

---

Subject: ??

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 12:26:48 GMT

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

---

So let me see; we can't leave Iraq because if we do all those guys died for nothing. But the Iraqi's show no sign of forming this wonderful democratic government the shrub was so proud to mention so that means we must stay. If they never get around to going with democracy then many more will die for nothing. So I am somewhat puzzled; how many have to die for nothing to make it a done deal?

---

---

Subject: 4 die in one day in wake of Katrina. We need to pull out of Florida and cut our loses :-)

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 13:35:58 GMT

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

---

Your premise is wrong that "Iraq's show no signs of forming this wonderful democratic government". Let's see the had free elections with millions participating. Many more than expected. And they are working on a constitution. Sounds like they "are" showing signs of a "wonderful democratic government". That said I am not saying if it will succeed or not. If it does succeed though, GW Bush goes down in history as one of the great presidents. Of course the Democrats can't have that. They will do everything in their power to make sure it doesn't. Stay tuned. It should be interesting.

---

---

Subject: Re: 4 die in one day in wake of Katrina. We need to pull out of Florida and cut our loses :-)

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 14:13:16 GMT

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

---

Yes of course; we see it working well so far. If it doesn't succeed; what will that make him? Define success.

---

---

Subject: Re: 4 die in one day in wake of Katrina. We need to pull out of Florida and cut our loses :-)

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 15:27:01 GMT

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

---

"Yes of course; we see it working well so far" Apparently this is in the eye of the beholder. No one

---

ever said it would be quick or easy. And of course the odds are against it. But we will just have to wait and see."If it doesn't succeed; what will that make him?"It would make him someone that tried to do the right thing for the country knowing the odds were against him. Also someone that did the right thing knowing how much was at stake both politically and morally. A man that put country first and not polls first. Basically a leader. Am I happy with everything that has gone on? No. Am I happy people had to die? No. "Define success"Freedom, Democracy in Iraq. A safer US and world in the long run. (note: I said long run. Of course during the war, things will get more dangerous.)The very things that the terrorists are against. However it was very important to show the enemies of the US that we would not sit idly by and let evil deeds go unpunished (AKA Clinton). They now know we mean business (as long as there is a true Republican in office anyway). This in and of itself could be defined as success in my book.

---

---

Subject: Re: 4 die in one day in wake of Katrina. We need to pull out of Florida and cut our loses :-)

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 17:01:57 GMT

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

---

So Iraq is where the terrorists went? And is that who we are fighting there?We have no interest at all in the oil reserves there?

---

---

Subject: Now you getting it...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 17:20:15 GMT

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

---

Of course we have interests in the oil there. That is also where the terrorists are. And the terrorists didn't go there. They always were there. Terrorists are all over the middle east. They are like roaches. And Bush is the can of RAID.

---

---

Subject: Re: Now you getting it...

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 17:36:41 GMT

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

---

Are there any good people there and how do you tell them apart?

---

---

Subject: Good question...

---

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 18:13:04 GMT

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

---

You can tell the terrorists because they are the ones shooting at the coalition forces. Another indication is they have bombs in their cars or strapped to their bodies. I see we are getting silly now.

---

Subject: Yes, there are good people over there

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 19:13:10 GMT

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

---

Let me see..... Oh yeah, my wife is Arab.....Colin

---

Subject: Re: Good question...

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 19:27:48 GMT

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

---

I'll tell you why I ask. Let us agree there is a sizable force of individuals; call them insurgents/terrorists/loyalists/ whatever; but we must be honest and agree there is a sizable amount indicated by the serious and effective resistance they are putting up against an overwhelming force both numerically and technologically. There is an old military saying that goes an army of ten requires a support team of thirty. Lets add the numbers of fighters to the numbers of required support personell. Now we have quite a large group covering a sizable area. That mobile insurgency needs to be moved around/housed/fed/provided with intelligence/medical care/and money. That is a logistical feat in itself. Now when you add the concept of rewards offered to the population for any info that results in a capture you also must have all of this behaviour done in secrecy. The numbers of fighters for Iraq independence would then by definition need a huge and dedicated well supplied armed and protected support system. That means much of the population has provided in some way for the existance of these freedom fighters. Now I ask; does that sound like they are on our side? That they voted for a democratic system modeled after our own when their fledgling constitution provides for rule by Sharia or Islamic theocratic law? Where are the democratic members of the provisional govt that support the U.S. Occupation? They support our funding and when that ceases they will abandon all pretense of adopting our ways.

