
Subject: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO

Posted by [Dean Kukral](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 02:04:55 GMT

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

Do you suppose that there were any drug addicts in NO? Suppose they got trapped. Had to climb to the attic, alone. Started going thru withdrawal, because they could not get their fix. Rains stop, attic gets hot, and they are helpless going through withdrawal. Doesn't sound like a pleasant way to go.

Subject: Some related thoughts

Posted by [Dean Kukral](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 02:12:36 GMT

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

A lot of people in NO are pretty testy these days. Do you suppose many of them are smokers who have gone without a cigarette for five days? Or an alcoholic who can't get a drink. They showed people who needed insulin. What about the people on Dialysis? I have a friend with a colostomy. He would be better off, I think. Just pour your poop out. My wife thinks, "What about women in their periods."

Subject: New Orleans mayor lashes out at feds

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 08:36:53 GMT

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

Surely people with addictions will be even more desperate than others. But everybody's gotta eat. I can certainly understand tempers flaring. New Orleans mayor lashes out at feds God, this hurricane was just terrible. Time to put away the politics on this issue permanently. Like a car that won't start, just get out and push, it's the only way. Doesn't matter if it's the spark, fuel, whatever. Speculation and discussion won't get the damn thing out of the road.

Subject: Re: New Orleans mayor lashes out at feds

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 10:51:26 GMT

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

The problem is it absolutely is politics; it's the purpose of having a political leader and political system; to deal with stuff like this. That's why we have leaders; and they ultimately are the ones accountable. And there can be no soft peddling a major screw-up; that's their job period. If I screwed up like this I would not only have been fired but most likely indicted for incompetence and

negligence. Don't take the job then cry about circumstances; thats why you're there. Amazing people are making excuses that you would not make for your own self in your job. The buck stops there.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 10:54:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Do you suppose a few dozen of those Huey helicopters and some of the national guard troops digging for oil in Iraq might have helped the situation here? Why are the Iraqi's more important than Americans? This guy showed where his sympathy lies; where the money is period; we as a group should be outraged instead of making excuses for incompetence and outright negligence.

Subject: Re: New Orleans mayor lashes out at feds
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 12:26:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No man is accountable for acts of nature. If a natural disaster wipes out the planet, we're all gone. Some would probably want to argue we should have been prepared if they had time to debate the matter. But the fact is that man just isn't that powerful. Politics don't matter when higher forces are involved.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 12:39:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No amount of political rhetoric will help matters in New Orleans. All it can do is to create more frustration in people that are already at the breaking point. When we put the focus on politics, we are taking focus away from the real issues. I personally think it is insensitive and irresponsible in the extreme.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [Bill Martinelli](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 13:11:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Your right, He definitely stepped on his dick in this one. 4 days to get water to the dome?, and we can send a missile down an elevator shaft capabilities. Pure silliness. I don't believe GWB has the countries greater interest at heart. I made my donations to the situation and I'll cast a vote for a new leader when the time comes. For now I think we are limited to speaking up at the local government level's and let the elected people closer to us do the work.

Subject: Re: New Orleans mayor lashes out at feds
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 16:44:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Then why do we have a government? If the govt is not responsible for organising the responses to disasters then what is their job? Thats ridiculous to say they have no accountability here. I can't even respond to such a statement. We should have left the Twin Towers lying in the street by that logic.

Subject: Re: New Orleans mayor lashes out at feds
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 22:11:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you want to place blame, you might fix blame on the local or state governments too. One would expect them to have greater familiarity with their vulnerability than those at the federal level. I don't know, but I do know that making this matter political is just finger pointing and doesn't do any good. I can understand the frustration of everyone involved, and I can understand the mayor's comments. But I think he and the other local and state governments have as much or more responsibility for action as does the federal government. Again, I'm just saying that finger pointing in this case reeks of political rhetoric to me.

