
Subject: Election '08

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Sun, 06 Jan 2008 04:36:35 GMT

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

I was kinda surprised that no one had posted a thread on this. So the question is...who are you leaning toward this year? Democrat..Republican..3rd Party?

Personally I am going for Ron Paul..his economic policies on our monetary system and national debt drew my attention to him and set him apart from the other candidates.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sun, 06 Jan 2008 04:50:23 GMT

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

obama for dem or mccaine for rep

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Sun, 06 Jan 2008 05:13:57 GMT

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

If I lived in the US, I'd vote for Obama. I'd like to see him win, but I don't think that all the rednecks in the south will be too happy with a black guy running for president. It'd be cool if he won though. Anyone's better than Rudy Giuliani. Even Hillary. *shudder*

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Sun, 06 Jan 2008 05:28:07 GMT

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

If I was American, Ron Paul myself, He's been in politics since the 80's, And I'm sure he's seen it all.

He promises to do good thing and as you said, sets him apart from all the others.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sun, 06 Jan 2008 06:51:05 GMT

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

Because I'm Canadian, I support McCain. I've even donated money to his campaign, and I can't even vote for the guy.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Sun, 06 Jan 2008 10:57:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because I'm Australian, I really don't care.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sun, 06 Jan 2008 17:19:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

most of the people who've posted in here aren't even americans
shows how much we care i guess

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Sun, 06 Jan 2008 17:50:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

obama cuz pirate

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sun, 06 Jan 2008 22:57:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

obama got shot 9 times in jamaica queens n survived

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Sn1per74*](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 04:09:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

McCain or Ron Paul. I'm a huge conservative republican and Giuliani is too much of a democrat for me. I hope to God that Hillary doesn't win. I would much rather have Obama over Hillary.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Chimp](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 04:11:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sn1per74* wrote on Sun, 06 January 2008 23:09McCain or Ron Paul. I'm a huge conservative republican and Giuliani is too much of a democrat for me. I hope to God that Hillary doesn't win. I would much rather have Obama over Hillary.

If Hilary or Obama wins, I'm moving to Canada. I am not fucking kidding. That would mean

everything this country stands for would be a complete shit-in-the-basket.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Sn1per74*](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 04:15:28 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Sun, 06 January 2008 22:11Sn1per74* wrote on Sun, 06 January 2008 23:09McCain or Ron Paul. I'm a huge conservative republican and Giuliani is too much of a democrat for me. I hope to God that Hillary doesn't win. I would much rather have Obama over Hillary.

If Hilary or Obama wins, I'm moving to Canada. I am not fucking kidding. That would mean everything this country stands for would be a complete shit-in-the-basket.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 04:22:00 GMT

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

Sn1per74* wrote on Sun, 06 January 2008 22:15MWright967 wrote on Sun, 06 January 2008 22:11Sn1per74* wrote on Sun, 06 January 2008 23:09McCain or Ron Paul. I'm a huge conservative republican and Giuliani is too much of a democrat for me. I hope to God that Hillary doesn't win. I would much rather have Obama over Hillary.

If Hilary or Obama wins, I'm moving to Canada. I am not fucking kidding. That would mean everything this country stands for would be a complete shit-in-the-basket.

And I'm BLACK. When a Black man doesn't want a Black guy as president, you should realize that something is wrong immedietly.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 13:45:10 GMT

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

Would you care to elaborate on what you do not like about Obamas' political views? His "blackness" should have nothing to do with it.

I consider myself Republican, but honestly I wouldn't hate it if Obama came out on top, at least I haven't heard anything that he has said that sounded bad, unlike the garbage that Hillary spews.

I'm very undecided at this point, I don't really care for Giuliani much...if I had to choose now it would be a coin toss between McCain and Thompson.

I guess I should spend some time at
<http://projects.washingtonpost.com/2008-presidential-candidates/>

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 20:09:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Clinton.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 21:33:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Without any questions in my mind, my vote is for Ron Paul. He's been my candidate since April, and I've been given no reason whatsoever to stop my support of him. If he doesn't win the Republican's nomination, my vote will either be given to the Libertarian Party candidate, as long as Hillary or Giuliani or Romney are not their respective party's candidates. If it's Hillary against Rudy or Mitt, I'm moving to Canada or starting a revolution (and I don't think I'd have any problems finding supporters of that). I will gladly choose Barack over Rudy or Mitt any day of the week, and I'm a conservative libertarian.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Chimp](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 21:41:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 15:33 Without any questions in my mind, my vote is for Ron Paul. He's been my candidate since April, and I've been given no reason whatsoever to stop my support of him. If he doesn't win the Republican's nomination, my vote will either be given to the Libertarian Party candidate, as long as Hillary or Giuliani or Romney are not their respective party's candidates. If it's Hillary against Rudy or Mitt, I'm moving to Canada or starting a revolution (and I don't think I'd have any problems finding supporters of that). I will gladly choose Barack over Rudy or Mitt any day of the week, and I'm a conservative libertarian.

Damn it, you stole my idea you poopy face. I was the one who was gonna go to Canada if these ass holes soiled our great America

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 22:52:14 GMT

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

There's enough Canada for everyone.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 00:18:49 GMT

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

Canadacd wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 16:52 There's enough Canada for everyone.

I disagree.

(shhhhhhhhhhh)

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 00:49:54 GMT

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

MWright968 wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 18:18 Canadacd wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 16:52 There's enough Canada for everyone.

I disagree.

(shhhhhhhhhhh)

This is off topic, but Troop...Why the hell did you name yourself MWright968?....I'm not upset...Its just....Disturbing...Your not pretending to be me or anything, you just made an account with one different number...I...Just...Don't.....Understand.....

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 00:51:10 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Sun, 06 January 2008 22:22 Sn1per74* wrote on Sun, 06 January 2008 22:15 MWright967 wrote on Sun, 06 January 2008 22:11 Sn1per74* wrote on Sun, 06 January 2008 23:09 McCain or Ron Paul. I'm a huge conservative republican and Giuliani is too much of a democrat for me. I hope to God that Hillary doesn't win. I would much rather have Obama over Hillary.