---

Subject: First and foremost.. They are not "Freedom Fighters"

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 20:23:46 GMT

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

---

They are if anything "Anti Freedom Fighters". Terrorists and nothing else. This political correct crap is just that. As far as the rest of your post all I can say is I disagree. I think the vast majority of people in Iraq are good people that want freedom. As evidenced by the recent election. The people risked their life to vote. Women for the first time voted. People want to be free. The terrorists I think are losing the fight. Suicide bombings are a last ditch effort because nothing else works. As it was for the Japanese in WWII. In any case the Democrats and the Media should be doing everything they could to help the US and the coalition forces succeed. Instead of the other way around. It would be better for the US, it would be better for the world.

---

---

Subject: Re: First and foremost.. They are not "Freedom Fighters"

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 21:29:09 GMT

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

---

Well I guess you are entitled to your position but truthfully I had hoped for a real answer to the post. All the touchy-feely stuff doesn't really amount to much when peple are dying. Make no mistake this is no last ditch effort; it's only the beginning. This war was predicated on lies about WMD's and it is beginning to sour in the public eye. I lived through Vietnam and this is the same thing. The Vietnamese did not defeat us; we defeated ourselves because we insisted on pursueing a false premise just like we are doing here.

---

---

Subject: Re: First and foremost.. They are not "Freedom Fighters"

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 22:53:42 GMT

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

---

Please spare me the Vietnam comparison because they have nothing in common (except the example given below). WMD was only one of many reasons for the war. Not the only reason like the liberals would have us believe. How about this reason: After the first Gulf War Saddam signed an agreement to abide by any and all UN Resolutions (he did this probably knowing that the UN was absolutely and completely corrupt. And is nothing more than an Anti US organization). If he didn't abide by the resolutions then the war continues and he is taken out of power. How many resolutions did he break? 17? 18?. That is more than enough justification right there. You are right about Vietnamese not defeating us. But we didn't defeat us. The liberals did. By doing the same exact thing they are now. By using the media to convince people that everything is going wrong. If we lose this war, make no mistake, it will be history repeating itself. So let me ask you a question. What would you have us do? Let Saddam continue to break resolution after resolution? More food for oil agreements? More tough talk with no action? This is exactly the reason we are in this war to begin with.

---

---

Subject: Re: First and foremost.. They are not "Freedom Fighters"

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 23:00:57 GMT

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

---

He was punished with sanctions; thats what civilised nations do. We wanted the oil more than he wanted the food. Whats tough talk; we had no business messing with him in the first place. He invaded Kuwait; we drove him back to his country; we placed sanctions on all trade with Iraq until he complies with the rules . So why are we there?

---

Subject: Re: First and foremost.. They are not "Freedom Fighters"

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 23:23:09 GMT

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

---

And if he doesn't comply? Like he wasn't doing. Isn't it the liberals that complain that sanctions only hurt the innocent people of the country?The agreement that he signed was not, you can comply if you want to with the UN resolutions but if you don't we will impose sanctions. It was you comply or we take you out of power. Plain and simple. The sanctions were not in the agreement at all. And we all know how the food for oil plan turned out don't we?So what would you do? He doesn't comply and never will. After 17 or 18 broken resolutions. What do you do? Continue to starve the people of Iraq? While its leader bribes the UN officials? Clinton tried sanctions? Did they work? Did 911 happen anyway?I ask again. What would you have us do? This is the reason the Democrats are losing election after election. They have no answers. All they can do is use the media to bring opponents down. It still works but not for long. The media is slowly losing power. Thanks to cable news and the internet.

---

Subject: Republicans need to be careful

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Fri, 26 Aug 2005 23:40:41 GMT

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

---

President Bush has made the Gulf War his sole agenda. You're right. If he can pull off mid-East peace, he will go down as one of the great Presidents. But history is against him.Read some of the conservative boards. Most of the attention is now focused from supporting the war, which is still high, to fighting illegals, high gas prices, and China/India. The talk is not about the war anymore, but about domestic problems, which President Bush has ignored.....Colin

---

Subject: Re: Republicans need to be careful

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 00:47:56 GMT

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

---

Look, I know it sounds like I am supporting Bush in whatever he does but I do not. That said, I don't believe Bush has made the Gulf War his sole agenda (although it certainly will be the most important aspect of his administrations, as well it should be). He has tried to fix the Social Security problem (which the Democrats are now denying is even a problem), he's handled some of the problems with drug coverage for seniors, Tax reform etc. Fighting illegals he hasn't done and probably won't. This is one of the points I disagree with him on. High gas prices. Not much he can do about this. Except start a war for oil (Oh that's right. Hmm guess that war isn't about oil after all :-). China/North Korea are potential problems in the future I think. Just going to have to handle these things as they come up I guess. I don't have all the answers.

