?

Oh, I dunno, mebbe because Watson is a barking moonbat? And no one takes
him seriously enough to answer his assertions?

I have heard that we have more biodiversity today than at any other time,

and

that humans are responsible for a minute portion of the extinctions we are experiencing, but I cannot give you the reference for these things.

>I don't advocate genocide. I do advocate a refocus on what is good for the

>survival of the ecosphere, which happens to include us, and I think there

>are ways to start changing this stuff....but we need to start taking this

>very seriously

Then the population reduction goals will not be met. To do so, simply requires some mechanism for huge numbers of deaths.

The discussion is important, but it must exist among the reasonable. Too many lives are at stake.

>I think a good start would be a bit of common sense as far as our breeding

>and end-of-life thinking goes. Our religions tell us to "be fruitful and

>multiply".

In Christianity this was the advice given to the first humans in an empty earth.

Christians do not generally believe it to apply to us today when the world is quite full. How can you proceed from there with such a faulty assumption?

>These religions were born of a time when we weren't necessarily
>at the top of the food chain.

And there you go. Religions were born of man. Simple atheism. I reject this worldview out of hand. Now, if you want to talk about stewardship of the earth, we have much common ground.

>Also, on a more personal note, something that really sticks in my craw is

>the strange affinity we have for prolonging life when it isn't desired by

>the living (and yes, I have experienced suicides and know the devastation

>this causes). As I get older, I often wonder when I will get to the point
>when I'm so damn miserable I'll be ready to move on. I'm only 57 but I have
>lived a lot in those years and I have already decided that the living death
>that is a nursing home route isn't for me. It just ain't gonna happen, nor
>would I desire to inflict my decline on a family by being set in a hospital
>bed in their living room (which I have seen happen as an alternative to
>nursing homes) . I'll likely choose my own way if it isn't chosen for me.
My
>mom is to that point right now. We have had some open and frank discussions
>about this but her religion tells her that to end her life on her own terms
>is a sin and she will burn in hell.

Do you know why? Here is the Catholic position: Life is a gift from God. We did not give it, and should not take it unless we must to save innocent lives. When we commit suicide, we commit a sin that cannot be repented of because we are dead. It is a sin thrown right in God's face against the very life he gave us.

Now I am not Catholic, and I suspect that God looks at the whole life, not just the end, but their position is a great touchstone to balance out the

secular culture. They believe that if we have faith, he will get us through the death we must face, and we will go somewhere much better.

If you believe in God, it makes sense, if you do not, it is barbarity.

>She is 85, still active and she is
>praying for a swift and merciful end when it comes so she won't be required
>to experience thie final indignity of losing all control over her body as
>she becomes an total invalid. I doubt I'll have these reservations. I really
>don't think it's *humane* to force elderly and sick folks to carry on if
>they are ready to leave this life.

I will not condemn them if they opt out, but I wish they wouldn't.

>It has been stigmatized though by certain
>religions to the point where there is the certainty that eternal life in
a
>burning hell is waiting for us unless we eke every last bit of misery out
of
>this life, and by doing so, prolong the misery of our loved ones as they
try
>to mitigate it, which they cannot do. Maybe I will just move to Oregon when

>it comes time to take a powder...of course, I'll have to make it look
>accidental so my life insurance company will still pay off. Maybe a nice

>cocktail of Oxy and Succinylcholine would do the trick.

I just can't bring myself to condemn the person who does this, but I honestly

think it is a horrible thing. Listen my sister died from Oxy, depression,
and
self pity and my Mom is taking the most prolonged miserable way out I can
imagine. It's bullshit, but it's MY bullshit dammit, and I will face it
with my
faith and dignity intact.

The Apostle Paul said:

For I am already being poured out like a drink offering, and the time has

come for my departure. I have fought the good fight, I have finished
the race, I have kept the faith.

Now there is in store for me the crown of righteousness, which the

to me, but also to all who have longed for his appearing.

And you know what? I don't even CARE about the crown...

take care

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 19:40:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We need to get together again and chew the fat.....barking

moonbat???...I like that.

;o)

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:4643751c\$1@linux...

