Subject: Blorp!
Posted by Wayne Parham on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 15:42:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Rip - Blorp - Oops!About that little Super Bowl extra, I know we probably shouldn't let the kiddies see boobies and stuff, but is it really all that bad?I've definitely seen worse on prime-time TV.

Subject: haha!
Posted by Mike.e on Tue, 03 Feb 2004 09:25:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I saw on the news- they spent about 4minutes covering the superbowl ,its such a huge event! is the grass even real?are the guys even real they wear so much padding and armour? hahaare janets boobs real,? or are they fake too HAHAtry playing some REAL Rugby... its abit ruff for me!
link

Subject: Re: haha!
Posted by Wayne Parham on Tue, 03 Feb 2004 17:51:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's kind of amazing how popular this sport is in America, and how unpopular it is everywhere else. Fully one-fourth of the American population watches the Super Bowl, which is like the World Cup is to soccer, or as much of the rest of the world calls it, football. Then again, soccer is even less exciting to me, so I'm not sure which is better. I just like hangin' out with folks, eating the cheap foods like hot dogs and popcorn. That's the best part. And hey, if you get to see breasts, bonus!You should see how big a reaction there is to this thing with Janet Jackson. But I do understand that some children were watching, and that brings up the issue of public decency.I'm just a guy, and like most guys, I like beautiful women. Exposed cleavage is good, jiggling even better, and popping out altogether, now that's an exceptionally happy accident. At least for we guys, it is. Alona is used to me by now, and tolerates my indulgence with fast cars, loud sound systems and, well, boobs. She prefers that I look at hers, of course, but hey, if one pops out at you, whatcha gonna do?Now for something completely different.Far be it from me to get serious - and especially in the dungeon forum - but I can't resist one serious reflection, on a different, but similar subject.America prides itself on legal fairness, free speech and separation of church and state. Big jump from boobs to church and state, I know, but then again, you should see the line-up of folks running for president this year. Anyway, bear with me.It's one thing to censor something shown on a private network. CBS owns the equipment and franchises the content, so what they show on their networks is up to them. I don't have a problem with them dictating what will and will not be shown on their television network. There are laws that prevent them from showing, say national trade secrets or photos and film of rape and murder, stuff like that. But

within the limits of the law, CBS can show whatever stuff they want, and they can delete or refrain from broadcasting whatever they want too.But we have this weird thing we do here these days, where certain judges demand that all references to God be removed from public buildings as an "effort towards separation of church and state." This is a violation of free speech, in my opinion. It isn't private institutions we're talking about here - It's public places. And the fact that a symbol or slogan might be used by a particular religion doesn't make an utterance or display of it in a public place to be co-mingling matters of church and state. At least that's how I see it. Some of the religious censorship being done in America today has become ridiculous.I don't want a Hindu to feel left out or insulted because of people forcing Christianity down his throat, but as long as that isn't happening, I don't think a Hindu minds seeing the words "In God We Trust" on the walls of a courtroom. If kids want to have a Bible Study or read the Bhagavad-gita every morning in their schools, maybe put up some posters on the school walls to invite friends to join in, I say let 'em do it.So when I see an American judge ordering that references to God be removed from these institutions, I can't help but think that it's the damn judge that has now crossed the line and begun to violate the Church/State boundary. By drawing attention to the matter, he simply makes a big deal of nothing and causes the very sort of boundary issues that he says he's trying to prevent. In my opinion, every time a judge makes an order like this, he drives us further down the wrong road. Some of the stuff I see is no better than what we used to complain that the Soviets did.Then again, what do I know? If it were up to me, we would allow symbols on the walls and every woman would have a neckline that extended down to her breasts. Maybe it's 'cause when I was twenty-something and would go out to clubs all the time, my parents used to tell me to go to church more often and "meet a nice girl there." So it was easy to get confused about the purpose of the place.

Subject: more hahas
Posted by Mike.e on Tue, 03 Feb 2004 21:47:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

we have this weird thing we do here these days, where certain judges demand that all references to God be removed from public buildings as an "effort towards separation of church and state." political correctness gone madhere its worse-you cant spank your kids(soon)-the Government splits us into whitemen and maori(neither of which are a full blooded one,i mean come on its 140yrs of mixing!there is an inevitable tie between church and state.I guess state,being the feelings of the people and beleifs of the people who run the state lol....Subjectivism will never be taken out of the person..Theres alot of BS going onremoving your past,the faith that the pioneers of USA had,from public places is real wierd,its the humanists again :Pmy parents used to tell me to go to church more often and "meet a nice girl there." So it was easy to get confused about the purpose of the placelolwell dont worry,therse no nice chicks here-the only nice ones are in churches Some of the stuff I see is no better than what we used to complain that the Soviets didcommunism really hates religion...and thats what USA is doin now, All PC etc...cant risk insulting some one...I might go live in a place called 'fiordland' on NZs westcoast..live in a shack,and ignore the world haha...

Subject: Re: more hahas
Posted by Wayne Parham on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 05:58:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Did you hear about that guy in Germany that killed the fellow and ate him?

Subject: Re: more hahas
Posted by Adrian Mack on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 10:39:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I heard about some guy who was doing that. Didn't he put an ad on the internet and he got some 200 responses? Who would want to give themselves up to be a meal :P

Subject: Re: more hahas
Posted by Wayne Parham on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 17:57:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah, that's what I heard too. The one that was eaten was one of the people who responded. They said on the radio that the whole process was recorded on videotape. Yuch!