If Hilary or Obama wins, I'm moving to Canada. I am not fucking kidding. That would mean

everything this country stands for would be a complete shit-in-the-basket.

And I'm BLACK. When a Black man doesn't want a Black guy as president, you should realize that something is wrong immedietly.

QTF

What sucks is that I'm going to be 17 this year, so I have to wait another 4 years to vote. Damn it.

Ron Paul is too much of a fanatic for me, I would have to say Fred Thompson, or Mitt Romney.

The problem is that both of them have personal baggage. Mitt is a Mormon (though that shouldn't matter, it seems to in this country) and Fred hasn't really done anything. McCain is a republican only with the war. Other than that, he is a democrat. Hillary ran the country in the 90s, I don't want to see her run it again.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 01:32:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

because I found you sexually attractive.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Chimp](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 01:46:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MWright968 wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:32because I found you sexually attractive.

Well, I AM bisexual, so lets hook up some time.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 02:17:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MWright967 wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:46MWright968 wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:32because I found you sexually attractive.

Well, I AM bisexual, so lets hook up some time.

.....
.....
.....

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 02:31:14 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:51

Ron Paul is too much of a fanatic for me, I would have to say Fred Thompson, or Mitt Romey. Constitutionalism is NOT fanaticism. They seem like radical ideals, but they're simple ideas of small government that everybody is afraid of for no real good reason. People are so used to big government, it scares them to imagine a world without such interference. It's like taking a blanket away from a small child. The child doesn't need the blanket, but it doesn't know anything else. The fact is, the child ends up being better off without it because now it doesn't have a disease-infested strip of fabric attached to its hand, it no longer slows the child down when playing, and the child learns to rely on himself to be confident rather than the blanket. The same goes for government, it's nothing but a disease-infested organization that doesn't really have a place playing a major part in one's every day life. Getting rid of it would certainly help the economy, and it would force Americans to rely on themselves (as they did for 150 years before the 1930s) instead of government.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 02:51:07 GMT

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

I've read that Ron Paul's policies may have been overly hyped up and amplified by the younger people around him. I'm against the idea of an isolationist United States, because that will literally give military, and economic enemies a free ticket to mess up the world even more, and with costly consequences.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 03:12:30 GMT

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

People need to learn that Ron Paul is NOT an Isolationist and DOES NOT promote Isolationism. Ron Paul is a non-Interventionist. He still wants America to be a part of the world economy and be friendly to all nations. He just doesn't want to intervene like we have in the Middle East over the past 30 years and longer.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 03:15:18 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:12 People need to learn that Ron Paul is NOT an Isolationist and DOES NOT promote Isolationism. Ron Paul is a non-Interventionist. He still wants America to be a part of the world economy and be friendly to all nations. He just doesn't want to intervene like we have in the Middle East over the past 30 years and longer.

Good luck with that. That's me telling people that Hillary isn't a Communist and doesn't have sand in her vagina. Even though it's true, Americans believe what the TV tells them.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 12:47:03 GMT

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

I haven't been paying attention enough at the moment. To much going on for me. I'm going to have to try to catch some of the upcoming debates to make a decision. So far, Romney has appealed to me, but to be honest - It's still very much up in the air for who gets my vote. I know this much - voting for Hillary is an impossibility for me

As for Ron Paul - I have no idea what he stands for. I'd go to his website to find out, but I'm really strapped for time at the moment with college starting up. In fact, I'm writing this post with only 5 minutes left before I leave for class. Has he been invited to debates with other candidates? Also, when are the next televised debates, does anyone know?

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Sn1per74*](#) on Wed, 09 Jan 2008 03:31:28 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 21:15cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:12People need to learn that Ron Paul is NOT an Isolationist and DOES NOT promote Isolationism. Ron Paul is a non-Interventionist. He still wants America to be a part of the world economy and be friendly to all nations. He just doesn't want to intervene like we have in the Middle East over the past 30 years and longer.

Good luck with that. That's me telling people that Hillary isn't a Communist and doesn't have sand in her vagina. Even though it's true, Americans believe what the TV tells them.
AHAHAHA. Quote of the year!

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 09 Jan 2008 03:33:19 GMT

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

Jecht wrote on Tue, 08 January 2008 06:47I haven't been paying attention enough at the moment. To much going on for me. I'm going to have to try to catch some of the upcoming debates to make a decision. So far, Romney has appealed to me, but to be honest - It's still very much up in the air for who gets my vote. I know this much - voting for Hillary is an impossibility for me

As for Ron Paul - I have no idea what he stands for. I'd go to his website to find out, but I'm really strapped for time at the moment with college starting up. In fact, I'm writing this post with only 5 minutes left before I leave for class. Has he been invited to debates with other candidates? Also,

when are the next televised debates, does anyone know?
Ron Paul would probably end up being assassinated if he looked like winning tbh

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 09 Jan 2008 10:20:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've watched the August 5 debate in Iowa on youtube, and Ron Paul seems to be a liberal in Red clothing. He supports pulling the troops out...right now. That would do more harm than good at this point. Whether you're for, or against the war, that much has to be certain. I still have no idea who I'm voting for, but Huckabee, Thompson, Hunter, Guiliani, and Romney are probably who I'm deciding between on the Republican side. I still have to find time to look at the debates for the Dems.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Viking](#) on Wed, 09 Jan 2008 10:50:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am voteing for obama just because I know he will eventually get shot and it will result in epic lulz.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 09 Jan 2008 12:03:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jecht wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 05:20I've watched the August 5 debate in Iowa on youtube, and Ron Paul seems to be a liberal in Red clothing. He supports pulling the troops out...right now. That would do more harm than good at this point. Whether you're for, or against the war, that much has to be certain. I still have no idea who I'm voting for, but Huckabee, Thompson, Hunter, Guiliani, and Romney are probably who I'm deciding between on the Republican side. I still have to find time to look at the debates for the Dems.
He's a L-I-B-E-R-T-A-R-I-A-N. There's nothing Democrat about him. In fact, he's a paleolibertarian, so he's somewhat of a conservative libertarian.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 09 Jan 2008 13:15:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

there is an argument that of all the Republican candidates, Ron Paul is the only true conservative.

calling him 'liberal' is not really true, although some of his policies certainly appeal to the liberal populace... and what's really funny is when die-hard republicans say that as if it were a bad thing.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Wed, 09 Jan 2008 20:25:54 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 06:03 Jecht wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 05:20 I've watched the August 5 debate in Iowa on youtube, and Ron Paul seems to be a liberal in Red clothing. He supports pulling the troops out...right now. That would do more harm than good at this point. Whether you're for, or against the war, that much has to be certain. I still have no idea who I'm voting for, but Huckabee, Thompson, Hunter, Guiliani, and Romney are probably who I'm deciding between on the Republican side. I still have to find time to look at the debates for the Dems.