Subject: This just about sums it up
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Sat, 03 Sep 2005 23:18:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well said; however, I would have left off the "too" in the first sentence.....Colin

Subject: Re: This just about sums it up

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 04 Sep 2005 00:29:52 GMT

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

Well; You all have me flummoxed. Who built and maintained the levee's; who is responsible for declaring a national emergency and releasing the funds to pay for services. I am non-plussed at the thought that the Feds have no responsibility here. Then a poor state like Mississippi gets nothing since they have almost no budget to begin with and have no recourse to the type and amount of supply and rescue equipment needed on that scale. So they get nothing I guess. They have no standing to recall the military rescue; they can't even call the coast guard; that is a federal service; so they sink I guess. Freakin' amazing.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 04 Sep 2005 00:34:52 GMT

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

Bill; as always the voice of reason. I'm gonna miss Charlie and you could be a little less scarce around here too in my book. It gets lonely trying to make sense sometimes. Like flinging sand against the tide.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 04 Sep 2005 00:36:24 GMT

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

It's irresponsible to fail to provide the leadership you were elected to provide while people suffer and die as a result.

Subject: You are correct

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Sun, 04 Sep 2005 01:15:59 GMT

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

Believe what you want. President Bush stepped up when it was clear that the mayor of NO and the governor of LA could not handle the situation. Would you like to see some links where some are proposing that Katrina was a scalar-war designed to cause massive damage, just so Cheney/Halliburton could get the clean-up contract, which they were give yesterday?.....Colin

Subject: Re: You are correct
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 04 Sep 2005 12:04:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am sure you have those my friend; they are filed next to the area 57 section, right? And the Alligators in the NYC sewers are a real threat. Gotta love those bloggers; idle hands and all that. I used to read the blogs a couple yrs ago; but they seemed to ratchet up the bad craziness as more and more of them went online and they vied for attention; now it's not only pointless even reading the good ones, it's actually sad that these people ruined the whole concept of the citizen journalist. Another idea brought to you by technology run amok.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [cheetah](#) on Sun, 04 Sep 2005 16:04:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Manualblock, You are correct as the other post states. But the failure was "MORE" at the state and local level to act than it was at the federal level. The Governor bears the ultimate responsibility to take point in any kind of relief effort. She bears the bulk of the responsibility here. The guard works for her, not Bush. Only if he had federalized the guard troops, could he have taken control, and no Governor will take kindly to that action. George could have, and should have, acted earlier, but he was trying to give the governor the chance to get it right. All the while people died. Don't get me wrong here. The President should have stepped in 24-48 hrs. earlier. It was plain to see Governor Blanco was in over her head by Tuesday morning. But to do so would have required Bush to step on a lot of toes, that simply refused to be stepped on .

Subject: Re: You are correct
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 00:25:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

John, I'm so glad you saw the humor. I was a bit worried I would come off as an insensitive smartass.....Colin

Subject: Re: This just about sums it up
Posted by [cheetah](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 02:30:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Simple fact is the mayor and governor need to declare a state of emergency, before the president

can declare a state of emergency at the federal level. To do this prematurely would violate the states sovereignty. This doesn't make a bit of difference to the poor shmoe waiting for help to come. But legally and politically certain things must happen before the president can act. The case of LA, even at the late hour he acted, Bush usurped some of Gov. Blanco's authority. I'm sure there will be some fall out over that.

Subject: Drug addicts anyplace have problems!
Posted by [Bill Martinelli](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 02:57:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I sure hope Charlie will be rebuilding and wired back into the web before too long. Anyone who thinks the government didn't take too much time or dragged their feet getting help and assistance to the gulf coast for this storm would be a short lived person if they had balls to voice that opinion in one of the area's that is still being evacuated. Did the locals fall down on the job? Maybe so, but the feds knew this was going to be a major disaster before it even hit. There could have been trucks and supplies waiting upstate for the first break in weather. Hind sight is always a great thing and what I can see pretty clearly is that there are people who are not capable of handling this kind of situation. Does it matter if they are elected or hired? Political or private sector? The people heading up organizations and groups cant be allowed to sit around in wonderment. To think, FEMA did a study in NO itself, just last year as a practice run from the threats of the big hurricane last fall. Among other things it was found that the levees would most likely fail with a category 3 and greater hurricane and the city would flood. The idea of people looting grocery stores for food and supplies although not legal should be acceptable under the emergency situation for survival. The looters taking things not needed for survival, raping and pillaging the communities, shooters and gangs running like dogs should all be corralled up like the animals they are and sent to Guantanamo. For that matter, the gas stations that all raised the price of gas this past week for product still in their holding tanks should be spanked equally. Nothing like a little supply and demand frenzy to rile up a good gouging.

