
Subject: Republican Family Values
Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sun, 15 May 2005 13:27:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Unbefuckinglylievable
Neal Horsley - Anti-abortion activist

Subject: Re: Republican Family Values
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 15 May 2005 14:50:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Fox News;The Jerry Springer of news shows. Whenever someone is fanatically anti-anything concerning moral values; they usually do it.

Subject: But ,dude...
Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sun, 15 May 2005 17:23:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not only did he grow up fucking donkeys, he DEFENDS it!

Subject: Re: But ,dude...
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 15 May 2005 20:21:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Who's to say. Like Rodney Dangerfield said,"There gonna make a movie about my life; they call it Dance's with Dogs.'Didn't they catch Jimmy Swaggart doing some strange shit?People still send him money.

Subject: Re: But ,dude...
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Mon, 16 May 2005 01:50:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm still thinking about Ann Coulter.

Subject: Re: But ,dude...

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 16 May 2005 10:55:56 GMT

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

Does your wife know that??

Subject: Re: But ,dude...

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Mon, 16 May 2005 11:26:25 GMT

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

Subject: Re: But ,dude...

Posted by [metasonix](#) on Tue, 17 May 2005 05:40:46 GMT

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

Don't bother, I already ass-reamed her. She only gets moist when you whisper in her ear something about Hillary Clinton being a man in drag or somesuch.

Subject: Re: But ,dude...

Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Tue, 17 May 2005 08:23:23 GMT

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

I heard you were hittin it with a preop trannie that just looks like her.What is it with you dems anyway? Always wanting to fuck someone in the ass.

Subject: Notes of a dirty old man

Posted by [Damir](#) on Tue, 17 May 2005 10:52:44 GMT

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

"...but then in those days, I'd just never given it that way, and I was feeling little crazy, as usual, and I had this strange idea that a good fuck in THEIR ass would solve a lot of MY spiritual and mental problems..."...I put the thing in. I put in what I had. "oooh," she said, "it`s good! you`re so

curved! like a gaff""accident I had when I was child. something with the tricycle.""oooooh..."I was just going good when something RAMMED into the cheeks of my ass. I saw flashes before my eyes."hey, what the HELL!" I reached and pulled the thing out. I was standing there with this guy`s thing in my hand. "what do you think you`re doing, buddy?" I asked him."listen, friend",he said, "this whole game is just one big deck of cards. if you want to get into the game you have to take whatever comes up in the shuffle."I pulled up my shorts and pants and got out of there."Charles Bukowski

Subject: Re: Notes of a dirty old man
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 17 May 2005 10:57:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Damir; your literary references are wasted on this rabble.The best they can dream is to do Ann Coulter???I want Leilei Sobieiskiiieeee.Pretty as a stump and twice as thick.Ever notice Ann Coulter has very big hands?

Subject: Re: Notes of a dirty old man
Posted by [Damir](#) on Tue, 17 May 2005 16:17:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Never heard of these chicks, you guys visit pretty odd XXX pages Try Google "Veronika Zemanova" next time... "Not that it means anything" - A. Rimbaud

Subject: Re: Notes of a dirty old man
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 17 May 2005 17:43:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ann Coulter is a smug, harsh looking blond republican progaganda shill born into priveledge; with the mannerism of a harpy from the myth's of the ancient greeks. Evidently some things never change.I don't know how it is over there; but here women used to raise the kids and cook. Now they've become,"Pundits."And people of mexican heritage clean the house. And the kids think thats their mom.

Subject: Re: Notes of a dirty old man
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Wed, 18 May 2005 02:08:57 GMT

Some day I'm gonna tell ya'll about my Cheryl Crow (yeap, THAT Cheryl Crow) story: the one where her drees winds up beside my bed, with the wife's blessings.....Colin

Subject: Re: Notes of a dirty old man
Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Wed, 18 May 2005 05:17:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's rich. You've described the hollywood lefties to a tee. Smug and harsh, born into privilege and completely out of touch. Take a look at the last democrat presidential canidate. You have to go back a long way before you'll find one that looks anything like a working man's canidate.

Subject: Re: Democrat Values
Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Wed, 18 May 2005 05:31:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Michael Moore started this trend. Blatant lies told in the form of a documentary. It caught on with the dems big time. Look at Dan Rather. Look at Newsweek and its story about the Koran.I see a pattern here. No story to tell? Make one up. Make up a story about Neal Horsley. Make up a story about Ann Coulter. Make up a story about Bush, make up a memorandum, make up this, make up that...Let me tell you what, ladies and gents. This little game is part of a childrens tale. When you "cry wolf" enough times, when there's something real to bitch about no one will pay attention. From the looks of the news these days, it has already happened.Good job, dems.