He's a L-I-B-E-R-T-A-R-I-A-N. There's nothing Democrat about him. In fact, he's a paleolibertarian, so he's somewhat of a conservative libertarian.

I actually call him a paleoconservative but I think in hindsight that would be wrong, I should call him a constitutionalist. He is the most conservative of the Republicans...I mean what isn't conservative about not meddling in other people's countries? People who call him liberal really need to check him out, his views on the government's role sound nothing like the mainstream liberals of today.

I think Ron Paul is hurt by several factors not under his control(I won't go into his personal faults):
1. His supporters..while most of them are good small government supporters some are bat shit crazy with conspiracy theories. Every time I go on ronpaulforums.com I see several 9/11 conspiracy nuts who are probably the same guys who go to opponent's rallies(which are covered more by the media) and scream 9/11 truth over and over again. This doesn't help Ron Paul at all with the general populace...I mean the guy doesn't support any of the trash they are saying.
And 2: The smear job of the mainstream media...FoxNews especially. Its amazing how many times several of their conservative commentators say he thinks that the US is responsible for 9/11..it kinda makes me sick. Dismissing someone by saying they are a fanatic is ignorant, read into his positions, see what he stands for, and most importantly see what his record says!...you might just be surprised.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 01:08:28 GMT

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

Sn1per74* wrote on Tue, 08 January 2008 19:31 Dover wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 21:15 cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:12 People need to learn that Ron Paul is NOT an Isolationist and DOES NOT promote Isolationism. Ron Paul is a non-Interventionist. He still wants America to be a part of the world economy and be friendly to all nations. He just doesn't want to intervene like we have in the Middle East over the past 30 years and longer.

Good luck with that. That's me telling people that Hillary isn't a Communist and doesn't have sand in her vagina. Even though it's true, Americans believe what the TV tells them.
AHAHAHA. Quote of the year!

I'm not sure if you understood me. I actually support Clinton.
Speaking of whom, she won the Primaries, along with McCain. Things are going my way it seems.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Sn1per74*](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 01:13:58 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 19:08Sn1per74* wrote on Tue, 08 January 2008 19:31Dover wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 21:15cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:12People need to learn that Ron Paul is NOT an Isolationist and DOES NOT promote Isolationism. Ron Paul is a non-Interventionist. He still wants America to be a part of the world economy and be friendly to all nations. He just doesn't want to intervene like we have in the Middle East over the past 30 years and longer.

Good luck with that. That's me telling people that Hillary isn't a Communist and doesn't have sand in her vagina. Even though it's true, Americans believe what the TV tells them.
AHAHAHA. Quote of the year!

I'm not sure if you understood me. I actually support Clinton.
Speaking of whom, she won the Primaries, along with McCain. Things are going my way it seems.
O.

Even so it made me laugh.

PS: Hillary is loco. Nation wide health care is what communism does.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 01:14:06 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 06:03

He's a L-I-B-E-R-T-A-R-I-A-N. There's nothing Democrat about him. In fact, he's a paleolibertarian, so he's somewhat of a conservative libertarian.

Are you sure he's just not an anti-dis-neo-liberal? Honestly, labels don't matter. His views from that debate conflicted heavily with mine. That's all I need to know.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 01:15:39 GMT

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

Sn1per74* wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:13Dover wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 19:08Sn1per74* wrote on Tue, 08 January 2008 19:31Dover wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 21:15cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:12People need to learn that Ron Paul is NOT an Isolationist and DOES NOT promote Isolationism. Ron Paul is a non-Interventionist. He

still wants America to be a part of the world economy and be friendly to all nations. He just doesn't want to intervene like we have in the Middle East over the past 30 years and longer.

Good luck with that. That's me telling people that Hillary isn't a Communist and doesn't have sand in her vagina. Even though it's true, Americans believe what the TV tells them.
AHAHAHA. Quote of the year!

I'm not sure if you understood me. I actually support Clinton.
Speaking of whom, she won the Primaries, along with McCain. Things are going my way it seems.
O.
Even so it made me laugh.
PS: Hillary is loco. Nation wide health care is what communism does.

Okay. I see nothing wrong with that.
You Americans have this silly misconception that Communism = BAD!!!!1!!1one11SHIFT11!!!

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 01:32:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 20:15Sn1per74* wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:13Dover wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 19:08Sn1per74* wrote on Tue, 08 January 2008 19:31Dover wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 21:15cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:12People need to learn that Ron Paul is NOT an Isolationist and DOES NOT promote Isolationism. Ron Paul is a non-Interventionist. He still wants America to be a part of the world economy and be friendly to all nations. He just doesn't want to intervene like we have in the Middle East over the past 30 years and longer.

Good luck with that. That's me telling people that Hillary isn't a Communist and doesn't have sand in her vagina. Even though it's true, Americans believe what the TV tells them.
AHAHAHA. Quote of the year!

I'm not sure if you understood me. I actually support Clinton.
Speaking of whom, she won the Primaries, along with McCain. Things are going my way it seems.
O.
Even so it made me laugh.
PS: Hillary is loco. Nation wide health care is what communism does.

Okay. I see nothing wrong with that.
You Americans have this silly misconception that Communism = BAD!!!!1!!1one11SHIFT11!!!

Well considering that communist regimes have historically been the most brutal in regards to human rights violations...I find that assumption not too far off the mark.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 01:34:53 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 20:15Sn1per74* wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:13Dover wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 19:08Sn1per74* wrote on Tue, 08 January 2008 19:31Dover wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 21:15cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:12People need to learn that Ron Paul is NOT an Isolationist and DOES NOT promote Isolationism. Ron Paul is a non-Interventionist. He still wants America to be a part of the world economy and be friendly to all nations. He just doesn't want to intervene like we have in the Middle East over the past 30 years and longer.