Subject: Re: Drug addicts anyplace have problems!
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 11:18:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wheew; thanks Bill.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 11:27:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Where are you speaking of? Also the Guard is National. Any President can mobilise the gaurd; look at Iraq.I see after perusing the papers Sunday that the spin is desperately revolving around placing blame on the locals. I think; and this is only my opinion, that the concept that Bush and company are so completely inept and so fixed on getting their agenda across in congress is frightening to Americans on so many levels that even supposedly sober-minded individuals are willing to allow some shifting of responsibility if only so that we don't look so pathetic around the globe.Thinking you have a leader who has no concern for his people and is essentially a puppet for the monied interests is very unsettling to many folks. What happens when the next disater strikes; it could be you.

Subject: Re: You are correct
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 11:31:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You; insensitive? Naah!One sec; I have to put my crystals back in my pyramid.

Subject: Re: This just about sums it up
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 11:33:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Bush declared a state of emergency on Saturday but so what? He offered no help or support and promptly left to give a speech propping up his losing effort in Iraq.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [cheetah](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 14:22:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Government is inept at all levels. When this is over and people begin to take the aftermath and response apart and analyse them; not Bush, not Blanco, not Nagin. All levels of government failed here. That has been my point all along. I don't see pointing a finger at any one individual and saying why didn't you do more? What took so long?And what of the people who refused to go? Yes there were some who could not. Those who were/are sick, infirmed, the old and feeble, the young who are wards of the state, the list goes on. I saw yesterday that over 230,000 had been evacuated from NO. And only God knows how many more they will find, when they start going door to door. You simply can't make a case that this many people simply couldn't find a way out.No, a very large number a people chose to stay: the reasons are varied and their own: and ride this one out. They gamble with their lives and lost. My heart breaks because of the conditions

these people had to endure. But the fault is their own. I guess what I am saying is this. We, you, me, all of us are damn idiots if we are depending on the government to take care of us. Ultimately I am responsible for my self. Not the mayor. Not the governor. Not the president. ME! If it had been my family, and we had the advanced notice of what was coming, you can bet that I would have gotten them us out. Some way some how. Even if I had to walk. I would have gotten my brood out. Those who could not help them selves, Yes; we as a society have a responsibility to help. We didn't. Our social services failed. Government failed. We all failed to make preparation for what we all knew was coming, eventually. Bottom line. If I allow government to have the responsibility for my welfare and safe keeping, then there is much personal freedom I must also relinquish. No one can be saddled with responsibility without the authority to back it up. Be it government or private individuals. Since government is inept, as the response to Katrina so vividly illustrates, I will not depend on them for the well being of mine. I will look after them. But, I also need to get government out of my life, to allow me to do the things I need to do, to prepare. The debate in this country needs to change. We are missing the point as we all discuss how and why the government response failed. The debate should be who is more able to protect me and mine when disaster comes. Government, all levels? Hardly! Joe

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 05 Sep 2005 14:37:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Harry Truman said it best about the presidency; The Buck Stops Here. A leader is supposed to lead; not tell the citizens to do it themselves. That's silly.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Tue, 06 Sep 2005 15:35:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I like to think of politicians as people who serve, not people who lead. Do you really consider politicians we see on TV everyday (of either party) to be leadership material? I agree, we are all responsible for our own destinies, at least I believe I am. -akhilesh

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 06 Sep 2005 17:10:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So; AK what is the definition of a leader? Do they not exist anymore? Was Abraham Lincoln a server or a leader? George Washington? How about Mohandus Ghandi? I got it; a leader is one

who takes orders??Where I grew up there were guys you knew were men. They were the guys you wanted around you if something went wrong or needed doing. They had some characteristics in common with each other. They tended to be capable; quick thinking and resourcefull. And when something went wrong..they accepted the responsibility and corrected the situation.Then there were guys known around to be weasels. They were always bragging about their supposed accomplishments that were non-existent; you could not trust their word to be true or accurate; they never finished what they started or they screwed up the things they did do then tried to blame it on someone else. And when the shit hit the fan they either disappeared or provided excuses instead of help.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 08:25:27 GMT