---

---

Subject: Re: First and foremost.. They are not "Freedom Fighters"  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 00:48:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

We can't have a reasonable dialogue if you insist on tying 9/11 to Iraq. That's ridiculous and you know it. Second; you keep bringing up Republican/Democrat. This is the Oil cartel headed by Bush/Cheney appropriating the oil for the U.S. If that is admitted then maybe some real discussion can take place. That aspect of Bush's policy at least makes sense. The oil reserves in the world are becoming depleted at an ever faster rate and the explosion of need from the far east will accelerate that eventuality. Sending troops into the oil producing region in order to secure our ability to acquire oil and the means to guard our interests is the real reason we are there. That is not open to debate. It's the means by which we accomplished this and the needless deaths resulting from this assbackwards policy that concerns most of the civilised world. Venezuela is headed by a marxist dictator who hates the U.S. Saudi Arabia has been cheating us and disrespecting us for fifty yrs. Russia has the bulk of the rest of the oil. Israel can no longer provide the security in locus parentis for us in that area anymore. The argument is why the administration has overridden all reasonable approaches to negotiating from a position of strength by throwing the military into the field prematurely and proving how precarious our military options are. Dumbass shit by a fool. And bottom line; where are the tower bombers? Happy somewhere I suppose since they don't seem to care much about getting ahold of them.

---

---

Subject: Ridicules in your mind not mine...  
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 01:27:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"We can't have a reasonable dialogue if you insist on tying 9/11 to Iraq. That's ridiculous and you know it." No I don't. Iraq has a lot to do with terrorists. Why are we fighting them there then? Are we just fighting nice civilians that don't want us in their country? Are these the people that are cutting off Americans heads? Why did the terrorist bomb the train in Spain? Why did they bomb the subway in London? Why would they want us out of Iraq if they have nothing to do with Iraq?

"This is the Oil cartel headed by Bush/Cheney appropriating the oil for the U.S. If that is admitted than maybe some real discussion can take place."Why would I admit to something so ludicrous? If it was about oil why didn't we take it during the first Gulf War? Why aren't we taking it now? "That aspect of Bush's policy at least makes sense. The oil reserves in the world are becoming depleted at an ever faster rate and the explosion of need from the far east will accelerate that eventuality. Sending troops into the oil producing region in order to secure our ability to acquire oil and the means to guard our interests is the real reason we are there. That is not open to debate. It's the means by which we accomplished this and the needless deaths resulting from this assbackwards policy that concerns most of the civilised world."Not open to debate in your mind. But lets say the above is true. Ask yourself why are we so dependant on foreign oil? Could it be because the liberals won't allow a nuclear plant to be built anywhere in the US? Could it be because the liberals won't let us drill for oil anywhere? Hmm? Iraq has what 2% of the worlds oil supply? Why don't we go after Saudi Arabia where there is more oil if that's what we are after? None of what you are saying makes sense. Yes we have oil interests in the area. No it has little to do with this war. Why did the Democrats in congress vote for the war if it was about oil?"The argument is why the administration has overridden all reasonable approaches to negotiating from a position of strength by throwing the military into the field prematurely and proving how precarious our military options are."After 18 broken resolutions, I would say we gave him all resonable approaches of negotiation. More than 18 broken resolutions would be unreasonable. "Throwing the military into the field prematurely"?? Are you serious? How long did Saddam have to comply? Please. This one statement right here is the reason the Democrats have lost control of congress and the presidency. It's proof that Democrats have no ties to reality. IMO we gave Saddam way too many chances. IMO when he broke the first resolution that would have been it. After 18 broken resolutions and years of sanctions, you say lets give him another chance. Give negotiations a try. Surely this is self delusion.So I noticed you dodged my question. Let me repeat it for you. What would you do? Sanctions didn't work. More sanctions? He wasn't complying. He wasn't going to. The sanctions were starving the innocent people of Iraq. What would you do?

---

---

Subject: Re: Ridicules in your mind not mine...

