

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 02:12:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

[http://www.zombietime.com/sf\\_rally\\_november\\_3\\_2004/](http://www.zombietime.com/sf_rally_november_3_2004/)

Yet they wonder why we didn't vote for them. More self-destructing Marxists and anarchists, please!

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 02:18:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Good one, ACK, you found a site that hosts about 6 pictures of actual questionable demonstration signs mixed in with a bunch of filler.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Panther](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 02:25:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Your crude generalizations don't really impress anyone, AcK.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 02:29:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You're both idiots, I'll explain why.

SuperFlyingFungus: I count at least 13 images ranging from "oil pimp," inferring that the war was for oil, to "Bush = Hitler" and "Fuck middle America." That is not six, that's at least 13. In addition to burning a President Bush effigy, attempting to start a riot, and attacking police officers. You are an idiot, please try again.

Panther: This wasn't made to impress anyone, it was meant to show exactly what was shown. I put "left" in quotation marks to signal that I wasn't sure that these people even constituted the actual left section of society. They're beyond left, they're simply retarded and cannot think for themselves using the facts that are readily available. You are also an idiot, please try again... And since both of you are too stupid to write out the proper acronym for my name, I'll say it again. My name is not ack. It never has been ack, and never will be ack.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 02:32:09 GMT

---

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

---

ACKSuperFlyingEngi: I count at least 13 images ranging from "oil pimp," inferring that the war was for oil, to "Bush = Hitler" and "Fuck middle America." That is not six, that's at least 13. In addition to burning a President Bush effigy, attempting to start a riot, and attacking police officers. You are an idiot, please try again.

Okay, 13. You win. 13 questionable signs. Out of what, thousands? And this cameraman was obviously hunting for the most controversial signs he could find.

And the site itself states that the group that started a riot and attacked the cops hated liberals just as much as Bush. The "black bloq" or something.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 02:44:33 GMT

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

---

Isn't that the point to find the most controversial thing possible and focus only on that? I mean it's only what you've done for the past year.

Quote:I fell in with the "Black Bloq," a group of anarcho-fascists whose only goal is to commit violence and incite chaos. I marched with them for hours as they chanted, "Tonight, We're gonna, Fuck! Shit! Up!" and "Hey hey, Ho ho, this civilization's got to go!" and "Shoot Bush, not dope!" and "No Bush, No Kerry, Revolution's necessary."

Bzzt, wrong. They're anarchists, which falls on the liberal side of the fence.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 02:47:40 GMT

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

---

You can't be conservative and want revolution... lol...

Also if he went around looking for the most non controversial signs what good would that do?

To prove my point I'm going to show evidence that detracts from my aim.  
I R TEH SMRT.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 03:14:05 GMT

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

---

AircraftkillerIsn't that the point to find the most controversial thing possible and focus only on that? I mean it's only what you've done for the past year.

Quote:I fell in with the "Black Bloq," a group of anarcho-fascists whose only goal is to commit violence and incite chaos. I marched with them for hours as they chanted, "Tonight, We're gonna, Fuck! Shit! Up!" and "Hey hey, Ho ho, this civilization's got to go!" and "Shoot Bush, not dope!" and "No Bush, No Kerry, Revolution's necessary."

Bzzt, wrong. They're anarchists, which falls on the liberal side of the fence.

Goldilocks, they're a group of crazed revolutionaries whose only relationship with anything Democrat is in the broadest definition of the word "liberal," namely, change.

And what's the point of this site? 13 people made rude signs? So what?

ZombieTime]The Black Bloq folks hate San Francisco's touchy-feely leftists as much as they hate George Bush.

They're probably on the Democratic payroll.

And do us all a favor and go see a barber.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 03:16:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So what if they make signs when those 13 signs are echoed across the nation in illogical protests that accomplish nothing but whining? I don't know, ask them why it's such a big deal that they have to drive away people who might otherwise support them.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 03:21:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You mean those 13 signs are prostrated by people like you who find the logical route of attack against an entire core of beliefs the personal thoughts of 13 different people? It's not like any of them are in positions of any political importance. They don't represent anyone else.

You want an actual riot? Look at the 2000 protest in front of the DNC. Rage Against the Machine really got the bloodlust into those conservative eyes. So much so the police had to come in and rubber bullet everyone. Rent Live at the Grand Olympic Auditorium sometime and see for yourself. It's one of the special features.

The concert itself is quite good, as well.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 03:23:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm sure that person's extremely patriotic, eh? "IN ORDER TO SUPPORT OUR COUNTRY, LET'S ABANDON IT!" I love it how liberals say that they're patriotic and love their country, but yet no sooner than they say that, they're ready to pack their bags and get the fuck out. If you love your country, you stick with it tthrough thick and thin. Take the good with the bad. This goes to conservatives too. They'd act the same exact way, and it's just fucking pathetic. I love my country, but now I want to leave! Yes, sir, I'm proud to be a fellow American with you!