Subject: Re: Notes of a dirty old man
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 18 May 2005 06:26:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree with you there. What a maroon; a goldfish should have been able to take bush. In that respect you are correct; spoiled brats spitting out lies and jive at each other. That don't change what I said about that witch though.You can be wealthy and still have concern for the middle class and their possibilities. Who's a workingman anymore anyway; we are all "private contractors", "associates" now, responsible for our own health care/retirement/job training etc. And the company offers...what? Slave wages? Great.No problem with that providing they not take our tax revenue in the form of rebates/pollute the envirnment then leave it for us to clean up and pay for; withold vital medications in order to wring more profit out of them; run up huge deficits to pay for

private wars of the wealthy, not to mention the dead... the list goes on.

Subject: Re: Notes of a dirty old man
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 18 May 2005 06:30:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Colin; about time someone had a story worth hearing.

Subject: Re: Notes of a dirty old man
Posted by [Damir](#) on Wed, 18 May 2005 07:58:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don't you think that obsession with famous and rich "stars", desire for "dirty" details of their private lives, and public confession of some people, "I suck *** of ****" or so, is somewhat miserable?

Subject: Re: Notes of a dirty old man
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 18 May 2005 12:07:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Somewhat miserable is putting it mildly; it's pathetic. That's why the News Organisations focus on it. It is easily understood by the masses and provides simplistic, non-threatening topics for conversation. Reporting in depth on any subject requires tremendous resources in the form of reporters and fact checkers and then time to provide this information to the public. Time cost money, it's cheaper for the media to show a 30 sec. spot concerning some nit-wit pop star that catches the eye; then fade to endless money-making commercials; than it is to do an in depth report. Consequently people have been conditioned to react to only the simple loud and bright colored objects that require no thought and sell product. See; here we try to embrace controversy in our culture while eliminating it in our conversation. That way the news becomes the story instead of the story being the news. The concept that an adult should have an opinion on the important issues of the day is now forbidden except if you appear on the TV or run some kind of faux religious organisation. The kind of personal involvement in political causes you have over there disappeared with the end of the Vietnam war here. So people watch and comment on stupidity. That's why a guy who can barely spit out a coherent sentence can be elected to public office. People now distrust thinking and prefer to follow celebrities and their antics. Remember also we have a much more diverse group of citizens here than you all do. The media needs to appeal to every type and group of person to be successful. It's hard to provide the relevant content in the context that will address every group and their cultural philosophies. Much easier to just show pretty pictures; and every one can relate to the foibles of human relationships like marriage and

divorce.

Subject: Re: Democrat Values

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 18 May 2005 15:10:00 GMT

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

Let me say this my Republican friend. You're not going to get that kind of an argument here. I say this so you don't waste your time. Dabbling in political posts is one thing but hardcore debate is for another more politically oriented site. I don't minimize your position, just telling it like it is. Personally my political concern lies on the personal level; ie. I just want a level playing field for everyone; not just the privileged or the lucky.

Subject: American Politics

Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Thu, 19 May 2005 06:06:56 GMT

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

I like a level playing field too and that's why I don't like entitlements. Is it fair that one man does poorly in school, never takes an interest in working or society but society will pay him welfare money? While another works hard to stay in school, then gets out and works hard for a job and his standard of living but is not that much better? Democrats would have both men having the same standard of living, or very close. Republicans would allow the working man to rise while the non-working man sinks. People need an incentive or they stagnate. The middle class is broad in this country because of Republican values. Work hard for a better life. The Dems want entitlements, free for everyone, no matter what. This disadvantages the working man and benefits those that don't work. It also tends to widen the lower class. Don't start in on the big business bad man story. At this point, the Dems usually point to corporate corruption and say that's all Republicans are about. Criminal activity is not part of the Republican agenda. Democrat "pundits" like to equate the two things because it gets people revved up but that's just propaganda. Many people outside the USA and even people inside the USA under 30 think the Democrat party in America has democratic values. Not so. Democrats believe in socialist values. Republicans believe in the free enterprise system. That is important, because a lot of people get stuck on the name without realizing they are exactly opposite of what they think. In fairness, most people that vote Democrat must certainly want a level playing field and all good things. So do socialists though, don't forget they were idealistic dreamers wanting (and believing) they were building a utopian society. It isn't right to say any of these systems or the people in them are inherently corrupt. That's not what I'm saying. In fact, when an economy stagnates very badly, some capital infusion tends to stimulate it, and that is an idea favored by Democrats. I don't say everything the Dems say is bad. I do think Dems are politically motivated though, and way off the track in a way that is very bad for the country. It isn't about social-economic issues anymore, it's about winning the next election. That puts a real kink in the values, and makes entitlements very, very dangerous bargaining chips. Republicans are for getting what you work for. If you're a Republican,