>

> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:

>

>> Assuming that a *regime* is necessary to pull thias off instead of coming

>

>> together and trying to work some sort of common-sense solution.

>

> Ok, you call Bush and Blair, and I will call Ahmadinejad and Olmert. We

> can

> all get together. I will let you present their population reduction

> targets

> to

> them.

>

> And of course, that assumes that Watson we right. I don't buy it without

> a

> non-insane source.

>

>

>>> And this is the subtext of all these ideas: the individual behind them

> is

>>> unbalanced, seeing humans as "no more intrinsically valuable than

>>> earthworms".

>

>

>> I'll bet that an earthworm would differ with you. I think that we place

> far

>> too much importance on ourselves, which is natural to us since we have

>> evolved to the point that we have invented God in our own image..

>

> Wait a minute! Not much of a brain there... How would it differ?

>

> As far as inventing God in our image, that is theology, (and bad Tull

> lyrics)

> and if you want to discuss that, I will, but trust me, that is not an

> unassailable

> position...

>

>

>> This is, of course, absurd. Ironically it takes a human,

>>> with all the benefits of our big brains, our schools, our science, and

> our

>>> reasoning and writing skills, to say such stupid shit.

>
>>We say lots of stupid shit besides this Don.
>
> Yeah, and a whole bunch of it came from an education that taught us that
> misanthropy is enlightened...
>
>
>>I'd certainly be willing. I'd say the larger question is why does it take
>
>>someone with such extremist views to rattle our cages to the point where
> the
>>problem is discussed in a serious manner.
>
> It isn't. Not yet. So far it is just a dispute, not a discussion. You
> and I go back
> and forth, the right exposes him for the fool he is, the mainstream left
> gets
> quiet, while the hard left tries to turn the discussion back to the actual
> "facts"
> he quotes. No one listens. This subject is not getting the hearing it
> deserves,
> and that is indeed a problem.
>
>
>>Well.....it could also be that ther reason there is no refutation
>>is.....?
>
> Oh, I dunno, mebbe because Watson is a barking moonbat? And no one takes
> him seriously enough to answer his assertions?
>
> I have heard that we have more biodiversity today than at any other time,
> and
> that humans are responsible for a minute portion of the extinctions we are
> experiencing, but I cannot give you the reference for these things.
>
>
>>I don't advocate genocide. I do advocate a refocus on what is good for the
>
>>survival of the ecosphere, which happens to include us, and I think there
>
>>are ways to start changing this stuff....but we need to start taking this
>
>>very seriously
>
> Then the population reduction goals will not be met. To do so, simply
> requires
> some mechanism for huge numbers of deaths.
>

> The discussion is important, but it must exist among the reasonable. Too
> many
> lives are at stake.
>
>
>>I think a good start would be a bit of common sense as far as our breeding
>
>>and end-of-life thinking goes. Our religions tell us to "be fruitful and
>
>>multiply".
>
> In Christianity this was the advice given to the first humans in an empty
> earth.
> Christians do not generally believe it to apply to us today when the world
> is
> quite full. How can you proceed from there with such a faulty assumption?
>
>>These religions were born of a time when we weren't necessarily
>>at the top of the food chain.
>
> And there you go. Religions were born of man. Simple atheism. I reject
> this
> worldview out of hand. Now, if you want to talk about stewardship of the
> earth, we have much common ground.
>
>
>>Also, on a more personal note, something that really sticks in my craw is
>
>>the strange affinity we have for prolonging life when it isn't desired by
>
>>the living (and yes, I have experienced suicides and know the devastation
>
>>this causes). As I get older, I often wonder when I will get to the point
>
>>when I'm so damn miserable I'll be ready to move on. I'm only 57 but I
>>have
>
>>lived a lot in those years and I have already decided that the living
>>death
>
>>that is a nursing home route isn't for me. It just ain't gonna happen, nor
>
>>would I desire to inflict my decline on a family by being set in a
>>hospital
>
>>bed in their living room (which I have seen happen as an alternative to
>
>>nursing homes) . I'll likely choose my own way if it isn't chosen for me.