Now, I suppose you're going to quote Thomas Jefferson again, eh, Tool?

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 03:24:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

AircraftkillerYou're both idiots, I'll explain why.

SuperFlyingFungus: I count at least 13 images ranging from "oil pimp," inferring that the war was for oil, to "Bush = Hitler" and "Fuck middle America." That is not six, that's at least 13. In addition to burning a President Bush effigy, attempting to start a riot, and attacking police officers.  
14. You missed this one

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 03:27:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i sortof agree with Engi on this one. They are extremist, but they are liberal. They are the most extreme type methinks. Kindof like the KKK to Christianity or Taliban to Islam

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 03:29:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

j\_ball430I'm sure that person's extremely patriotic, eh? "IN ORDER TO SUPPORT OUR COUNTRY, LET'S ABANDON IT!" I love it how liberals say that they're patriotic and love their country, but yet no sooner than they say that, they're ready to pack their bags and get the fuck out. If you love your country, you stick with it tthrough thick and thin. Take the good with the bad. This goes to conservatives too. They'd act the same exact way, and it's just fucking pathetic. I love my country, but now I want to leave! Yes, sir, I'm proud to be a fellow American with you!

You're contrasting the words of few with the thoughts of many. But then again, that's all you can do.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 03:33:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm sure it's just that ONE person and a few other radicals that want to abandon the nation, right? There's no way that the news could be telling the truth about the thousands of others wanting to get the fuck out. Yeah, I'm sure it's just a coincidence that people are actually wanting to secede.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 03:34:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I guess it's suddenly cool to live in the past then? Protesting things that are over already...

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 03:43:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

AAAAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!! Doitle is my favorite kid on these forums ROFL!!!!!! Always has some sort of satire. Its like Simpsons for the forums.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 04:15:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If most "liberals" wanted to leave, they would have been in Canada by now. Aircraftkiller, thanks for showing us Anarchist protesters and labeling them as "liberals," you really added something substantial here. :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 04:20:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SEALIf most "liberals" wanted to leave, they would have been in Canada by now. Aircraftkiller,

---

thanks for showing us Anarchist protesters and labeling them as "liberals," you really added something substantial here. :rolleyes:

Did you not see me mentioning Conservatives as well? Of course not, then you wouldn't have an argument. Also, I never said most. Though, I did say "liberals", that's a mistake on my part.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 04:21:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

They aren't all anarchists. Try viewing the images?

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 06:48:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yea they aren't all anarchists. It began as a peaceful protest, and then the american Nazi party decided to show up.

I'm going to keep an eye on Bush's inauguration. My sister thinks there are going to be big protests.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 11:55:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

and protests interest you? Its just a bunch of people in denial. If you witness the inaguration, make it a historical reason, not an entertainment one.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 23:07:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I should really give you a slapping just for saying that, moron.

All of the protests supporting th Civil Rights movement were "just a bunch of people in denial."

May I ask when the last time you saw protests at an inauguration was? I want to see if there are going to be any protests even. I want to observe whats going on. According to the forefathers, a good American citizen will try to educate themselves about politics and national affairs. Does that sound like entertainment?

Shove your assumptions that I want to watch the inauguration for entertainment purposes up your

ass, where they belong and where they came from.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [rm5248](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2005 23:49:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh god... not another pointless flaming political topic...

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 00:14:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh no, not rm5248 spamming threads he doesn't want to participate in! :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Spoony\\_old](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 02:38:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Page two

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 02:47:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Once again, the Iraq war was for gain, not to liberate the people. What about poor Africa, where they don't need us to make wars, just the \$\$\$?

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 03:33:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Shut up. Only desperate people still pull that. We did not go into Iraq for gain. We DID go there to liberate the people and to fight terrorism. Just use some common sense for once.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 03:38:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I am. Wars are made for GAIN.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 03:48:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Fine, if you want to play technicality. What we're "gaining" is another democratic nation in the world by liberating the nation and setting up a democracy.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 03:49:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Or, another military base giving America an advantage. Either way, eh?

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 03:52:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yeah, we just wanted to go through all this trouble for a base that WOULD be a good grab, but not crucial. :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 03:53:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That would give Americans and their allies a fair first strike into any country there fairly fast.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 04:13:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Bush is not stupid enough to jeopardize relations with other countries for a fucking military base. He would not have attacked Iraq if he had not thought he had a good reason to. Whether or not you agree with the war, it's plain as day that he isn't in Iraq for a fucking military base. Just more mindless liberal propaganda.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 04:51:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Attacking Iraq for a military base is very much overkill seeing as how they had no trouble mobilizing around Iraq. Some countries were willing to help, and they already have a base in

---



Israel. Spending upwards of \$150 Billion simply to establish a military base, expand influence over the middle-east and to "liberate" a nation is absurd.