Good luck with that. That's me telling people that Hillary isn't a Communist and doesn't have sand in her vagina. Even though it's true, Americans believe what the TV tells them. AHAHAHA. Quote of the year!

I'm not sure if you understood me. I actually support Clinton. Speaking of whom, she won the Primaries, along with McCain. Things are going my way it seems. O. Even so it made me laugh. PS: Hillary is loco. Nation wide health care is what communism does.

Okay. I see nothing wrong with that. You Americans have this silly misconception that Communism = BAD!!!!1!!1one11SHIFT11!!1! Marxism doesn't work in large populations. You know, such as America that has 300 million people.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 01:40:15 GMT

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

GoArmy44 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:32Well considering that communist regimes have historically been the most brutal in regards to human rights violations...I find that assumption not too far off the mark.

<http://www.anu.edu.au/polsci/marx/classics/manifesto.html>

Read it, and when you find something about violating human rights, get back to me.

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:34

Marxism doesn't work in large populations. You know, such as America that has 300 million people.

Why?

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 01:49:07 GMT

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

Well, it's hard for a government to have that much control over that large of a populace. Crime would increase because people are greedy, and nothing is going to stop them from trying to get what they want. There's no incentive for people to be as productive as they could be in the government doesn't allow for competition between businesses. There's no real improvement in technology because there's no incentive to, either. Why produce something improved if there's no competition? There's little incentive to invent new technologies if you can't take advantage of supply and demand.

Plus, if it's to all be about the "common good", then there's a problem with not respecting individual liberties. The populace is made up of individuals, and in order to get people to respect each other is to respect the individual. Nobody is going to want to improve their communities if they're not respected. I wouldn't feel I owe the community anything if I'm now allowed to be myself.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 01:54:34 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:49 Well, it's hard for a government to have that much control over that large of a populace.

The idea isn't the control people. The idea is to control the economy.

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:49 Crime would increase because people are greedy, and nothing is going to stop them from trying to get what they want.

I refuse to believe this. If people are naturally greedy, and nothing that they ever do will change that, then I say start over, the experiment didn't work, and I'll be waiting for 40 days of rain anytime soon.

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:49 There's no incentive for people to be as productive as they could be in the government doesn't allow for competition between businesses.

With technology advancing as rapidly as it is, I somehow doubt productivity is much of a problem. How many farmers do you know? How many farmers are there? Yet this tiny number of people provide food for the millions and millions of the rest of us. Factories are relying more and more on automated labor. Who needs incentive when less people are accomplishing more work every day?

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:49 There's no real improvement in technology because there's no incentive to, either. Why produce something improved if there's no competition? There's little incentive to invent new technologies if you can't take advantage of supply and demand.

Which explains why Soviet Russia got man both in space and in orbit before the US did, right?

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:49: Plus, if it's to all be about the "common good", then there's a problem with not respecting individual liberties. The populace is made up of individuals, and in order to get people to respect each other is to respect the individual. Nobody is going to want to improve their communities if they're not respected. I wouldn't feel I owe the community anything if I'm now allowed to be myself.

<http://www.anu.edu.au/polsci/marx/classics/manifesto.html>

Read it, and when you find something about violating individual liberties, get back to me.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 01:58:28 GMT

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

Government controlling the economy IS violating individual rights. I hate government kicking money to corporations and huge tax breaks to them, as well. I hate the fact that our government plays even any part in our economy... especially the part where they create inflation by printing off new money. The government is our own worst nightmare when it comes to the economy.

They were in an arms race against America. It was the government's incentive to be the biggest world super power. Without this arms race and national competition, the advances would have been trivial.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 02:33:30 GMT

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

Quote: [GoArmy44](#) wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:32

Well considering that communist regimes have historically been the most brutal in regards to human rights violations...I find that assumption not too far off the mark.

<http://www.anu.edu.au/polsci/marx/classics/manifesto.html>

Read it, and when you find something about violating human rights, get back to me.

I never said anything about the Communist Manifesto. But taking people's property just because they are "bourgeois" does have a unethical taste to it.

I was talking about communist regimes such as the Soviet Union, China, Vietnam, North Korea, Cambodia, Cuba, etc, setc...that have what seems like a fraction of the civil liberties and property

rights that we nonchalantly enjoy here in the U.S.

Quote:cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:49

There's no real improvement in technology because there's no incentive to, either. Why produce something improved if there's no competition? There's little incentive to invent new technologies if you can't take advantage of supply and demand.

Which explains why Soviet Russia got man both in space and in orbit before the US did, right? Thats true, but isn't it the United States who landed on the moon? I mean, we started later in the space race yet were able to beat them..why? Because some of the technologies used to put man on the moon are now used in commercial products. This incentive to invent creates much more production of new tech from a growing number of entrepreneurs that propelled us ahead of the Russians in space.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 03:15:04 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58Government controlling the economy IS violating individual rights.

I'm sorry you feel that way.

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58I hate government kicking money to corporations and huge tax breaks to them, as well.

Somehow, I doubt this will be a problem under communism.

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58I hate the fact that our government plays even any part in our economy.

I hate people who drive the speed limit on the freeway. What's your point?

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58especially the part where they create inflation by printing off new money. The government is our own worst nightmare when it comes to the economy.

So the sollution is lazie-faire capitalism? Revolutions have been fought and empires toppled over capitalism gone wrong. I don't know how people can still support it at all.

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58They were in an arms race against America. It was the government's incentive to be the biggest world super power. Without this arms race and national competition, the advances would have been trivial.

I don't see how launching people into space helps with the arms race. Don't get started about orbital weapons. It's a good fifty years later and we still don't have any of those.

GoArmy44 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 18:33 I never said anything about the Communist Manifesto. But taking people's property just because they are "bourgeois" does have a unethical taste to it.

I was talking about communist regimes such as the Soviet Union, China, Vietnam, North Korea, Cambodia, Cuba, etc, etc...that have what seems like a fraction of the civil liberties and property rights that we nonchalantly enjoy here in the U.S.