> My
>>mom is to that point right now. We have had some open and frank
>>discussions
>
>>about this but her religion tells her that to end her life on her own
>>terms
>
>>is a sin and she will burn in hell.
>
> Do you know why? Here is the Catholic position: Life is a gift from God.
> We did not give it, and should not take it unless we must to save innocent
> lives. When we commit suicide, we commit a sin that cannot be repented
> of because we are dead. It is a sin thrown right in God's face against
> the
> very life he gave us.
>
> Now I am not Catholic, and I suspect that God looks at the whole life, not
> just the end, but their position is a great touchstone to balance out the
>
> secular culture. They believe that if we have faith, he will get us
> through
> the death we must face, and we will go somewhere much better.
>
> If you believe in God, it makes sense, if you do not, it is barbarity.
>
>
>>She is 85, still active and she is
>>praying for a swift and merciful end when it comes so she won't be
>>required
>
>>to experience thie final indignity of losing all control over her body as
>
>>she becomes an total invalid. I doubt I'll have these reservations. I
>>really
>
>>don't think it's *humane* to force elderly and sick folks to carry on if
>
>>they are ready to leave this life.
>
> I will not condemn them if they opt out, but I wish they wouldn't.
>
>>It has been stigmatized though by certain
>>religions to the point where there is the certainty that eternal life in
> a
>>burning hell is waiting for us unless we eke every last bit of misery out
> of
>>this life, and by doing so, prolong the misery of our loved ones as they
> try

>>to mitigate it, which they cannot do. Maybe I will just move to Oregon
>>when
>
>>it comes time to take a powder...of course, I'll have to make it look
>>accidental so my life insurance company will still pay off. Maybe a nice
>
>>coctail of Oxy and Succinylcholine would do the trick.
>
> I just can't bring myself to condemn the person who does this, but I
> honestly
>
> think it is a horrible thing. Listen my sister died from Oxy,
> depression,
> and
> self pity and my Mom is taking the most prolonged miserable way out I can
> imagine. It's bullshit, but it's MY bullshit dammit, and I will face it
> with my
> faith and dignity intact.
>
>
> The Apostle Paul said:
>
> For I am already being poured out like a drink offering, and the time has
>
> come for my departure. I have fought the good fight, I have finished
> the race, I have kept the faith.
>
> Now there is in store for me the crown of righteousness, which the
> Lord, the righteous Judge, will award to me on that day-and not only
> to me, but also to all who have longed for his appearing.
>
>
> And you know what? I don't even CARE about the crown...
>
> take care
>
> DC
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 20:04:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>We need to get together again and chew the fat.....barking
>moonbat???...I like that.
>

>;o)

Micelis. yessss

Oh, and some great music would be fun...

Come on out.

DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 20:14:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm gonna do it as soon as I regroup from the Denver tour.

;o)

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:46437ac8\$1@linux...

>

> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>We need to get together again and chew the fat.....barking

>>moonbat???...I like that.

>>

>>;o)

>

>

> Micelis. yessss

>

> Oh, and some great music would be fun...

>

> Come on out.

>

> DC

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 21:07:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I like your argument DJ - Our will and instinct to survive is going to kill us ! Oh, I'm laughing.... sort of...

-Carl

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:46433b62@linux...
> Don,
>
> This article down to and including the sentence:
>
> "It's a train that carries all the earth's species as unwilling passengers
> with humans as the manically insane engineers unwilling to use the brake
> pedal."
>
>appears to be deadly accurate. The remainder is simply a pragmatic
> argument based on statistics. Do you dispute the statistics? If so, can
you
> disprove them. Has anyone even tried? Is there even any point in it? If
not,
> why would you dismiss this as being Hitlerian? He's not advocating the
> survival of one group of *superhumans* over another group of *subhumans*.
> I'd say he's pretty egalitarian for a Nazi. I personally don't think
there's
> a chance in hell that things are going to change for the better here
unless
> we drasticall reduce the number of *us* somehow and I also believe that
our
> biological imperative to breed and survive will eventually be the end of
us
> but I think that this will be taken out of our hands if we don't take some
> steps that, by virtue of our very instinct to survive at all costs, we
will
> never be willing to take.
>
> Beware the microbe.
>
> ;o)
>
>
>
> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:4642aa36\$1@linux...
> >
> > Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> >> I don't think the person that is attacking me our that I'm attacking is
> >
> >>evil. If they are directly mine or someone else's life and the only way
> >
> >>I have to stop them is to kill or injure them I think is perfectly
> >>except able and a normal reaction pf our species. We are hoarding
> >>pack/tribal creatures that have been lucky enough to our brains become
> >>our main survival tools. snip...