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

I see that as an idealistic position, and I agree. The best organizations I know of treat their office positions as trusted servants, and they encourage rotation of position. There's a certain learning curve for a new person in a position, then a period where they are comfortable and most effective, then a burnout period. By rotating the position, the organization is made stronger because more people become more involved. It also protects the organization from institutionalized leadership, which is almost always a power grab. I don't know if it would work on a national level though. Seems to work best on a smaller local level, where everyone knows everyone else. One thing is certain. No matter how much you try to institutionalize safety, it's still just layers and layers of abstraction over a fundamental level of uncertainty. What I mean is, you can build social systems with insurance against catastrophe, but you cannot ensure safety. You can do a lot to help things, and you can think ahead. But you cannot ensure a person's safety, health or prosperity. Not that I think we should stop trying to do the best we can, but I think it is important to do a reality check. The worst thing I see out of the last 50 years or so is people have become so accustomed to cradle-to-grave security that they believe they can actually demand it. We tend to forget that social systems are there to protect society, not individuals. Each individual has to protect himself, and one forgets this at his own peril. I'm not saying I think everyone should fend for themselves, and forget those that can't. Not at all. But I am reminding everyone of this simple fact. The police that catch the robber isn't there to protect your stuff, in fact, he could care less. The police are there to protect society by acting as a deterrent, to frighten bad guys into acting like good guys. He is also a sometimes a tax collector of sorts, bringing in revenues for the city, state or federal agency he works for. Same is true of the military, National Guard, etc. They aren't there to protect anyone. They are there to protect everyone. So if you are under attack, hurt, hungry or thirsty, by all means, do the best you can. Don't wait for the cops or the National Guard because they might not help you. That's not their job. Weird, I know, very frustrating. But just have your house burgled or your car stolen and you'll see what I mean. Be attacked and mugged. See what happens if your kids are kidnapped. Or have a natural disaster destroy your life. That's when I think it's time for us to go above and beyond the system, to reach out as individuals to other individuals. Because the system isn't setup to help individuals, and those that think otherwise become hopelessly frustrated.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 14:29:53 GMT

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

If you are hungry and thirsty you better not wait for the national guard or police under this administration because as we saw they ain't coming. But then if you do what you must to survive without regard for law and order then you have anarchy. I find the concept that the government we elect to ensure that these functions are provided has no responsibility to us as citizens to be so unacceptable that truth is I can't take that position seriously. Maybe that's the problem; I can't tell if you are serious or pulling my leg here. Then you say the police are not here to keep the peace but they are here to control the population sounds like a fascist state to me. If you are under attack be sure to know the law before you retaliate because you could end up in jail yourself. We have those laws and police to prevent people from taking the law into their own hands and the penalties for doing so are stiff. The best policing in this country has been studied for years. Under Bratton; New York became the safest large city in America during the Guillian years. His theories also were proven in Boston. His basic fundamental position? Each and every officer is responsible for every individual on his beat. It's called quality of life policing and it works. Maybe that's something you should look into; because your theories are so discredited that they sound archaic. Cradle-to-grave security? Not when you see half the country without health insurance. What Social Security? Study the conditions of America that brought the concept of SS into being. The great depression and how many thousands of people died of lack of nutrition medical care safe work environment. SS works and works well unless you think the very rich should get richer. Have you discussed with survivors what conditions were like during the great depression? You certainly would not be working because the engineering trades that existed at the time were decimated by the economy; and there weren't many people buying audio with their life savings. You think it can't ever happen again? The classic mistake throughout history because it damn sure does repeat itself. I see a different America than you do; most of the folks I know work two jobs and their wives work. Their kids come home and take care of themselves because there isn't anyone home. They go to the HIP center for medical treatment because most of the jobs now do not pay for health coverage. Cradle-to-grave security? Where, the two percent of our fellow citizens that collect welfare? Say; who paid for your education anyway; did you get any student loans? Grants? maybe. Small business loans or tax abatement? You are obviously a hard working guy no doubt; but try putting in those hours with four kids. My point; it doesn't add up for a decent guy like yourself to have these positions that are miserly and accepting of Governmental incompetence. You work hard; why should they get a pass? They have a job to do; do the damn job and stop looking for excuses. I never heard you make an excuse for yourself; why make it for them? I have a serious dis-connect with your statements here because I know what kind of guy you are and this position that the government owes nothing to it's citizens and police should not protect the individual and people should do whatever they see fit to survive; it doesn't gibe with what I know of you.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 15:17:05 GMT

