
Subject: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [LeeLee](#) on Sun, 05 Feb 2012 03:33:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What does everyone think of Romney? I keep seeing something on the news about a Romney ringtone. I guess he slipped up! Is there any of the candidates that you like? I am still unsure, I have never trusted a politician. I think they are bred to lie.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sun, 05 Feb 2012 15:39:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I just can't get excited about Romney. Seems to me like the presidential choices just keep getting worse and worse.

If it's just between Obama and Romney, I'm pretty sure we're screwed. Again.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [gofar99](#) on Sun, 05 Feb 2012 17:18:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi, I'm with Wayne. I think a write in campaign for Lady Gaga would be more suitable

When one of the automated calls come in for any candidate I ask who are they running against. Then tell them because they violated my privacy I will vote for the other guy. It usually stops them cold in their tracks. Now of course they probably have put a hex on my house.....

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [AudioFred](#) on Tue, 07 Feb 2012 23:10:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've decided to run as an independent candidate. My motto is "A tube amp and a pair of constant directivity speakers in every listening room". These will be free for everybody who is legally in the US. A new tax on rich speaker manufacturers and tube amp manufacturers will pay for it.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 07 Feb 2012 23:13:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [gofar99](#) on Tue, 07 Feb 2012 23:19:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Make it some quality ESLs and you have my vote. But please tax the other amp makers.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [AudioFred](#) on Tue, 07 Feb 2012 23:29:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wayne Parham wrote on Tue, 07 February 2012 17:13

Are you saying that "rich" and "speaker manufacturer" can never be in the same sentence? Ditto for tube amp manufacturers. Darn, I was counting on you for a \$100,000 contribution to my super pac.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [Carson](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2012 00:39:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I happen to like Ron Paul, and I really think he could help fix the mess we are in. Sadly, everyone seems to ignore Ron. Sometimes I think America might be brain dead.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2012 01:41:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One of the bad things about a democracy is that it is certain that dumb shits will rule. I mean, not to be an elitist, but think about it: People with high aptitude are a minority, and democracy is the rule of the majority. Hence, dumb shits rule. Same thing with communism/socialism.

I know, we're not a democracy, we're a republic. And I think that helps. It's definitely a step in the right direction, but not so far that a single sovereign rules (who might also be a dumb shit, just one with royal blood). But still, I agree with you that it is apparent we're letting the tail wag the dog. Even in a republic, I guess we can't get away from that problem entirely.

I'd just as soon have Barney Frank and Jack Abramoff running against one another as Barack Obama and Mitt Romney. Same shit, different, uhh, well, different nothing. Just the same old shit.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [AudioFred](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2012 11:59:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Carson wrote on Tue, 07 February 2012 18:39 I happen to like Ron Paul...

He's the only one whose message has been consistent through several campaigns.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [Chicken](#) on Thu, 09 Feb 2012 19:08:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I give props to Ron Paul for his consistency and integrity that many other politicians lack, but his ideas scare me.

I'm voting for AudioFred.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [gofar99](#) on Fri, 10 Feb 2012 03:35:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think most of the folks running now scare me. I want to hear how they are going to fix things, not tear each other to shreds. We need some compromises, not lines in the sand. At the rate we are going our elected officials will turn the USA into the largest third rate country in the world.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [AudioFred](#) on Fri, 10 Feb 2012 13:10:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gofar99 wrote on Thu, 09 February 2012 21:35 I think most of the folks running now scare me. I want to hear how they are going to fix things, not tear each other to shreds.

Here's my solution as your presidential candidate: The current crop of candidates on both sides have been focused on all the wrong issues, such as the economy, jobs, foreign wars, healthcare, etc. These issues are inconsequential in comparison to the issues I will emphasize.

My campaign will have only three issues: abortion, contraception and gay marriage. It is absolutely essential to take control of these issues that effect each and every one of us every day of our lives. If the federal government would focus all its legislative and regulatory power on these issues, and fix the problems in the bedroom, eveything else would fall neatly into place.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [steve f](#) on Sun, 19 Feb 2012 16:23:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hell, everyone running for president scares me. I particularly fear Santorum, as what I believe is my own business. Ron Paul wanting to eliminate the Fed would be a disaster. Obama will never be able to accomplish an economic recovery.