> >
> > We will not agree on solutions because we utterly disagree on these
> > premises. I reject this view of life on its face, as you surely do
mine.
> >
> >
> >>A radical group of people that feel that the dominant government/society
> >
> >>is destroying their beliefs and way of life. They believe that the only
> >
> >>way to stop this is by committing terrorists acts on a large scale
> >>against their protagonists killing thousand if not millions of their
> >>enemies to bring about their vision of the world.
> >>Luckily Clancy did not write the Turner Diaries because would probably
> >>be influential on enough actually make a difference. It has only
> >>influenced fringe groups so we've only had a Oklahoma city bombing so
> >>far. The book is poorly written almost as bad a Mein Kampf. Another book
> >
> >>that I'm glad Clancy didn't write. :)
> >
> >
> > Even using Clancy in the same sentence is silly. Does doing so, strike
> > you as clever?
> > You should read Rainbow 6, you have got it totally wrong. In this case
> > it is the radicals who are planning a giant die off in the name of Gaia,
> > not
> > the government.
> >
> > The closest thing to Mein Kampf in this whole discussion is right here:
> >
> > http://www.seashepherd.org/editorials/editorial_070504_1.htm I
> >
> >
> >>>> Without the second amendment, all the other amendments
> >>>> are just suggestions.
> >
> >>And very good ones at that. but like the 10 commandments they should
> >>have been more detailed.
> >
> > And of course, you know better than the author of either... Amazing.
> >
> >
> >>Thankfully we didn't make our right to bare arms the same as England's.
> >
> >>They only allowed Protestants the right.
> >
> > I'm sure there is a point in here somewhere...
> >

> >
> > DC
> >
>
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 21:10:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

one heck of a conundrum all right

where are the evil aliens when we need them?

"Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:46438b16@linux...

> I like your argument DJ - Our will and instinct to survive is going to kill
> us ! Oh, I'm laughing.... sort of...

>
> -Carl

>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:46433b62@linux...
>> Don,

>>
>> This article down to and including the sentence:
>>

>> "It's a train that carries all the earth's species as unwilling
>> passengers
>> with humans as the manically insane engineers unwilling to use the brake
>> pedal."

>>
>>appears to be deadly accurate. The remainder is simply a
>> pragmatic
>> argument based on statistics. Do you dispute the statistics? If so, can
> you
>> disprove them. Has anyone even tried? Is there even any point in it? If
> not,
>> why would you dismiss this as being Hitlerian? He's not advocating the
>> survival of one group of *superhumans* over another group of *subhumans*.
>> I'd say he's pretty egalitarian for a Nazi. I personally don't think
> there's

>> a chance in hell that things are going to change for the better here
> unless
>> we drastically reduce the number of *us* somehow and I also believe that
> our
>> biological imperative to breed and survive will eventually be the end of
> us