Then clearly we're talking about two different things. You're talking about "Soviet Union, China, Vietnam, North Korea, Cambodia, Cuba, etc," and I'm talking about Communism.

GoArmy44 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 18:33 That's true, but isn't it the United States who landed on the moon?

Depends on who you talk to.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 03:31:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58

especially the part where they create inflation by printing off new money. The government is our own worst nightmare when it comes to the economy.

So the solution is laissez-faire capitalism? Revolutions have been fought and empires toppled over capitalism gone wrong. I don't know how people can still support it at all.

I wouldn't use those examples as laissez-faire economies. The French Monarchy and the British Empire were more like mercantile economies where strong government regulation at the federal level was used to protect the industries of those countries.

Quote:cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58

They were in an arms race against America. It was the government's incentive to be the biggest world super power. Without this arms race and national competition, the advances would have been trivial.

I don't see how launching people into space helps with the arms race. Don't get started about orbital weapons. It's a good fifty years later and we still don't have any of those.

It helps create new technologies that help benefit military forces already established...GPS for example, computerization was most certainly sped up by the great push to put a man in space thus providing an invaluable resource for communication between commanders and units.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 03:37:20 GMT

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

GoArmy44 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 21:31Quote:cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58

especially the part where they create inflation by printing off new money. The government is our own worst nightmare when it comes to the economy.

So the sollution is lazie-faire capitalism? Revolutions have been fought and empires toppled over capitalism gone wrong. I don't know how people can still support it at all.

I wouldn't use those examples as laissez-faire economies. The French Monarchy and the British Empire were more like mercantile economies where strong government regulation at the federal level was used to protect the industries of those countries.

The English empire has been the 2nd most successful empire ever created. For one simple reason.

Hitler had it all wrong. He tried to make enemies to conquer the land.

The English actually USED the conquered areas for trading, shipping, factories, etc. Thats why they were able to keep such favor among the conquered for so long.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 03:45:03 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 21:37

The English actually USED the conquered areas for trading, shipping, factories, etc. Thats why they were able to keep such favor among the conquered for so long.

I don't know my history very well, but didn't almost every country used their conquered land for trading and stuff? I mean... what else to use the land for? Porn storage?

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 03:46:01 GMT

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

Quote:The English actually USED the conquered areas for trading, shipping, factories, etc. That's why they were able to keep such favor among the conquered for so long.

I very much doubt the British built up a industrialized economy in their conquered lands. In the American colonies as in the Indian sub-continent the British practiced Mercantilism, this means that the British built up their industry at home, protected it with tariffs, then sold the goods to the colonists who in return provided Britain with agricultural goods and raw materials. This economic policy is one of the reasons (and taxes) we rebelled against mother England.

Quote:MWright967 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 21:37

The English actually USED the conquered areas for trading, shipping, factories, etc. That's why they were able to keep such favor among the conquered for so long.

I don't know my history very well, but didn't almost every country use their conquered land for trading and stuff? I mean... what else to use the land for? Porn storage?

Most empires did...I like to think the Mongols didn't do that...they just pillaged and raped but that's probably not true.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [prasp](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 04:41:37 GMT

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

Quote:PS: Hillary is loco. Nation wide health care is what communism does.

Under that assumption Social Security that goes into the pocket of old, rich, greedy hacks can be also called communism.

Quote:Well considering that communist regimes have historically been the most brutal in regards to human rights violations...I find that assumption not too far off the mark.

Only second to the US, it has an established record of overthrowing electing military governments and creating dictatorships in the name of "democracy".

Quote:Marxism doesn't work in large populations. You know, such as America that has 300 million people.

Funny, I assumed that it didn't work because the West was trying to overthrow Communist governments every other Thursday.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 04:56:50 GMT

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

' wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 21:45MWright967 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 21:37
The English actually USED the conquered areas for trading, shipping, factories, etc. Thats why they were able to keep such favor among the conquered for so long.
I don't know my history very well, but didn't almost every country used their conquered land for trading and stuff? I mean... what else to use the land for? Porn storage?

You don't understand what I mean.

See, what Hitler did, was that once he conquered an area, he would set up factories and such. HOWEVER! The english were different. The English didn't crete mandatory factories or anything like that. They just used the places that were already there, but got greatly reduced prices, and bonuses. The reason they did this? Quite simple. People who are essentially, slaves, are going to want to revolt at some point. This way, the people remain at least somewhat happy, and get PAYED for the job. The English Empire, until sometime in the 1800's, was the most powerful country on earth because of this tactic.

Basically, the differince is, one of them forced people to work, the others just "bargained". But of course, if they didn't do as expected, punishmental action would mostly be taken. Its sort of, don't ask don't tell.

I actually studied English History for 2 years in college. Pretty amazing stuff, actually.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 05:32:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Chimp](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 07:22:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rocko wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 23:32OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Rocko, you are the kind of person who really makes me ashamed to be half black.

Heres an idea, stop being a retard and go read a book.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 23:50:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is definitely gonna get to Ron Paul!
<http://www.cnn.com/2008/POLITICS/01/10/paul.newsletters/index.html>

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 23:58:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hear those claims are false. My friend researched them when he heard about them, and apparently they're false.

Either way, it wouldn't affect MY choice in who to vote for even if they were to be true. He could be a member of the KKK and promoting the lynching of blacks, but as long as he keeps to libertarian ideals (which would condemn the lynchings), I wouldn't give a fuck.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 03:44:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 17:50 This is definitely gonna get to Ron Paul!
<http://www.cnn.com/2008/POLITICS/01/10/paul.newsletters/index.html>

From what I've read it was a ghostwriter and not Ron Paul himself. Anyway I have known about this for months, I don't know why CNN would bring this out now (actually the article says it was the New Republic) unless they were trying to further discredit him...which is pretty sad since he isn't even polling double digits.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 03:45:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MWright967 wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 17:52 Rocko wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 23:32 OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Rocko, you are the kind of person who really makes me ashamed to be half black.

