Subject: Go; Hillary Go!
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 18 Jan 2006 21:02:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It is run like a plantation and Cheney is the Master and Bush is the overseer and Rummy is the Field Hand. Not hard to see if you look.No consideration whatsoever for any conflicting view; thats brought us Iraq/The Medicare Drug Fiasco/New Orleans incompetence/ Tax Theft;...ahh; you know.Wait until they dig up all the stuff the neo-convicts said when the Dems were in office.

Subject: If You Want to Read About Real Plantations . . .
Posted by elektratig on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 00:18:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

try Kenneth Stampp's book. Characterizing democratic rule by the majority as a plantation is nonsense, and the race angle is worthy of a race-baiter like Al Sharpton. Whoops! He was there, wasn't he? Disguisting.
Stampp, The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South

Subject: Re: If You Want to Read About Real Plantations . . .
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 00:45:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Democratic rule by the majority? Don't know if I agree with that. Democratic Republic is where we live; to protect the minority from the Majority imposing it's will on all the people. Thats why we co-operate; so everyone is equally represented.The founding fathers knew a thing or two.

Subject: Panties in a bunch.
Posted by Leland Crooks on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 11:37:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

They have their panties in a bunch because Hillary's using their own rhetoric against them.Cal Thomas - "Michael Steele should be elected to the United States Senate from Maryland, not only because he is qualified, but because he would provide a sharp contrast to the Democratic Party and its plantation mentalityWall Street Jouranal - "Democrats are rubbing their eyes in disbelief not just at President Bush's success across America, but also about the fact that a major group they thought would stay on the liberal plantation forever is making a getaway."Sher Zieve - "Black Americans who have left the Democrat plantation are no longer "black" according to

DemocratsAndrew Sullivan - " In fact, it's hard to under-estimate how much some on the left despise the idea of gay men and women leaving the Democratic plantation."These aren't very flattering to the dem party, but they do demonstrate that this is not unique language.

Subject: Re: Panties in a bunch.
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 12:47:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yep; we can go back further to Newt and the boys also.I can't wait to see how hysterical they get when the elections approach. Nothing they hate more than a Hillary; and now they are on the defensive and we know how the neo-cons get like rabid rats when they are cornered.Mountain out of a molehill; and now the Republican Party has a rift with this guy Shagadelic looking to squeeze in to the old Delay slot. I have to admitt I am glad we are rid of that predatory opportunist.

Subject: Re: Panties in a bunch.
Posted by Leland Crooks on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 13:02:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The whole K street project is just sleaze. The more I read the more pissed off I get. Consolidating your power once you gain the majority is one thing, this was just graft. Delay's looking more and more like he'll lose his seat come next election. Now for Blunt. I'm pretty reluctant to see Hillary run. Nothing will energize the opposing folks like her candidacy. If elected another 4 years of obsessive partisanship, and calls for special prosecutors every ten minutes. Let her run in the primaries, be the lightning rod, then nominate a candidate with less baggage. Watched a special on Johnson last nite. The other impeached president. Congress passed a law about removing appointees without their approval. He stubbornly fired one. They impeached him for breaking a law congress created. Sound familiar?

Subject: Re: Panties in a bunch.
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 16:25:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Very astute analysis on Hillary. It is the perfect scenarion. Maybe the best thing we can do is keep promoting the lightning rods until the parties run out of money.Where was this special on Johnson; thats Andrew right?Gulliani would make a great president but he carries too much baggage. Too bad.So; who are the under the radar candidate possibilities?

Subject: Re: Panties in a bunch.
Posted by Leland Crooks on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 16:55:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The history channel (I think) is running a week long series on presidents. Lat nite was 1820-1865. It was fascinating. Up until Lincoln, we had a series of presidents that make George look good. Ineffectual, dogmatic, drunk, disinterested, you name it. No wonder we had a civil war. Nobody took the reins until Lincoln forced the issue. His evolution thru the war is interesting too. From centrist to what they termed, "second revolution" in american politics. My how far the republican party has fallen. I don't really have a dem alternative yet, none of them step out as centrist enough to be elected. I haven't looked hard yet. But one will surface. I like John McCain. He's pretty far right on a lot of issues, but he tells it like it is. Unlike our current officeholder who started out that way, and now tells it as he wants it to be. And he understands the art of compromise. My right wing conservative employee tells me they'll never nominate him. The hard right of the party doesn't trust him.

Subject: Pre-War (Civil War, that is) Presidents
Posted by elektratig on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 17:57:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Sorry I missed the thread as it developed. Rather than get into a further GWB fight, I thought I'd comment briefly on the pre-Lincoln presidents. I haven't seen the History Channel series you're referring to, but over the past year or so I've been doing a good deal of reading about the 1820-1861 period.I, too, had had the impression that the pre-Lincoln presidents were uniformly dreadful, and there certainly were some stinkers, primarily Lincoln's immediate predecessors Franklin Pierce (1853-57) and James Buchanan (1857-61) -- Buchanan was probably the worst president we've ever had.But I've also been pleasantly surprised to find that a number of the pre-War presidents were of higher quality than typically portrayed. My favorite example is Millard Fillmore, whose name is usually trotted out only as a late-night television joke (Johnny Carson abused him all the time). In fact, after growing up in abject poverty (his father was basically a tenant farmer), by virtue of intelligence, hard work and a little luck, Fillmore became a lawyer and leading citizen of Buffalo, NY. The Whigs unexpectedly nominated him for the vice presidency in 1848 on a ticket with Zachary Taylor (also an admirable and accomplished man) because he was almost universally respected and admired. When Taylor died without warning in mid-1850, Fillmore's vigorous support helped accomplish the passage of the Compromise of 1850, which put off the Civil War for ten years.If anyone wants a recommendation on the generally-recognized single best book on the period immediately leading up to the War, the link is below.
David M. Potter, The Impending Crisis 1848-1861

Subject: Re: Pre-War (Civil War, that is) Presidents
Posted by Leland Crooks on Mon, 23 Jan 2006 22:17:38 GMT

Thanks for the link, and not taking the bait. I'm going to try the library. If I buy any more books either my shelves will collapse or my wife will leave me.

Subject: Re: Pre-War (Civil War, that is) Presidents
Posted by elektratig on Tue, 24 Jan 2006 10:23:04 GMT

Libraries are a good thing! Potter's book is really superb. It was written some 40 years ago and is still generally recognized as THE single best volume on the topic. It's not often you find such near unanimity over such an extended period. And it's emminently readable as well.