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 01:48:46 GMT

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

---

Sadam was a scumbag that needed to be taken out of the region. I only wish it had been in a bodybag. If, after his trial, he receives the death penalty, he will only rise to martyr. If he is kept alive, he will be used a negotiating tool for every terrorist group known. This is a no-win situation for the free world.The region has been politically unstable for as long as records have been kept. It is a pipe dream to think President Bush can bring peace to the region. I wish him all the power God can grant him. My wife is Arab, and I would love to take my kids to Nazarath someday to meet their cousins. The culture and people must be experienced to really appreciate the land.Yeap, Sadam was a scumbag and violated all the UN "rules." But are we really better off now? Personally, I don't feel much safer .....Colin

---

---

Subject: Re: Ridicules in your mind not mine...

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 02:06:11 GMT

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

---

I only respond to the 9/11 thing once more. We are fighting people of Iraqi citizenship who don't happen to like being invaded and occupied by a foreign power; as any other peoples of integrity would. You want to call freedom fighters terrorists call the invaders holy warriors against Muslim peoples. Same silliness. Iraq holds the second largest oil reserves in the world; little more than 2% I would say. Why not invade Saudi Arabia? Why not invade every oil rich nation; it seems a little off don't it? Why or why we are not dependent on foreign oil isn't the subject of this discussion well do that some other time; stay focused. Why terrorists enact terror is anyone's guess why have there always been terrorists? In Spain they want Basque separatism; in Italy they are communists; who knows about every terror group, not me. Fighting nice civilians who don't want us in their country..well; yes as a matter of fact, re-read my earlier post. They couldn't do it without the help of those nice civilians. Throwing the military into the field prematurely was a tactical error that I am sure even you have realised. What does that have to do with the sanctions? Iraq has most of the world's highest concentrations of high grade crude. When Saddam nationalised the oil fields in 1972 the U.S and U.K. lost billions of dollars in revenue and equipment. This war is about getting that back. Ask where the 6 billion dollars in expropriated U.N. funds have disappeared through the U.S. administrative body governing the dispensing of those funds after the occupation. Bush makes a phone call to Sistani today to call for some cooperation? Begging is more like it. On May 22 2003 the U.N. officially ended sanctions against Iraq with resolution 1483 calling for a development fund for Iraq dubbed, "DFI", administered by the U.S. U.K. coalition. 1483 called for a provisionally monitored accountability board which was promptly disregarded by the coalition administration. Since then some 20 billion dollars remain unaccounted for. All passing through the hands of the U.S. agency of administration. Funny how they try to smokescreen the oil for food issue while pilfering untold millions. Sorry; I don't usually get into specifics because I don't really want to have to be barraged by neo-con propaganda parroted from right-wing talk show nitwits. And the bandwidth is exceeded..to be continued.

---

Subject: Re: Ridicules in your mind not mine...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 11:19:56 GMT

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

---

Regarding terrorists in Iraq. You really are self delusional. Sorry don't mean to be nasty but there is no other explanation. We are not fighting citizens that don't want us in their country. We are fighting terrorists that were in Iraq and are also coming from other countries. Not citizens. Why did so many people risk their lives and vote in the elections? If the terrorist attacked Spain because they want Basque separatism. Why did Spain pull out of Iraq as a result? You forgot London. Why did they attack there? I believe the United States gets 2% of its oil from Iraq. My number may be off by some but in any case it is a small amount of the oil we use. May point was that if we were after oil why pick on Iraq when we could pick on Saudi Arabia (Or Iran for if that makes you happier) which has more oil. Wouldn't that make more sense if we wanted to start a war over oil? "When Saddam nationalised the oil fields in 1972 the U.S and U.K. lost billions of dollars in



revenue and equipment. This war is about getting that back. "If the above statement were true. Why not take it during the first Gulf War? A perfect opportunity then wouldn't you say? I'll help you out here. We didn't because the your accusation is false. To say that we prematurely sent our troops into the field is ludicrous as I said above. What does that have to do with sanctions? Read my response to this question above. Don't feel like repeating myself again. Money unaccounted for doesn't mean the US stole it. Besides this has nothing to do with our discussion. "neo-con propoganda parroted from right-wing talk show nitwits" Wasn't it you that posted in another place on this site that insults have no place here? I NOTICED THAT YOU STILL HAVEN'T ANSWERED MY QUESTION. WHAT WOULD YOU HAVE DONE???