Heres an idea, stop being a retard and go read a book.
Well if you stopped focusing on the color of people's skins and focused only on their words and personality, then you might not be such a huge racist faggot.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Chimp](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 04:23:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rocko wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 21:45MWright967 wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 17:52Rocko wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 23:32OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Rocko, you are the kind of person who really makes me ashamed to be half black.

Heres an idea, stop being a retard and go read a book.

Well if you stopped focusing on the color of people's skins and focused only on their words and personality, then you might not be such a huge racist faggot.

Oooh, okay. Tell the half black half chinese left wing guy he's being racist. Right.

Weren't you the one who said "So my people can take over"? Nawwww, thats not racist at ALL.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 04:27:45 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 22:23Rocko wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 21:45MWright967 wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 17:52Rocko wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 23:32OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Rocko, you are the kind of person who really makes me ashamed to be half black.

Heres an idea, stop being a retard and go read a book.

Well if you stopped focusing on the color of people's skins and focused only on their words and personality, then you might not be such a huge racist faggot.

Oooh, okay. Tell the half black half chinese left wing guy he's being racist. Right.

Weren't you the one who said "So my people can take over"? Nawwww, thats not racist at ALL. So if you're part of any minority it's impossible for someone to be racist? Yeah whatever dumbshit.

and don't even try to attack me instead of defending yourself and your own racist views.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [prasp](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 04:31:08 GMT

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

Quote:Weren't you the one who said "So my people can take over"? Nawwww, thats not racist at ALL.

No, that isn't, and I think you're overacting to his post, Rocko can't be older than 18.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [jnz](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 04:53:31 GMT

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

Rocko wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 21:45MWright967 wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 17:52Rocko wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 23:32OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Rocko, you are the kind of person who really makes me ashamed to be half black.

Heres an idea, stop being a retard and go read a book.

Well if you stopped focusing on the color of people's skins and focused only on their words and personality, then you might not be such a huge racist faggot.

Hypocrite.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 05:16:01 GMT

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

RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 22:53Rocko wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 21:45MWright967 wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 17:52Rocko wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 23:32OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Rocko, you are the kind of person who really makes me ashamed to be half black.

Heres an idea, stop being a retard and go read a book.

Well if you stopped focusing on the color of people's skins and focused only on their words and personality, then you might not be such a huge racist faggot.

Hypocrite.'

Thank you.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 16:04:05 GMT

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

RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 22:53Rocko wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 21:45MWright967 wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 17:52Rocko wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 23:32OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Rocko, you are the kind of person who really makes me ashamed to be half black.

Heres an idea, stop being a retard and go read a book.

Well if you stopped focusing on the color of people's skins and focused only on their words and personality, then you might not be such a huge racist faggot.

Hypocrite.
Secoded.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 00:10:31 GMT

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

RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 22:53Rocko wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008
21:45MWright967 wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 17:52Rocko wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008
23:32OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Rocko, you are the kind of person who really makes me ashamed to be half black.

Heres an idea, stop being a retard and go read a book.

Well if you stopped focusing on the color of people's skins and focused only on their words and personality, then you might not be such a huge racist faggot.

Hypocrite.

k most everything i say involving race such as my first post have just been a joke in a satirical fashion. Mwright's posts are outright racist. Too bad you're too much of an elitist piece of shit trying to be smart to notice this.

and to Mwright himself, you faggot. You are incredibly, and regardless of if i'm a hypocrite (which i'm not), racist and trying to attack only me instead of the argument proves how big of a retard you are.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 00:11:33 GMT

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

Rocko wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:10RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008
22:53Rocko wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 21:45MWright967 wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008
17:52Rocko wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 23:32OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Rocko, you are the kind of person who really makes me ashamed to be half black.

Heres an idea, stop being a retard and go read a book.

Well if you stopped focusing on the color of people's skins and focused only on their words and personality, then you might not be such a huge racist faggot.

Hypocrite.

k most everything i say involving race such as my first post have just been a joke in a satirical fashion. Mwright's posts are outright racist. Too bad you're too much of an elitist piece of shit trying to be smart to notice this.

and to Mwright himself, you faggot. You are incredibly, and regardless of if i'm a hypocrite (which i'm not), racist and trying to attack only me instead of the argument proves how big of a retard you are.

I lol'ed.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 00:12:37 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:11Rocko wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:10RoShamBo wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 22:53Rocko wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 21:45MWright967 wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 17:52Rocko wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 23:32OBAMA GONNA WIN IT ALL

Rocko, you are the kind of person who really makes me ashamed to be half black.

Heres an idea, stop being a retard and go read a book.

Well if you stopped focusing on the color of people's skins and focused only on their words and personality, then you might not be such a huge racist faggot.

Hypocrite.

k most everything i say involving race such as my first post have just been a joke in a satirical fashion. Mwright's posts are outright racist. Too bad you're too much of an elitist piece of shit trying to be smart to notice this.

and to Mwright himself, you faggot. You are incredibly, and regardless of if i'm a hypocrite (which i'm not), racist and trying to attack only me instead of the argument proves how big of a retard you are.

I lol'ed.

what server or forum did you take that i lol'ed line you unoriginal retard,

suck some of my fat black cock

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 00:29:57 GMT

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

Rocko wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:12
suck some of my fat black cock
Gay....

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 00:30:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sn1per74* wrote on Thu, 10 January 2008 01:13Dover wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 19:08Sn1per74* wrote on Tue, 08 January 2008 19:31Dover wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 21:15cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 07 January 2008 19:12People need to learn that Ron Paul is NOT an Isolationist and DOES NOT promote Isolationism. Ron Paul is a non-Interventionist. He still wants America to be a part of the world economy and be friendly to all nations. He just doesn't want to intervene like we have in the Middle East over the past 30 years and longer.

Good luck with that. That's me telling people that Hillary isn't a Communist and doesn't have sand in her vagina. Even though it's true, Americans believe what the TV tells them.
AHAHAHA. Quote of the year!

I'm not sure if you understood me. I actually support Clinton.
Speaking of whom, she won the Primaries, along with McCain. Things are going my way it seems.
O.
Even so it made me laugh.
PS: Hillary is loco. Nation wide health care is what communism does.

We used to have a elected Communist in Canada, which is why we don't have to pay money to go to the emergency room, like you people.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 00:40:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Where's that Communist? Send him here please!