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

I'm not kidding, not at all. I'm not making a judgement call, just stating the facts. To illustrate, look at the example of the car theft. The law isn't there to protect the victim of the crime, it is there to protect society from theft in general. Police try to catch bad guys and courts punish them as a deterrent, which then is supposed to rid the streets of bad guys. But nothing in that system is there to help the person that had their car stolen. It isn't setup to help individuals. If you see the Columbine kids shooting and you draw down on one and force him to lay down his weapon, you will be charged with a felony. But at least you might stay alive, and if so, it would have been worth the hassle in court. My statements aren't about what I think is right or wrong, they are facts about what is. The system isn't set up to protect individuals, it is set up to protect society. The hurricane created millions of individual tragedies. Lots of people need help. And I hope each and every one is helped. But it is going to take a lot of individual efforts, over and above what the government or any political pundits might promise. The political posturing makes me sick, from both sides. It makes me sick because it is so full of rhetoric and impossible promises. It's all about what would or should or could have been done if it were done "our" way. Talk, talk, talk. I think the good news for the hurricane victims, is that government assistance will be made available, and I think there will be a pretty good amount of it. I think destroyed cities and structures will be rebuilt, maybe some things will be different, but I think people will make good. And I think there will be plenty of individual assistance too, in this case. It is an extraordinary circumstance. But my point is that government is not setup to take care of each of us individually, for right or wrong, it just isn't. That's why it's really good to donate at times like these, because even after the government payouts, there still isn't going to be enough to take care of everyone. There never is. I don't think it's reasonable for a political party to spin this, or for anyone to turn this human tragedy into a political talking point. I just really don't like that, maybe it's just me.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 17:10:30 GMT

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

I think I see something here. It appears that you contend that somehow the government is separate from the governed and as a result we; the governed, must somehow perceive the various sections and hierarchies of governmental administration as an impediment to accomplishing our rights and our function as citizens. It almost seems as if the government you see is an alien organisation constructed to control issues in our lives that we can control ourselves and to greater effect. It also appears as if you feel they do us a favor when they in fact do supply the physical and philosophical resources they are commissioned for. The simple reply is we pay taxes for these services; that's what we are paying for. Forget the real economics behind government funding; too much to approach now; but we pay in fees; in price controls; in personal time and responsibilities....the list goes on and on. This government does not support or generate its own funding; we pay it to serve our needs. That makes it a job; one that the elected choose to strive for. They get paid in many ways and as a result; they have responsibilities. You taking them off the hook figuratively changes nothing. If I send a speaker to you to be re-built and you screw it up; are you responsible? All that talk about how they are not serving you; then who are they serving? I admit it gets more baffling. As far as the system; what system do you mean? The fact that the Police do not have the resources and ability to chase after every stolen vehicle doesn't

mean they are not supposed to do it. Reality; in Jersey City the stolen vehicles were so numerous insurance co. would no longer write policies for them. The police put in a mobile unit(taking men and equipment away from other issues) and cut the theft in half. Simple manpower allocation. Eliminate the drug laws and make drugs a medical issue and free up all those resources to do policing and see what you get. That's my point; these things are addressed as well as they can be with limited funding; but no one advocates you carry a piece and shoot anyone you suspect of stealing cars. It is the responsibility of the citizens to force those in office to do their jobs; not suggest they are not accountable. Anyone who thinks that the complete destruction of one of our large cities requires no involvement on the part of the Federal Government needs to surrender their voters registration card. I am pretty happy with our state and local government. It's safe and comfortable here and as you saw on 9/11 the politicians are capable and responsible. What's going on down there my friend?

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 19:29:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I grew up in a country with a socialist system. I have a healthy distrust of government, like our founding fathers here. The less the better. Nand I didn;t spend all these years settling down here to live in a society where everyone wants a handout from government either. The America I know is better than that. We fix thngs ourselves, as small communities, and ultimately as one big community. We don;t rely on some mealy mouthed bureaucrat to tell us what to do or give us directions. -akhilesh