>> but I think that this will be taken out of our hands if we don't take
>> some
>> steps that, by virtue of our very instinct to survive at all costs, we
> will
>> never be willing to take.
>>
>> Beware the microbe.
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>>
>>
>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:4642aa36\$1@linux...
>> >
>> > Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >
>> >> I don't think the person that is attacking me our that I'm attacking
>> >> is
>> >
>> >>evil. If they are directly mine or someone else's life and the only way
>> >
>> >>I have to stop them is to kill or injure them I think is perfectly
>> >>except able and a normal reaction pf our species. We are hoarding
>> >>pack/tribal creatures that have been lucky enough to our brains become
>> >>our main survival tools. snip...
>> >
>> > We will not agree on solutions because we utterly disagree on these
>> > premises. I reject this view of life on its face, as you surely do
> mine.
>> >
>> >
>> >>A radical group of people that feel that the dominant
>> >>government/society
>> >
>> >>is destroying their beliefs and way of life. They believe that the only
>> >
>> >>way to stop this is by committing terrorists acts on a large scale
>> >>against their protagonists killing thousand if not millions of their
>> >>enemies to bring about their vision of the world.
>> >>Luckily Clancy did not write the Turner Diaries because would probably
>> >>be influential on enough actually make a difference. It has only
>> >>influenced fringe groups so we've only had a Oklahoma city bombing so
>> >>far. The book is poorly written almost as bad a Mein Kampf. Another
>> >>book
>> >
>> >>that I'm glad Clancy didn't write. :)
>> >

>> >
>> > Even using Clancy in the same sentence is silly. Does doing so,
>> > strike
>> > you as clever?
>> > You should read Rainbow 6, you have got it totally wrong. In this
>> > case
>> > it is the radicals who are planning a giant die off in the name of
>> > Gaia,
>> > not
>> > the government.
>> >
>> > The closest thing to Mein Kampf in this whole discussion is right here:
>> >
>> > http://www.seashepherd.org/editorials/editorial_070504_1.htm I
>> >
>> >
>> >>>> Without the second amendment, all the other amendments
>> >>>> are just suggestions.
>> >
>> >>> And very good ones at that. but like the 10 commandments they should
>> >>> have been more detailed.
>> >
>> > And of course, you know better than the author of either... Amazing.
>> >
>> >
>> >>> Thankfully we didn't make our right to bare arms the same as England's.
>> >
>> >>> They only allowed Protestants the right.
>> >
>> > I'm sure there is a point in here somewhere...
>> >
>> >
>> > DC
>> >
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [JeffH](#) on Thu, 10 May 2007 23:19:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DJ wrote:

> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message [news:464360f7\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:464360f7$1@linux...)

>

>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>
>>>Don,
>>>
>>>This article down to and including the sentence:
>>>
>>>"It's a train that carries all the earth's species as unwilling passengers
>>
>>>with humans as the manically insane engineers unwilling to use the brake
>>
>>>pedal."
>>
>>No it doesn't. That is the part you extract because you care so much
>>about this issue. In reality, the article boils down to this
>>
>>There is NO way to implement the recommendations of Watson
>>without a regime that would make the Nazi's look polite.
>
>
> Assuming that a *regime* is necessary to pull thias off instead of coming
> together and trying to work some sort of common-sense solution.
>
>>And this is the subtext of all these ideas: the individual behind them is
>>unbalanced, seeing humans as "no more intrinsically valuable than
>>earthworms".
>
>
> I'll bet that an earthworm would differ with you. I think that we place far
> too much importance on ourselves, which is natural to us since we have
> evolved to the point that we have invented God in our own image..
>
> This is, of course, absurd. Ironically it takes a human,
>
>>with all the benefits of our big brains, our schools, our science, and our
>>reasoning and writing skills, to say such stupid shit.
>
>
> We say lots of stupid shit besides this Don.
>
> The statement
>
>>itself proves him to be wrong and a fool since the earthworm cannot
>>assent to it, nor dispute it. Watson is a moron and a misanthrope.
>>
>> <http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/individualProfile.asp?ind id=1217>
>>
>><http://www.activistcash.com/biography.cfm/bid/3370>
>>
>>There's lots more.

>>

>>If you would like a serious discussion of these important issues, we
>>will have to find a different starting point, one informed by rational
>>beliefs and willing to examine contradictory evidence.

>

>

> I'd certainly be willing. I'd say the larger question is why does it take
> someone with such extremist views to rattle our cages to the point where the
> problem is discussed in a serious manner.

> >

>

>>>.....appears to be deadly accurate. The remainder is simply a pragmatic
>>

>>>argument based on statistics. Do you dispute the statistics?

>>

>>Abso-fuggin-lutely. I dispute anything out of Watson's mouth.

>>

>>

>>>If so, can you
>>>disprove them. Has anyone even tried?