[Heres where the controversy begins]

But seeing how that money is largely being spent on American Corporations, some of it goes back into the pockets of... you guessed it.

Glyde is right saying that war is made for gain.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 05:00:56 GMT

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

---

omg that is sooo dumb. Its as ill conceived as the "blood for oil" notion that is as false as just about anything else the anti-war effort has tried to force feed the public through the media. Im sure Bush was thinking about about Corporate America when he declared war on Iraq :rolleyes: . We do 'GAIN' something, but its entitled to us. The only thing we 'GAIN' is safety by stopping what might have been in the future and Iraqis gain their freedom from the rule of Sadaam.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 05:44:55 GMT

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

---

You are right. His number 1 priority was morality and to do something good for the world as an American President. I feel so much safer in this country. Now that I know that 9/11 and Saddam Hussein were directly linked and that he had weapons of mass destruction I feel much safer. Now that Hussein is no longer in power, we can all hold hands and sing peaceful songs.

Does it not seem at all possible to Bush supporters that, even if you do not consider it fact, it is entirely possible and plausible? Does it not seem odd that the connection between 9/11 and Hussein was never established and that the reason for attacking Iraq changed like 3 times? (Combat terrorism->WMD's->Liberate Iraq)

This is your \$150 Billion. Do you want it to go to corporations? Or would you prefer to have it help the education system, Hospital, medical systems and to help combat poverty?

Oh and if you want to know, my father was sacked from his job in 2001 when California's education budget was cut by \$20 Billion and there were many job cuts. There was a huge job-freeze from 2001 - 2003 and the situation isn't much better. Now I wonder where that money went. Or rather who is wiping their ass with \$100 bills.

Also my old school used to receive \$30,000 grants every 6 months from the State to spend on Science. Well that program took the axe in 2001.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 06:40:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://www.husseinandterror.com/>

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 07:03:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

AirCraFtKiller just put you all to shame with that one little website. That website couldnt explain it better. It answers all Three:

Quote:Combat terrorism->WMD's->Liberate Iraq

and FYI, the objectives never changed, they were just added on . They are still looking for WMDs im sure.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 07:33:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

No they are not. They have officially announced that. It took them a while though. Tony Blair admitted this about last july in an official report.

Let me just bring something to your attention.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A47812-2004Jun16.html>

I'll just emphasize the first paragraph.

Quote:

The Sept. 11 commission reported yesterday that it has found no "collaborative relationship" between Iraq and al Qaeda, challenging one of the Bush administration's main justifications for the war in Iraq.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/3118262.stm>

Quote:

We have no evidence that Saddam Hussein was involved with the 11 September attacks  
President Bush  
(Take a look at the little beige box at the beginning)

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/3119676.stm>

Well, if Bush's administration states this, then am I to believe the biased article?

Sure, Hussein has funded terrorism before, but he did not play a part in 9/11. I'm sure he loved to watch it, but he didn't play a part in it. Especially not fund it seeing as how loaded Osama is.

That link did not put anyone to shame.

Theres tons more info about the absence of the Hussein 9/11 link. Google it or use Yahoo or Reuters.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 10:06:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I've never seen anything, anywhere, that shows the President and his administration said Saddam had any ties to 11 September, 2001.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 13:48:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

AirCraftKiller! I've never seen anything, anywhere, that shows the President and his administration said Saddam had any ties to 11 September, 2001.

USA Today Bush, speaking to troops in Tampa yesterday, did not mention an Iraq-al Qaeda link, saying only that Iraq "sheltered terrorist groups."

Exactly, Bush never said anything about merely only going after Al Qaeda. Thats what all you people seem to forget. After the Attack on 9/11, he said he would hunt down terrorists and the countries who Harbor them. No one seemed to be against him then. But now you all accuse him of taking an unnessesary war with Iraq and saying that all these reasons like 'GAIN' are the only reason for him being in this war. Well the website AirCraftKiller posted clearly states how Iraq had ties with terrorism.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 14:07:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Aircraftkiller! I've never seen anything, anywhere, that shows the President and his administration said Saddam had any ties to 11 September, 2001.

Well, in an odd bit of hypocrisy, watch George Bush the day al Qaeda ties are flatly ruled out [A month or two ago] George Bush says Iraq had no connections to al Qaeda, and then about 5 minutes later says there was a connection. It would be funny if he weren't our "President."