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 20:22:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Then you better vote Democratic ticket because under the Republicans the Government has expanded three-fold. The bureaucrat is supposed to be working for us; we tell them what to do. Why is that hard to phathom? I had an epiphany earlier that I think explains this serious dichotomy in perception of what our government does and is. When I was younger I lived in a very exclusive area of New York called Great Neck. I wasn't wealthy, I rented, specifically in order to send my daughter to their schools. They have a school system that is rated in the top 10% of public schools in the U.S. I worked per diem for the school in order to acquaint myself with the quality and methodology they favored in order to reach that level of ability. There were several reasons for the excellence of their schools. The oversight committees were an agregate of parents/teachers and administration personell. The parents were extremely involved in this process and believe me when I tell you there was accountability there. Even with the strength of the Teachers Unions they still had to answer to the school boards and the oversight committees. If a teacher slacked off even for a second they had a monitor installed and the teacher was assigned a mentor. The

administration was held to the same standards. The school system in my town now does not have this system in place. While they are not bad; they are nowhere near what Great Neck was. The parents are not as involved and the administration has a hands off policy that excludes people from participation. The people that live here are natives; most of them grew up here and so did their parents. So they feel the schools are what they are and cannot be changed. They are fine they say. Why? Because they have never been exposed to what a school should be. I think that is the Dis-Connect here. People settle for government behaviour in parts of this country that is inexcusable because they have no reference with which to compare how their officials should be behaving. With poor leadership;..of course you think you have to do it yourself. After all; if you don't, who will?? We need to share some of the better governed places with those suffering from inept and incompetent leadership; so they can see what their leaders should be capable of. I believe that explains the complete bafflement at the attitudes expressed where the government is not accountable; nor is able to do their job correctly.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Thu, 08 Sep 2005 14:30:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A leader is someone who takes a group of people in a specific situation and motivates them to accomplish a goal. Do you think a politician is a leader? Good politicians are supposed to serve, to take the people's money and decide how to spend it. They are ultimately accountable to the people, who are their "bosses". That's why we have elections, to replace our public servants with others if we are not happy. I don't think a public servant is a leader at all. At worst, he/she is a dishonest crook who steals, at best he / she is a public servant who performs his/her duties with a sense of service. -akhilesh

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 08 Sep 2005 21:30:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

O'Kay so if the President is a public servant how did he manage to send an army to Iraq on his own recognisance? What exactly is the job of the President in your eyes if I may ask? What would you say are his duties and responsibilities?

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 10 Sep 2005 18:17:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am surprised there is no response my friend AK. What is the Presidents job and responsibility because after this thread I don't see what you all think he is there for.

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2005 03:17:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Exactly as defined in the US Constitution. I wouldn't call the duties of the President, as defined in our Constitution, those of a leader. The PResident leads the armed forces & executive branch of our govt, yes, but he doesn;t really lead teh American people, at least not in my opinion, no matter who he is. IN times of emergency, like 911, or the Civil War, he can be a cerntal point of rallying and energy, but thats about it. Ultimately, we are responsible for our own fate. Also, the President can't just go around making war. There are checks & balances. They were adhered to in going to war on Iraq, I believe. Otherwise, why is Congress continually funding this war? -akhilesh

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2005 11:43:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AK; if I reproduce the exact definition of the Presidents powers and responsibility as written in the Constitution; and that spells out his duties as a leader will that change your mind?Remember the Constitution was written to be interpreted by law; so the duties of the President have been enumerated throughout our history. But they are concrete and they are easily described; so how about it?

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2005 12:20:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I just read teh COnstitution. Nowhere does it say the president is leader of the American people. He is the leader of the executive branch of the government, and has certain powers, but that's it. I view politicians, best case, as public servants, and worst case as crooked scunbags who'd sell their gradnmothers for "power". -akhilesh

Subject: Re: 2 B A Drug Addict in NO

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2005 13:26:43 GMT

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

Commander and Chief of the Army and Navy Power to make treaties with foreign govts./appoint all officers of the govt and all Judges of the federal courts Power to convene both houses of the legislature and adjourne them when he sees fit He shall take care to insure that all alws are faithfully executed and shall commission all officers of the U.S. to accomplish that The veto power is inherent in the Presidency wherein he shall excersize the power to defeat legislation not deemed in accordance with his policies. How am I doing; thats all from memory. If all those powers don't make you a leader; nothing does. I think you are thinking of a dictater; thats different. The power of the Presidency is keeping how many people in jail in Guantanamo without any trial or representation; that almost is a dictator. What more can he do as a leader?