>>

>>I looked around. There is no specific scientific refutation of the piece
>>out
>>there yet. It is too new. There will be one.

>

>

> Well.....it could also be that ther reason there is no refutation
> is.....?

>

>

>

>>>but I think that this will be taken out of our hands if we don't take some
>>

>>>steps that, by virtue of our very instinct to survive at all costs, we
>>>will
>>

>>>never be willing to take.

>>

>>I, of course have a different view of the future of humanity.

>>

>>But even within your perspective, we would have to commit genocide on
>>all the people who will never accept the brave new world you try to
>>convince them of. Do you have no love for those billions of souls?
>>Is love and respect reserved only for animals? Can you not see how
>>psychotic Watson's ideas are?

>>

>

> I don't advocate genocide. I do advocate a refocus on what is good for the

> survival of the ecosphere, which happens to include us, and I think there
> are ways to start changing this stuff....but we need to start taking this
> very seriously
>
>
>>>Beware the microbe.
>>
>>Yes, and the rest of the seven deadly plagues as well....
>>
>>DC
>
>
> I think a good start would be a bit of common sense as far as our breeding
> and end-of-life thinking goes. Our religions tell us to "be fruitful and
> multiply". These religions were born of a time when we weren't necessarily
> at the top of the food chain. This philosophy is utter insanity nowadays.
> Also, on a more personal note, something that really sticks in my craw is
> the strange affinity we have for prolonging life when it isn't desired by
> the living (and yes, I have experienced suicides and know the devastation
> this causes). As I get older, I often wonder when I will get to the point
> when I'm so damn miserable I'll be ready to move on. I'm only 57 but I have
> lived a lot in those years and I have already decided that the living death
> that is a nursing home route isn't for me. It just ain't gonna happen, nor
> would I desire to inflict my decline on a family by being set in a hospital
> bed in their living room (which I have seen happen as an alternative to
> nursing homes) . I'll likely choose my own way if it isn't chosen for me. My
> mom is to that point right now. We have had some open and frank discussions
> about this but her religion tells her that to end her life on her own terms
> is a sin and she will burn in hell. She is 85, still active and she is
> praying for a swift and merciful end when it comes so she won't be required
> to experience thie final indignity of losing all control over her body as
> she becomes an total invalid. I doubt I'll have these reservations. I really
> don't think it's *humane* to force elderly and sick folks to carry on if
> they are ready to leave this life. It has been stigmatized though by certain
> religions to the point where there is the certainty that eternal life in a
> burning hell is waiting for us unless we eke every last bit of misery out of
> this life, and by doing so, prolong the misery of our loved ones as they try
> to mitigate it, which they cannot do. Maybe I will just move to Oregon when
> it comes time
Go ahead and cart your studio with you... I got room for those pretty
little boxes...

;-)

JH

to take a powder...of course, I'll have to make it look
> accidental so my life insurance company will still pay off. Maybe a nice
> coctail of Oxy and Succinylcholine would do the trick.

>
> Regards,
>
> Deej
>
>
>
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 11 May 2007 09:00:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

400 years ago...we were the aliens. ya know, there are days i'm proud
to be shallower than a footprint on a rock.

mr. footballhead

On Thu, 10 May 2007 15:10:14 -0600, "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com>
wrote:

>one heck of a conundrum all right
>
>where are the evil aliens when we need them?
>
>"Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotNOSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
>news:46438b16@linux...
>>I like your argument DJ - Our will and instinct to survive is going to kill
>> us ! Oh, I'm laughing.... sort of...
>>
>> -Carl
>>
>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:46433b62@linux...
>>> Don,
>>>
>>> This article down to and including the sentence:
>>>
>>> "It's a train that carries all the earth's species as unwilling
>>> passengers
>>> with humans as the manically insane engineers unwilling to use the brake
>>> pedal."
>>>
>>>appears to be deadly accurate. The remainder is simply a
>>> pragmatic
>>> argument based on statistics. Do you dispute the statistics? If so, can