---

---

Subject: We are mostly in agreement.  
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 11:32:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I agree with much of what you say. It may be a pipe dream to think that Bush can bring peace to the region. You're right, but that should not stop him or the world from trying to bring peace. And the people that are against the attempt are the ones to look out for IMO. "Are we better off now. Do I feel safer."Of course not there is a war going on. Of course things will get worse during a war. The coalition forces have captured or killed many terrorists. In the end I believe the world will be a safer place. This is providing the liberals in the US don't succeed with their propoganda and force a pull out of Iraq before it is stabilized. However as you know, there are no guarantees. But the free world has to try. IMO.

---

---

Subject: Re: We are mostly in agreement.  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 13:25:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well then we have some job ahead of us. Next stop North Korea; then Ten or Twelve contries in Africa then we go to South America. Think our mission of conversion can accomplish all this? Or might we stop in the places that have oil? I wager we concentrate all this missionary fervor in those petroleum rich nations and pretty much disregard the rest of the bad guys.

---

---

Subject: See post above regarding oil (NT)  
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 13:56:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NT

---

---

Subject: Re: Ridicules in your mind not mine...  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 15:41:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well you still have not answered my point either. How does such a large and well organised insurgency function without the help of the people. So I will make you a deal; since I asked first if you answer me than I'll answer you; it's only fair. Second; sorry but insulting the right wing media is only fair since they do more than their share of it.

---

---

Subject: "No one ever said it would be quick or easy" !?!?!?  
Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 16:04:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Stop listening to Limbaugh - every word from his mouth is a lie. # On the March 16, 2003, broadcast of CBS' Face the Nation, Cheney stated: "I think [the war will] go relatively quickly." When host Bob Schieffer pressed the vice president to offer a more precise estimate of how long the war would take, Cheney replied: "Weeks rather than months." On NBC's Meet the Press the same day, Cheney stated, "my belief is we will, in fact, be greeted as liberators [by the Iraqi people]." # In a February 7, 2003, appearance at Aviano Air Base in Italy, Rumsfeld projected that the Iraq war "could last six days, six weeks. I doubt six months." # In a February 13, 2002, Washington Post op-ed, Ken Adelman, at the time a member of the Defense Policy Board, stated: "I believe demolishing Hussein's military power and liberating Iraq would be a cakewalk. Let me give simple, responsible reasons: (1) It was a cakewalk last time; (2) they've become much weaker; (3) we've become much stronger; and (4) now we're playing for keeps." They're are dozens more; remembered by those of us who don't swallow every revisionist lie spewed by the cabal of criminals in this administration and their all too willing media accomplices.

---

---

Subject: Re: Ridicules in your mind not mine...  
Posted by [Mr. Vinyl](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 16:29:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, I disagree that it's a large and well organized insurgency. But for the sake of this debate I will answer the question by saying with the help from Syria and Iran. Now your turn.

---

---

Subject: Re: "No one ever said it would be quick or easy" !?!?!?  
Posted by [Mr. Vinyl](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 16:57:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I don't listen to Limbaugh on any regular basis. Stop listening to NPR every word there is a lie.Cheney was talking about the initial war to take Iraq which I believe took weeks and not months. He doesn't say the hostilities will be over in weeks and we will have a democratic system set up. Nor did he say hostilities will end and we will be out of Iraq in weeks. So taking him out of context does not help with our discussion.

---

---

Subject: Re: Ridicules in your mind not mine...  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 19:14:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You mean they hide there during the day then come out at night? My turn to say come on; I repeat.They need mobility/Food/shelter/information/money and it all must be done in secret. That would indicate to me a large amount of help from the population. I sure as hell don't see them running across the desert from Syria everytime they need to do an operation.No; the people want our money and us out of there pure and simple.Even offering huge rewards has not gotten us any more information than we were able to find out ourselves. No; The people do not like their conquerors and want them gone.Vietnam all over again.

---

---

Subject: OK. Terrific.  
Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 20:47:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

nt

---

---

Subject: Very glad we agree..(nt)  
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sun, 28 Aug 2005 01:23:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nt

---

---

Subject: Re: OK. Terrific.  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 28 Aug 2005 13:27:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

They have blinders on because the reality is they are more interested in being right than fair. So no matter how much logic you hit them with they still dodge the issue and turn it to some irrelevancy. Glad I don't live in the red states, can you imagine the silliness that goes on there?

---