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 16:13:36 GMT

---

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

---

One of Saddam's reigning members was, and still is, a part of Al Qaeda. That Zarqawi guy, however you spell his name.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 22:13:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh man that EVIL EVIL money going to corporations...

So they can pay their workers, and create jobs, and donate to the communities they serve...

SHAME ON THEM! Shame on everyone who works for large corporations!

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 22:22:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Haven't you learned by now, Crimson, that all rich people are evil and arrived at their position in life solely by exploiting the "working-class" man?

Don't you know that all that rich people do is think of how else they can screw over poor people for more of their money?

That's why I'm in support for much higher taxes on the evil rich and no taxes on the working-class! That'll show those evil, rich, capitalist bastards!

FROM EACH ACCORDING TO HIS ABILITY; TO EACH ACCORDING TO HIS NEED!!!  
WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!!

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 23:46:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You both just missed the point COMPLETELY. I did not say anything about working class people, or people who work for large corporations. I did not generalize either.

The point is that the war was instigated by Bush/Cheney. Why? Well the cost of the war would go straight back to those corporations. Do you think the "poor middle class workers" are going to get ANY of that money other than what they are already getting paid? Its going to the high-up people, the chairmen, CEO's Executives, Directors. Strangely enough almost all of Bush's cabinet members and advisors have ties to major corporations. Including Lockheed Martin, Haliburton, BP (British Petroleum, AKA "Arco"), Exxon, GM (General Motors), and Chevron. (There are more of course).

Now how much of this \$150 Billion are workers ever going to see? Nothing out of their ordinary wages.

Quote:

So they can pay their workers, and create jobs, and donate to the communities they serve...

1. Of course they need to pay their workers, but those workers would have been paid regardless if there was a war or not. The corporations those workers were employed by weren't nearing bankruptcy.

2. Well if budgets are being cut from elsewhere, and people are getting laid off? Take a look at this.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states"

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 20 Jan 2005 23:53:28 GMT

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

---

Some of those workers may have lost their jobs due to the lack of money to the corporations. Ever think of that? No one is guaranteed a paycheck if their job is on the line. And extra taxation is not going to have a positive effect. The corporation won't take a huge hit like that to their income, they will take it out on the working class.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states"

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 21 Jan 2005 02:01:22 GMT

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

---

You are a FOOL, a FOOL I tell ya! If a corporation doesn't have MONEY, then they CAN'T PAY THEIR WORKERS! You think anyone can just form a corporation, hire 20,000 people, and they all sit on their asses and do nothing and just collect big dollars from the government? Do you know NOTHING about economics? Or do you know only "BIG CORPORATION BAD! ME WANT DINNER!"

I work for a large corporation myself. A corporation so large that it once had a larger market cap than Microsoft a few years ago. My paycheck is directly derived from the success of my work. People higher up make money based on their decisions and the ability to manage effectively. A company grows by successfully filling a need and being paid to fulfill that need by other companies or end consumers. When people do their job well, the company makes more money which means they can do more things, expand their market, fulfill needs for more people, research new and innovative ideas... did I say HIRE MORE PEOPLE? When a company does a bad job, when they are not fulfilling a need, the company shrinks, jobs are lost. How many people do you think Haliburton hired to do the work over in Iraq? Do you think they just stopped fulfilling their other obligations with the rest of their customers and sent the existing employees over there? C'mon... think about it, ok?

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states"

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Fri, 21 Jan 2005 02:09:57 GMT

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

---

DoitleYou can't be conservative and want revolution... lol...

Oh, you think?

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [Spoony\\_old](#) on Fri, 21 Jan 2005 04:37:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Page three.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Fri, 21 Jan 2005 04:54:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:

If a corporation doesn't have MONEY, then they CAN'T PAY THEIR WORKERS!

NO SHIT!!! Well this was VERY unexpected!  
Thank you for confirming this for me.

I'm not a fucking idiot for christs sake.

Education budget cuts in CA -> School disctricts cannot pay SBC Corp. -> Job Cut.

Quote:

"BIG CORPORATION BAD! ME WANT DINNER!"

And don't try and make me look like I'm just here to hound big corporations just for the hell of it.

Let me break this down (even further so nobody can misinterpret it)

Imagine if you have \$1000 of someone else's money, and you are allowed to spend it wherever you like. At the same time, you also own shop. Where is that money going to be spent?

This is all that happened in the last years. Wether you agree if it was intentional or not, that is ultimately what happened.

Shit, I don't want to continue talking about this. This is my last post on this thread.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states&quo  
Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Fri, 21 Jan 2005 06:50:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Someone remind me what the topic is, I think we've lost track.

---

---

Subject: What the "left" thinks of the "red states"

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 21 Jan 2005 11:58:08 GMT

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

---

Answer: I would invest in upgrades to the shop or advertisement to bring in more customers.

---