The big problem is that all politicians become part of a gentry where the rules we live by simply don't apply to them.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [gofar99](#) on Tue, 21 Feb 2012 14:48:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi, I hate to say this but the republicans are doing a fine job to re-elect the incumbent. Our elected officials are supposed to help us. Now it seems because of various agendas they are so fragmented as to collectively be ineffectual. Very sad situation.

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [AudioFred](#) on Wed, 29 Feb 2012 14:30:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whether you're a conservative or a progressive or somewhere in-between, democrat, independent or republican, you should be smart enough to recognize that the campaign promises of both parties are unrealistic. They are a carefully scripted narrative designed to exploit ideological differences and win votes, not to solve our problems.

Here are the recommendations of an economist who believes, as I do, that our institutions are so fundamentally flawed that they must be redesigned from the ground up:

<http://www.thepurpleplans.org/>

Subject: Re: Presidential Hopefuls
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 29 Feb 2012 16:25:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've been on a kick watching all the history shows I can find, focusing on British and American history. One thing I am struck by is the number of times the same sorts of cycles reappear. What I see today looks very much like what was going on in earlier days.

One that's most fascinating to me is the Adams/Jefferson arguments, the Federalists and the Democratic Republicans around the turn of the century 1800. Adams and the Federalists wanted strong central government, and they were somewhat allied with the English. Jefferson and the Democratic Republicans favored States rights, and less influence from the Federal government. They were more allied with the French.

The "Alien and Sedition Acts" were passed by the Federalist-controlled Congress in 1798, ostensibly to control the activities of foreigners in the United States during a time of impending war. But in truth, these laws were crafted in an effort to quash Jeffersonian Republicanism, by giving a legal means to censor and even imprison them.

A hundred years later - turn of the century 1900 - in the decade or so that followed, Herbert Hoover was the man of the hour. This was the era of John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil and Andrew Carnegie's Steel empire. J.P. Morgan had single handedly acted like the "Fed", saving the economy from collapse. But each of these men were seen as industrialist robber barons, where Herbert Hoover was seen as a humanitarian.

Hoover was very successful in the coal industry, but he was best known for using his resources towards humanitarian efforts, like establishment of the American Relief Administration, feeding 200 million people between 1914 and 1922, and providing disaster relief to hurricane victims in 1928. He was America's most popular man in the 1920's, and both parties wanted him to run for President. He was friends with Franklin Roosevelt back then, and FDR tried to convince Hoover to run for president as a Democrat. But Hoover was a self-made man and felt more aligned with Republican ideals. So he ran as a Republican and won by a landslide.

Ironically, Roosevelt was born into immense wealth and lived pretty much isolated in his family (castle) estate. All his family were Republicans, including his Uncle, a former president, Theodore Roosevelt. So FDR's choice to become a Democrat was made primarily to differentiate himself within his own family. He began embracing liberal ideals, but it was only after the stock market crash that he really found traction, developing his "New Deal" ideas.

After the stock market crash in 1929, Hoover initiated volunteer efforts and public works projects such as the Hoover Dam. He also raised taxes significantly from 25% to 63% in the top tax bracket. These initiatives did not produce economic recovery during his term, but served as the groundwork for various policies laid out in Roosevelt's New Deal. Many people don't realize this.

As the 1932 presidential election campaign started ramping up, Roosevelt distanced himself from his old friend Hoover and began to promote himself as a man that sided with the "little guy". I think he was charismatic and interesting, and I like him, especially impressed with his perseverance after getting polio in his middle age. But I do think his positions were somewhat opportunistic, and don't like the way he turned on Herbert Hoover when fate intervened and caused Hoover to become unpopular.

This sounds all too familiar. I see both sides saying "it's the economy, stupid", when really neither side has any answers. They both want to take credit when things get better and both want to blame the other when things get worse. It's hubris in the extreme, since neither side is more responsible or correct than the other.