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 00:43:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 00:46:23 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 20:37GoArmy44 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 21:31Quote:cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58

especially the part where they create inflation by printing off new money. The government is our own worst nightmare when it comes to the economy.

So the sollution is lazie-faire capitalism? Revolutions have been fought and empires toppled over capitalism gone wrong. I don't know how people can still support it at all.

I wouldn't use those examples as laissez-faire economies. The French Monarchy and the British Empire were more like mercantile economies where strong government regulation at the federal level was used to protect the industries of those countries.

The English empire has been the 2nd most successful empire ever created. For one simple reason.

Hitler had it all wrong. He tried to make enemies to conquer the land.

The English actually USED the conquered areas for trading, shipping, factories, etc. Thats why they were able to keep such favor among the conquered for so long. uhuh and the first was?

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 00:55:03 GMT

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

cnc95fan wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:46MWright967 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 20:37GoArmy44 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 21:31Quote:cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58

especially the part where they create inflation by printing off new money. The government is our own worst nightmare when it comes to the economy.

So the sollution is lazie-faire capitalism? Revolutions have been fought and empires toppled over capitalism gone wrong. I don't know how people can still support it at all.

I wouldn't use those examples as laissez-faire economies. The French Monarchy and the British Empire were more like mercantile economies where strong government regulation at the federal level was used to protect the industries of those countries.

The English empire has been the 2nd most successful empire ever created. For one simple reason.

Hitler had it all wrong. He tried to make enemies to conquer the land.

The English actually USED the conquered areas for trading, shipping, factories, etc. That's why they were able to keep such favor among the conquered for so long.
uhuh and the first was?

I'd say Rome, except it wasn't technically a country. America has been the most successful for multiple reasons:

- Its democratic system is unmatched
- Its on good terms with most countries
- It has the least problems in terms of benefitting the poor
- Its the most technologically advanced country on earth (NO. It is not Japan. This is a retarded misconception. Japan has the best technology in things like, cameras, computers, etc. However, for weaponry, it comes no where close to America).
- Has lasted over 230 years, which is more than I can say for many countries.
- Has an unsurpassed army training program, and the most well equipped troops on earth.
- Trades with nearly every country in some form or another
- Has one of the highest money values of any country
- Has one of the best immigration policies in the Americas

I can keep going on and on. Point being, America, in my view, is the most successful country.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 01:38:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sadukar09 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:43No.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 01:41:47 GMT

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 11:55cnc95fan wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:46MWright967 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 20:37GoArmy44 wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 21:31Quote:cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 09 January 2008 17:58

especially the part where they create inflation by printing off new money. The government is our own worst nightmare when it comes to the economy.

So the sollution is lazie-faire capitalism? Revolutions have been fought and empires toppled over capitalism gone wrong. I don't know how people can still support it at all.

I wouldn't use those examples as laissez-faire economies. The French Monarchy and the British Empire were more like mercantile economies where strong government regulation at the federal level was used to protect the industries of those countries.

The English empire has been the 2nd most successful empire ever created. For one simple reason.

Hitler had it all wrong. He tried to make enemies to conquer the land.

The English actually USED the conquered areas for trading, shipping, factories, etc. Thats why they were able to keep such favor among the conquered for so long. uhuh and the first was?

I'd say Rome, except it wasn't technically a country. America has been the most successful for multiple reasons:

- Its democratic system is unmatched
- Its on good terms with most countries
- It has the least problems in terms of benefitting the poor
- Its the most technologically advanced country on earth (NO. It is not Japan. This is a retarded misconception. Japan has the best technology in things like, cameras, computers, etc. However, for weaponry, it comes no where close to America).
- Has lasted over 230 years, which is more than I can say for many countries.
- Has an unsurpassed army training programm, and the most well equipped troops on earth.
- Trades with nearly every country in some form or another
- Has one of the highest money values of any country
- Has one of the best immigration policies in the Americas

I can keep going on and on. Point being, America, in my view, is the most successful country.

You forgot the all important geographical location.

To ALL: Double post is a mistake but live with it. I am not sorry.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [prasp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:08:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:- Its democratic system is unmatched

Not anymore. Because you elected Bush you can kiss your democracy goodbye.

Quote:- Its on good terms with most countries

Only because if a government pops up that it doesn't agree with it either stages a coup to overthrow it or bombs the country to the stone age, and many of it's allies put up with the US only because it is a superpower.

Quote:- It has the least problems in terms of benefitting the poor

Then how come most blacks are still unable to climb the class ladder?

Quote:- Its the most technologically advanced country on earth (NO. It is not Japan. This is a retarded misconception. Japan has the best technology in things like, cameras, computers, etc. However, for weaponry, it comes no where close to America).

Maybe, but 75% of the population never see this "advanced technology that you speak of."

Quote:- Has lasted over 230 years, which is more than I can say for many countries.

And yet is that is 1/10 of China's existence as a state.

Quote:- Has an unsurpassed army training programm, and the most well equipped troops on earth.

And yet it still lost in Vietnam.

Quote:- Trades with nearly every country in some form or another

Quote:- Trades with nearly every country in some form or another

So does most of Europe.

Quote:- Has one of the highest money values of any country

And it won't be that way in 50 years, keep on electing leaders like Bush and soon there will be hyperinflation.

Quote:- Has one of the best immigration policies in the Americas

What about Canada?

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:29:41 GMT

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

prasp wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 20:08Quote:- Its democratic system is unmatched

Not anymore. Because you elected Bush you can kiss your democracy goodbye.

Quote:- Its on good terms with most countries

Only because if a government pops up that it doesn't agree with it either stages a coup to overthrow it or bombs the country to the stone age, and many of it's allies put up with the US only because it is a superpower.

Quote:- It has the least problems in terms of benefitting the poor

Then how come most blacks are still unable to climb the class ladder?

Quote:- Its the most technologically advanced country on earth (NO. It is not Japan. This is a retarded misconception. Japan has the best technology in things like, cameras, computers, etc. However, for weaponry, it comes no where close to America).

Maybe, but 75% of the population never see this "advanced technology that you speak of."