you believe that you hunt for food or grow some crops, prepare it and eat it. If you aren't a farmer, then you do something that a farmer would want and you trade him for his food. The exchange is done with money, but you still do something for your living. If you cannot earn your keep, a Republican doesn't want you to starve but some accountability is expected. Republicans have that as their basic value system. Democrats are for sharing and dividing resources equally. When human nature comes into the picture, what tends to happen is that people get lazy and don't perform. They just want handouts. Socialist countries at least have quotas and if you don't match them, you are punished. The Democratic party hasn't thought it through that far, they just want everyone to have the fruits of a healthy economy, whether there is production to support it or not. The democrat socialist agenda practically ensures an unhealthy economy.

Subject: Hmmm...

Posted by [Damir](#) on Thu, 19 May 2005 11:10:09 GMT

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

I can't say anything about US politics, but in Europe there are some countries with very healthy economies, with large social/human/medical/pension, etc. rights, with "left" governments. And there are some "left" governments only by the name. And there are some countries where only 40% people vote (60% know that's only a BS performance), and minister or district-prefect became the local tycoon with 8% votes by the "left" and "right" arranging...money, money, money and political power are nice things, or about the same thing. The best thing is that I can't be more specific, I already said too much.

Subject: Re: American Politics

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 19 May 2005 13:34:01 GMT

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

First let me say that the above is perfectly alright to debate because it is your opinion and your feelings. Not a fact attack. Welfare; for all intents and purposes no longer exists. To get on welfare you have to be one step from the grave nowadays. If you are on welfare in these times, you need it. It is so difficult and horrible of an experience that only the most desperate succumb. Not to be confrontational but there is a case to be made that farm subsidies is a big welfare program and most of the recipients are very wealthy landowners; as well as huge government tax relief programs for the energy industry and the pharmaceutical industry. Who do you think picks up those tax burdens? It ain't Donald Trump. I think you are confusing Communism with Socialism. The latter seeks to provide basic needs to all by allocating revenue in a fair manner. Would you eliminate childrens school lunch programs for indigent parents. My point is when these kinds of programs are eliminated; it is usually to create a benefit for the more affluent who really do not need the help in order to burden the less able with higher financial responsibilities. If you believe in the law of the jungle; that only the strong survive (where you state that we should let the weaker members of our country sink) then fine; but don't try and call it civilisation. All politicians do what

they do to get elected; assigning nefarious agendas to the democrats exclusively is naive'. Here's my beef. The Republican Party stood for over 100 yrs. for; Less Government. That means less taxes. Less involvement in personal lives. Less regulatory restrictions on business. Fiscal responsibility. More power to state government. The current administration has; Raised taxes by cutting all funding to the states while creating mandated programs that cost huge amount of money. Created a whole new department of govt. in the Homeland Security Dept. then forced the funding onto the states. Created the No Child Left Behind act then left funding to the states. Started a War to Obtain foreign resources while instituting a tax rebate to help them get elected. Caved in to pressure from religious extremists to use the courts to mandate morality. There's more but I don't want to use the bandwidth.

Subject: Re: American Politics

Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 04:08:02 GMT

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

There are Section 8 apartments in every city filled with drug dealers and prostitutes getting subsidized with public moneys. This doesn't require a person to be one step away from the grave and is horribly abused. The people that could really use program like this usually get back on their feet in a short period of time. Someone that actually contributes to society and just has a temporary problem will solve it eventually. They need emergency assistance only. Section 8 style entitlements simply don't work. Same thing with food stamps. The acceptance procedure takes several months to go through so the only people that get them are "professional" welfare recipients. They are people that get themselves setup for life. The politicians that voted in these kinds of programs obviously didn't think them through. They might be a good campaign platform for a dem but as a real social assistance program, they can't possibly do any good. The only people on them are long term welfare recipients. There are no emergency plans for the truly needy, only plans for people that contribute nothing and are the same as street panhandlers. Except of course, these people have their panhandling down to an art. No Republican would vote for something like this. It is the Dems that put plans like this into effect. It hurts the working class by taking food off their plates and giving it to the dope dealers and panhandlers that have taken the time to get setup on Section 8 and food stamps.