>> you
 >>> disprove them. Has anyone even tried? Is there even any point in it? If
 >> not,
 >>> why would you dismiss this as being Hitlerian? He's not advocating the
 >>> survival of one group of *superhumans* over another group of *subhumans*.
 >>> I'd say he's pretty egalitarian for a Nazi. I personally don't think
 >> there's
 >>> a chance in hell that things are going to change for the better here
 >> unless
 >>> we drastically reduce the number of *us* somehow and I also believe that
 >> our
 >>> biological imperative to breed and survive will eventually be the end of
 >> us
 >>> but I think that this will be taken out of our hands if we don't take
 >>> some
 >>> steps that, by virtue of our very instinct to survive at all costs, we
 >> will
 >>> never be willing to take.
 >>>
 >>> Beware the microbe.
 >>>
 >>> ;o)
 >>>
 >>>
 >>>
 >>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:4642aa36\$1@linux...
 >>> >
 >>> > Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
 >>> >
 >>> >
 >>> >
 >>> >> I don't think the person that is attacking me our that I'm attacking
 >>> >> is
 >>> >
 >>> >>evil. If they are directly mine or someone else's life and the only way
 >>> >
 >>> >>I have to stop them is to kill or injure them I think is perfectly
 >>> >>except able and a normal reaction pf our species. We are hoarding
 >>> >>pack/tribal creatures that have been lucky enough to our brains become
 >>> >>our main survival tools. snip...
 >>> >
 >>> > We will not agree on solutions because we utterly disagree on these
 >>> > premises. I reject this view of life on its face, as you surely do
 >> mine.
 >>> >
 >>> >
 >>> >>A radical group of people that feel that the dominant
 >>> >>government/society
 >>> >

>>> >>is destroying their beliefs and way of life. They believe that the only
>>> >
>>> >>way to stop this is by committing terrorists acts on a large scale
>>> >>against their protagonists killing thousand if not millions of their
>>> >>enemies to bring about their vision of the world.
>>> >>Luckily Clancy did not write the Turner Diaries because would probably
>>> >>be influential on enough actually make a difference. It has only
>>> >>influenced fringe groups so we've only had a Oklahoma city bombing so
>>> >>far. The book is poorly written almost as bad a Mein Kampf. Another
>>> >>book
>>> >
>>> >>that I'm glad Clancy didn't write. :)
>>> >
>>> >
>>> > Even using Clancy in the same sentence is silly. Does doing so,
>>> > strike
>>> > you as clever?
>>> > You should read Rainbow 6, you have got it totally wrong. In this
>>> > case
>>> > it is the radicals who are planning a giant die off in the name of
>>> > Gaia,
>>> > not
>>> > the government.
>>> >
>>> > The closest thing to Mein Kampf in this whole discussion is right here:
>>> >
>>> > http://www.seashepherd.org/editorials/editorial_070504_1.htm I
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >>>> Without the second amendment, all the other amendments
>>> >>>> are just suggestions.
>>> >
>>> >>And very good ones at that. but like the 10 commandments they should
>>> >>have been more detailed.
>>> >
>>> > And of course, you know better than the author of either... Amazing.
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >>Thankfully we didn't make our right to bare arms the same as England's.
>>> >
>>> >>They only allowed Protestants the right.
>>> >
>>> > I'm sure there is a point in here somewhere...
>>> >
>>> >
>>> > DC
>>> >
>>>

>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 11 May 2007 16:34:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:q0c843tkr5gikj67omkvg7ts3ne34617p8@4ax.com...
> 400 years ago...we were the aliens. ya know, there are days i'm proud
> to be shallower than a footprint on a rock.
>
> mr. footballhead
>

>shallower than a footprint on a rock.

there's a song in there somewhere.....Bob Seeger??

;o)

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Fri, 11 May 2007 17:56:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:464368be@linux...
>
scchhhnip!

Assuming that a *regime* is necessary to pull thias off instead of coming
together and trying to work some sort of common-sense solution.

scchhhnip!

Let's start with the welfare state. No job? No income? No kids !! Stop
milling out more ill-parented losers !
If ya want kids, earn them by proving you'll actually take care of them
through responsible actions. This will solve a gigantic portion of our
upcoming problems. Overpopulation. Overtaxation to support dead beats. Crime
on the overall, created mostly in my mind by poverty imbalance and lack of
proper upbringing (aka, parenting). Less broken homes.

