Subject: Arnold
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 01:47:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't know Arnold personally but what I know of him I have always liked. Now I like him even more after he stood up and took full blame for the defeat of the California Propositions. Thats how a man acts. Hear this GWB? Rummy? Scooter? Cheney? Look to Arnold and take a lesson in manhood and how to behave.

Subject: Re: Arnold
Posted by akhilesh on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 15:46:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

HOw should women react, JOhn? Should they admit their errors too, or would that make them too masculine?-akhilesh

Subject: Re: Arnold
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 17:48:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I use the term Man in the generitive case. It applies to all behaviour that has merit. Regardless of sex.Arnold has always been striaght forward and honest with the public. Unlike our current leaders.

Subject: Re: Arnold
Posted by akhilesh on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 19:29:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I agree with you about arnold. Except when he says "girlie men".I find that sexist. -akhilesh

Subject: Re: Arnold
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 20:37:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes; but we are all allowed one slip. He also smoked pot in his first movie.That Don't make him a bad guy.What I see in him is a guy with respect for this country and what it stands for. Unfortuneately I don't see that in the Federal Administration. Just a bunch of hacks out for themselves.

Subject: Re: Arnold
Posted by akhilesh on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 19:06:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

John,I kinda agree with you on the federal level government being out for themselves, except I see it in BOTH parties, unfortunately. I think both parties' senior folk have sold themselves out to foreign oil producing countries. As people become more senior, they automatically get these "perks" from these oil countries. I won't name names here, but ask yourself: what is wronfg with our foreign policy that we have been supporting and dealing happpily with tyrants, monarchs and dictators who happily disregard any form of human rights, and completely ignoring some democratic countries like India, Phillipnes, S. Korea & Japan?Our foreign policy is totally messed up, and in my opinion, driven by one thing only: the payoffs that our senior politicans get (from both parties) in the form of "consulting fees" and "speaking fees" from fronts for one or two oil producing coutries who are also spreading hate in the world, in the interst of hanging on to power. THAT's the real problem, and unless we face it and get rid of our fat cat politicans and DC bureaucracy, we are headed downhill. -akhilesh

---

Subject: Re: Arnold
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 15 Nov 2005 15:03:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You are absolutely correct in terms of why are we ignoring India and the rest. Very good question.Policy is formulated in very distinct sequential goal driven efforts. The major think tanks produce policy reports designed to address issues in both the short and long terms. Then the political parties and their leaders consult their advisors on every level of government as to how to proceed in the foriegn arena.Take the Iraq war. That whole strategy was first explored during Henry Kissengers years as Secretary Of State. It turns on how the oil reserves left in the world will be financed and allocated. Lets be honest; oil runs policy because without it we don't have a country. So the real questionb as I see it is how to divide the remaining resources between the world community.Bush follows the neo-con agenda which is to create an American controlled regime in the rest of the major oil producing nations left open to us. Since Russia has 20% of the oil and Venezuela has 13% of the oil then we must direct our policy to those countries that we can effect change in.My Point?Policy is directed far in advance of circumstances and it is difficult and demanding to study and follow the initiatives and effects on world events. To say that there is a way to govern that doesn't result in someone getting more than their share of things I don't see

how that could be accomplished. I mean; look at the pay of politicians? They are certainly not in it for the money; right?

Subject: Re: Arnold
Posted by akhilesh on Tue, 15 Nov 2005 16:24:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"It turns on how the oil reserves left in the world will be financed and allocated. Lets be honest; oil runs policy because without it we don't have a country. So the real questionb as I see it is how to divide the remaining resources between the world community. "I thought oil was sold on the open market. All companies paid the same price for oil. My point in my earlier post was that a lot of the politicans from both parties are acting in their own self interest (surprise) and not touching certain oil producing countries that are CLEAR promoters of hate and terrorism, simply becuase these politicians are being paid off by money from these same oil countries. If we really wanted to, we could go to these countries, and without firing a shot, demand they replace their monarchies with democracies, and then deal with the democratically elected leaders there. This wouold be much easier than trying to make Iraq a democracy, and much less costly in terms of young american lives. -akhilesh

---

Subject: Re: Arnold
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 15 Nov 2005 17:50:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well I'm all in favor of that. However we see that we have flexed our muscle in Iraq and threatened Syria with consequences if they don't stop hiding and abetting the terrorists. We have threatened Iran over nuclear weapons and North Korea also. And where has all this sabre-rattling gotten us so far? Syria still supports the terrorists; North Korea and Iran ignored our threats; maybe diplomacy might be a more attractive option at this point?As for oil; which currency will the oil markett be tied to in the future? Dollars/Euros/Yen; thats pretty important stuff regarding our financial interests. If China begins to make headway in the Mid-East and since they hold most of our debt there would be a powerfull weapon in the currency markett they could use against us.

Subject: Re: Arnold
Posted by akhilesh on Tue, 15 Nov 2005 20:25:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"As for oil; which currency will the oil markett be tied to in the future? Dollars/Euros/Yen; thats pretty important stuff regarding our financial interests."I don;t think it matters what it;s tied to, as

long as all of them float. In other words, you can convert costlessly (ignoring tiny broke costs) between EUros & dollars and yen, so it hardly matters whether I quote you the price of oil in dollars in Euros. Any economists amongst us care to discuss this?-akhilesh

---

Subject: Re: Arnold
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 15 Nov 2005 21:39:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes; this is supremely of interest. I for one would love to hear from someone knowledgable on this subject also.I understand it to mean that even thought the currencies float; the issuer realises an advantage from every transaction that increases the prescence of their currency since as the issuer they find whatever rate that their currency realises in respect to the float increases with increased valuation.Thats from twenty years ago taking Money and Banking in college.