Section 8

Subject: Re: Hmmm...

Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 04:13:14 GMT

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

With all due respect, I have never seen a country with a highly socialized government and a strong economy.

Subject: Re: Hmmm...
Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 04:45:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you "have never seen" countries with high standard for their cityzens and large social rights + prosperous economy, that doesn't mean that those European countries doesn't exist:-)

Subject: Re: Hmmm...
Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 04:56:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Name one. Show me a country with a highly socialized government and a strong economy.

Subject: Re: Hmmm...
Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 07:56:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey, why I would do your homework? Whatewer I say - you have your interests and your politics in your head and your truth. If I'll say, see the Sweden or Finland or Australia or whatewer country, you'll only try to find some negative thing about these countries, something that "prove" that your political/religious convictions are right - there's ONE GOD, ONE WAY, ONE COUNTRY, ONE PARTY, AND ONE LEADER. Right.

Subject: Kill the poor!
Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 08:01:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

May I suggest this song, "Kill the poor", then "Kinky Sex Makes The world Go `Round" and many other of "Dead Kennedys"?Here's the link for the one, enjoy...
Stars And Stripes Of Corruption

Subject: Re: Hmmm...
Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 08:39:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I would not discount your opinion. I simply stated that I can't think of any socialist countries with strong economies. I also want to remind you what kinds of comments started this thread.

Subject: Re: Hmmm...
Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 10:40:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, I lived in socialism, and now in capitalism, and IMO - both suck great way on their ways. And yes, both sistems can have some good side, etc, blablah. What "Manualbloc" politely said to you is that you can't expect the public for your political statements, nor serious discussion here. This is "kinky" forum, and you can expect some little fun, "polemics" for the sake of it, and little "politically incorect" provocations. P.S. If you are from USA, what kind of "Young Republican" is awake in 4:39:32?

Subject: Re: Hmmm...
Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 11:31:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I work the graveyard shift and have Fridays off. Pay off those student loans and generate some taxes for the welfare crack babies.

Subject: Re: American Politics
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 15:50:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You are correct; there is a lot of criminal activity in SRO's and Sec. 8 public housing. But that has nothing to do with party affiliation. In the 70's the state boards of health saw their funding cut to the bone by Ahemm, not Dems. This resulted in the vast exodus of schizo-affectives onto the streets without any recourse to treatment. The rational; new drugs that could control the symptoms. However that requires monitoring which of course cost money. Then there are people with addictions disorders that do respond to treatment providing it is available. The cost of not giving treatment is higher than the cost of providing it. The Rep's chose to build jails instead; because... drug enforcement is big business. Just follow the money.

Subject: Re: Kill the poor!

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 17:38:25 GMT

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

Damir; you're a wildman! Hows the amp project going?

Subject: Re: American Politics

Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 19:10:01 GMT

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

Sorry but that's just not so. Recent history shows rehab centers were all the rage in the 80's, fully funded by Uncle Sam. Ronald Reagan was the president and Nancy did the "just say no" campaign. Drug rehab was practically put on the map during a Republican presidency. It was slashed to nothing during Clinton's term. I don't know if it was related or not, but I do know rehab funding was cut to the bone during Clinton's term.

Subject: Re: Kill the poor!

Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 19:22:49 GMT

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

Maybe I was, about 20+ years ago:-), now I just sitting at the PC. Huh, the amp project... I know, part 3 - more power stage... cathode resistor + cap calculation, input cap, some wiring details, hum pot, etc. Then drivers, and power supply, then finalisation...I still expecting the power transformer, and maybe I'll buy input choke, too. For now, I use (buzzing:-)) 360-0-360V toroid, actually not too bad. And some new and salvaged chokes. Delivery time (4-6 weeks!) passed, and I'll wait a few more weeks, then I'll buy a "Lundahl" PT. At least, always on stock. And I'll try to buy some new and interesting "Mundorf" TUBE-Caps. But, to be honest, for now I'm doing nothing at all.

Subject: Re: Kill the poor!

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 21:47:50 GMT

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

Yeah; we get older and the time speeds up and we slow down, it's a bitch; ain't it. Would be nice to have one day a month when you could be you but twenty yrs younger. I don't even care about the hangover.