Now.. just getting everyone to realize the benefits socially of this over

what can I do to make people depend on/vote for me or *how do I get free "assistance" so I can be a baby machine and never have to work or lay here and sell my food stamps for dope, or etc...*

AA

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 11 May 2007 18:01:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aaron Allen wrote:
> Crime on the overall, created mostly in my mind...

I see the problem, Aaron. Quit creating crime in your mind!! ;^)

Hey, when you get a crime free moment, can you email me that construction info we were talking about? TNX!

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Fri, 11 May 2007 18:11:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.polysteel.com/>

The insulation factor of this stuff is (depending on what you set up) up to R50! They say you can literally heat a room with a decent sized incandescent lamp... crazy man.

I heard a story that someone ran a semi truck into one of these houses and it basically demo'd the truck and the house required little to no repairing afterward. Try that with standard wooden construction!

Haven't been able to get the water reclamation system info yet, but I'll pop that out for you soon as I do

AA

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4644b0d9@linux...

>

> Aaron Allen wrote:

> > Crime on the overall, created mostly in my mind...

>

> I see the problem, Aaron. Quit creating crime in your mind!! ;^)
>
> Hey, when you get a crime free moment, can you email me that construction
> info we were talking about? TNX!
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 11 May 2007 19:18:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cool, thanks Aaron!

If people are going to ram semi trucks into it we'd better install air bags...

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Aaron Allen wrote:

> <http://www.polysteel.com/>
>
> The insulation factor of this stuff is (depending on what you set up) up to
> R50! They say you can literally heat a room with a decent sized incandescent
> lamp... crazy man.
> I heard a story that someone ran a semi truck into one of these houses and
> it basically demo'd the truck and the house required little to no repairing
> afterward. Try that with standard wooden construction!
>
> Haven't been able to get the water reclamation system info yet, but I'll pop
> that out for you soon as I do
>
> AA
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4644b0d9@linux...
>> Aaron Allen wrote:
>>> Crime on the overall, created mostly in my mind...
>> I see the problem, Aaron. Quit creating crime in your mind!! ;^)
>>
>> Hey, when you get a crime free moment, can you email me that construction
>> info we were talking about? TNX!
>>
>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 11 May 2007 19:28:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

so are you saying i'm plagiarizing?

On Fri, 11 May 2007 10:34:12 -0600, "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com>
wrote:

>
>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:q0c843tkr5gikj67omkvg7ts3ne34617p8@4ax.com...
>> 400 years ago...we were the aliens. ya know, there are days i'm proud
>> to be shallower than a footprint on a rock.
>>
>> mr. footballhead
>>
>
>>shallower than a footprint on a rock.
>
>there's a song in there somewhere.....Bob Seeger??
>
>;o)
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 11 May 2007 20:07:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:dtg9431r209haviqfn6bebf928eb1g6v78@4ax.com...
> so are you saying i'm plagiarizing?
>

nawwww.....but if the lyrics referred to a cow and a flat rock, I'd say
that you were plagiarizing Garth Seeger.....

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment

Posted by [rick](#) on Sat, 12 May 2007 09:18:34 GMT

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

how 'bout these for a starter

i wasn't born dumb
but i'll die dumb
if i spend another minute with you

On Fri, 11 May 2007 14:07:55 -0600, "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com>
wrote:

>
>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:dtg9431r209haviqfn6bebf928eb1g6v78@4ax.com...
>> so are you saying i'm plagiarizing?
>>
>
>nawwww.....but if the lyrics referred to a cow and a flat rock, I'd say
>that you were plagiarizing Garth Seeger.....
>
>

Subject: Re: Why we need the 2nd Amendment

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 12 May 2007 13:50:44 GMT

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

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:rh1b431rpsnit75a22c43guhvcu08bgtr@4ax.com...

> how 'bout these for a starter
>
> i wasn't born dumb
> but i'll die dumb
> if i spend another minute with you
>

I smell a single
;o)