Subject: Re: American Politics
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 21:52:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well; you'll have to break that news to my wife who runs one. I guess well just have to agree to disagree. The Legislature was a republican majority during Bill's term. They have the budgetary responsibility in the govt. Let me ask a question of you. I believe you are a relatively young guy; is that correct?

Subject: Re: Kill the poor!
Posted by [Damir](#) on Fri, 20 May 2005 23:01:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Friend of mine has a private joke about himself, "well, I wish that I'm young, but with all wisdom I now have" - all laughed... Youth? I don't care - overrated as everything else...

Subject: Re: Kill the poor!
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 21 May 2005 00:06:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

My good friend; The knowledge is good to have and some things are better when you really understand what they mean. But damn, 25, strong, ready to go all night long, go straight to work; come home and do it again. Drive all night on 2 hrs sleep then party??? The fun never stops. There is only one first time. Here on Long Island there used to be a waterfront over 100 miles long filled with funky little bars and marinas. The drinking age was 18 but the reality was if you could walk you could be served. Boats were dirt cheap and beaches were everywhere. Need I say more? Oh; bars closed at 4am; then the after hours clubs opened.

Subject: Re: American Politics
Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Sat, 21 May 2005 08:30:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm 31 and one of my best friends is a doctor on staff at a large rehab center. He is always talking about how funding has been. Many of the largest treatment centers were opened in the 80's when funding was highest. Some wouldn't even take people that had no insurance in the 90's because they couldn't afford to. It has swung back now some after Clinton left office.

Subject: Re: American Politics
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 21 May 2005 13:54:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well; as always the discussion reverts back to the Mexican Standoff; I have one experience and you have another. I have no way of knowing if what you tell me is accurate and you have no way of knowing if I am truthfull. Bottomline; since all facts are elusive and open to interpretation, that leaves only one option; how do you feel about the current state you and your circle is in; same for me. I get from you that the countries full of welfare cheats and I get from my own experience that it is not. I am sure you have the same issue. Where you live that has such massive welfare rolls and fraudulent abuse of the public monies is a mystery to me. Living and working here in New York and having family that services the health community I have a totally opposite view. Following the state budget reveals less than 2% of total revenue expenditures granted to the public assistance rolls. A good portion of that includes elderly and children. So where are these armies of healthy abusers? I walk past Varick Street where the Welfare office is in Brooklyn and see maybe a couple of dozen people at any given time. So; where are they all?

Subject: Where are they all?
Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sat, 21 May 2005 16:19:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Easy - in the imaginations of the "I've got mine, screw you" crowd. Two things about people like our Young Republican friend never cease to amaze me: 1. They almost invariably identify themselves as Christians, yet when it comes to the basic tenants of Christianity, which is undeniably socialist, they reject anything that relates to sharing of worldly wealth with the less fortunate. The part about it being easier than a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven? Not a Republican platform plank. The part that says "But whoever has the world's goods, and beholds his brother in need and closes his heart against him, how does the love of God abide in him?" Never heard of it. Their idea of charity is to give monetary sums to causes and organizations that further and support their world view, which is founded on the concept that people less fortunate than themselves are inherently flawed, morally bankrupt – lazy, drug addicted, liars and cheats. They reserve their compassion for Rush Limbaugh and his rampant drug abuse or Bill Bennett and his wild gambling sprees while stepping over crack babies and shaking their heads. 2. They in no way are willing to acknowledge their responsibility in the social contract. An orderly society that allows the rich to remain rich requires money to keep it going. Somebody has to finance police, fire protection, the SEC, the military to secure the borders and yes, public order that depends on the poorest having what it takes to survive without stealing and general lawlessness to obtain it. But it is invariably the case that those who benefit the most from the societal structure are the ones who most vehemently deny their responsibility to finance it. Their idea of charity is to give to causes that further and support their world view, which is founded on the concept that people less fortunate than themselves are inherently flawed, morally bankrupt – lazy, drug addicted, liars and cheats. They reserve their compassion for Rush Limbaugh and his drug abuse while stepping over crack babies and shaking their heads.

Subject: Sorry for the poor editing
Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sat, 21 May 2005 16:21:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I was/am pissed.

Subject: Re: Sorry for the poor editing
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 21 May 2005 17:06:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Charley; It never ceases to amaze me how the other side cloaks their lack of basic human empathy in the shield of righteousness. But I must say our poster has not claimed to be a christian; unless I missed that post. I have no sympathy for crack addicts either, having spent enough time in the world; but the helpless ones who suffer from their negligence deserve our help. The current crop of fundamentalist practitioners have nothing to do with religion; it's a social club designed to network them into the best jobs and housing and all the rest of the basic status rewards. No problem with that as long as they admit up-front that is the case. Pretending you are a christian under those circumstances is laughable. But what is not laughable is the tax break they get while doing all this self-promotion and political posturing. That must and will be addressed. I like the homes and cars their leaders drive; because I know if Christ came back; they'd be the first to fry.

Subject: Re: Kill the poor!
Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sat, 21 May 2005 17:42:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Eat the poor.
A Modest Proposal

Subject: Re: Kill the poor!
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 21 May 2005 21:01:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Seems the same types re-occur periodically ehh.

Subject: Mental traps

Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Sun, 22 May 2005 08:21:53 GMT

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

Your assumptions are unfounded. This is one of the mental traps that Dems commonly fall into. Being Republican does not mean you have to be Christian. Being Christian does not mean you have to be Republican. Likewise, Democrats aren't always non-Christian. Don't mix your religion and politics please. Another mental trap is to say that because Republicans want to limit entitlements means that they want the poor to stay poor and the rich to stay rich. It's like you want to paint us all as greedy, selfish tyrants like Ebenezer Scrooge. Liberals use this as a imagery device, nothing more. It is ugly rhetoric, that's all. People that run into trouble aren't necessarily flawed but people that are "inherently flawed, morally bankrupt, lazy, drug addicted, liars and cheats" will most certainly run into trouble. Even that isn't the issue. The issue is what works and what doesn't. To say that Republicans operate on the "concept that people less fortunate than themselves are inherently flawed" is stereotypical. This is just another attempt to paint Republicans into a nasty picture. I won't stoop to using such a rhetorical argument. Instead, I will say that I think Section 8 housing and certain other welfare programs are a waste of money. Whether people taking that assistance are inherently flawed is not for me to judge. I personally don't think Socialism works and we've all seen evidence of its failure. I think if you tried it a hundred more times you'd get a hundred more failures. Likewise, I don't think that institutionalized multi-generational welfare for "unfortunate" families is a workable solution. They have to be given motivation, but a welfare check, food stamps and Section 8 housing isn't what I'd call motivation.

Subject: Re: Kill the poor!

Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 22 May 2005 09:22:28 GMT

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

This funny friend has some other one: "I'm glad that we went through it all and stayed PERFECTLY NORMAL!"

Subject: Re: Mental traps

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 22 May 2005 12:16:30 GMT

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

I tend to hear these arguments from people with this story. I don't assign this narrative to you in particular just a pretty common set of circumstances. You bought a building in an inner city housing project slated for gentrification. Three stories of 10 ft ceilings and oak mouldings that are 6 " wide with a flagstone fireplace. It is a great speculation except for those poor people that block the sidewalk whenever you need to go down to the street to the bodega to get milk and eggs. And it's hard to park unless you pay for a private spot in a secure lot. If they eliminated the safety net those people would die off or go away and your investment would quadruple overnight. Not to

sound mean-spirited; I just know many who are in that exact position and sound exactly the same. So I ask out of curiosity. They also tend to favor eliminating Social Security because they have a chunk of disposable income that they think could make them pretty comfortable by investing in Real Estate if they could just get that money they have coming from SS in a lump sum.

Subject: Re: addiction

Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sun, 22 May 2005 13:39:44 GMT

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

I guess I have a lot of empathy for people who I perceive as trying to escape their circumstances with drugs. It obviously compounds the problems they're trying to escape from, but their need to escape is something I can readily identify with. With 83% of Republicans self-identifying as religious, and my personal belief that very few of them are Wiccans, I think probability says Young is, like most of his cohorts, christian.

Political Affiliation

Subject: Re: addiction

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 22 May 2005 14:43:57 GMT

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

Will thou deny me three times before the cock crows?

Subject: Re: Mental traps

Posted by [Young Republican](#) on Sun, 22 May 2005 16:16:48 GMT

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

I'm not sure why you and wunhuanglo keep trying to paint me into a corner. I'm through talking "politics" here. You guys can go back to talking about buttfucking Ann Coulter and things like that.

Subject: Re: Mental traps

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 22 May 2005 16:48:13 GMT

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

No disrespect meant. I don't believe people operate on principal; their beliefs (and I include

myself), originate from their experience; so to understand someone's point of view you need to know what that experience is. The buttfucking thing is a timewaste and boring.