Quote:- Has lasted over 230 years, which is more than I can say for many countries.

And yet is that is 1/10 of China's existence as a state.

Quote:- Has an unsurpassed army training programm, and the most well equipped troops on earth.

And yet it still lost in Vietnam.

Quote:- Trades with nearly every country in some form or another

Quote:- Trades with nearly every country in some form or another

So does most of Europe.

Quote:- Has one of the highest money values of any country

And it won't be that way in 50 years, keep on electing leaders like Bush and soon there will be hyperinflation.

Quote:- Has one of the best immigration policies in the Americas

What about Canada?

Let me guess, your a little America-Hating left-wing activist, right?

Let me give you some directions to the front of the store my friend, since you seem to be stuck in the Ignorant Department:

1. Why did we lose in Vietnam? We didn't. We pulled out. We lost one thing. Our brothers, sons, husbands, boyfriends, and friends. Thats what we lost. But we didn't lose the war. And the only reason we didn't WIN it, is because we weren't able to devote ourselves fully to it, and sent about 1/10 as many soldiers over as we needed. My father was in Vietnam, and I know the stories, he told me a lot about it. Not only that, I've done a lot of research myself.

2. Bush is the least of our problems. I hate fools like you who look for the apocalypse in everything, saying "OH NO! SINCE WE SOMETIMES ELECT THESE PEOPLE WE'RE GOING TO TURN INTO A POLICE STATE ONE DAY! HORROR, HORROR!". I have some news for you. That happened to England. Guess what happened? America was formed. The government may not be made of the nicest people, but they aren't stupid, and they are the reason we have the freedom we do. If they were to take away our "freedom", there would be some serious shit going down, trust me. The only reason you can even SAY you dislike them is because we still have freedom. Some places wouldn't even give you freedom of speech. NO country is perfect. Not a single one. Because perfect doesn't, and will never, exist. But overall, America is the best country out there. And Canada? Lol. Thats funny.

3. Blacks can't get up in the world? Lol? Let me ask you something. Do you realize that I'm half chinese and half black? I'm also bisexual, and my mother left me and my father when I was 16. And you know what? I make 150k+ a year, I have a wife, a family, a good job as a Marine Biologist, and the fact is, I'm not hurting. I had practically ever disadvantage you could think of, and I still made myself into a success. ONE thing keeps "blacks" from getting ahead. Thats themselves. I'll take a quote from Bill Cosby: "Your dirty laundry gets home at 3pm every day". Hes totally right. These kids go out and cause trouble, and don't study, and mouth off. These kids are they're own problems, and sometimes, honestly, make me ashamed to even be half black. If these kids really wanted to have a life, they'ed do EXACTLY what I did. They would go off, get a job, study, go to college.

4. Canada? BAHHAHAHA! Yeah right. America is so superior to Canada in almost every way its not even funny.

I will go half way with you. America has its problems. Electing dumb asses like Bush being one. But guess what? This is the best god damn country on earth, and the fact that ANYONE who dislikes it lives here, really baffles me. If you have a problem with it, just leave, and see how long it is before you come back.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:30:19 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 16:55- Its democratic system is unmatched

Vauge. What do you mean to say by this? Unmatched in what?

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 16:55- Its on good terms with most countries

Because countries that aren't on good terms with the US tend to find themselves overthrown or bombed back to the stone age.

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 16:55- It has the least problems in terms of benefitting the poor

I would hardly call benefitting the poor a "problem".

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 16:55- Its the most technologically advanced country on earth (NO. It is not Japan. This is a retarded misconception. Japan has the best technology in things like, cameras, computers, etc. However, for weaponry, it comes no where close to America).

Technology doesn't just mean military technology.

For the record, Japan and the greater part of Europe have been ahead of the US in telecommunications for about 15 years now. If you'd ever traveled beyond your state, you might know that.

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 16:55- Has lasted over 230 years, which is more than I can say for many countries.

So? My motherland of Bulgaria has lasted as an independant state for 1300 years, and it would've been longer if it wasn't for the damn Turks.

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 16:55- Has an unsurpassed army training programm, and the most well equipped troops on earth.

Which means little to nothing outside military affairs.

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 16:55- Trades with nearly every country in some form or another

Who doesn't?

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 16:55
- Has one of the highest money values of any country

Hah. Funny. All of Europe has a higher "money value" than the US. (The Euro is worth about twice what the dollar is. The pound is about triple). Fuck, even the CANADIAN DOLLAR is now worth more than the US dollar. How pathetic is that?

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 16:55- Has one of the best immigration policies in the Americas

Oh? And which immigration policy is this one, exactly? The one that lets in all the illegals and terrorists, or the one that keeps out people with a legitimate reason to come here?

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 16:55I can keep going on and on. Point being, America, in my view, is the most successful country.

Of course you'd say that. You're an American. You've been fed this BS by your TV since your early childhood. The thought that another country might be "better" than yours is unfathomable.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:32:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think he's a little late on the dollar statement, the value of our currency is sinking like the Titanic.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:34:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I love how people act like the US is some huge, ominous force which is so evil and hateful. Some of you should try going to Africa sometime. Lets see if you still want to live there after about, a week.

I've been all over the world. Singapore, the Galapagos, Africa, Indonesia, Japan, Canada, Mexico, England, and France. None of them were even a shadow next to America.

(Of course, the Galapagos isn't a country...Just thought I'd throw that in there for fun.)

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:38:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Africa isn't a country either.

What's the longest you've stayed in any of those places?

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:39:44 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 20:38Africa isn't a country either.

What's the longest you've stayed in any of those places?

Semantics, you know what he meant.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:43:08 GMT

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

Ethenal wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:39Dover wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 20:38Africa isn't a country either.

What's the longest you've stayed in any of those places?

Semantics, you know what he meant.

In all honesty, I don't. Africa is a big place. My grandfather used to work as an Airplane mechanic in Sudan. Sudan is nothing like Egypt, and neither of the two are anything what I imagine South Africa would be like.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:44:21 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 20:43Ethenal wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:39Dover wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 20:38Africa isn't a country either.

What's the longest you've stayed in any of those places?

Semantics, you know what he meant.

In all honesty, I don't. Africa is a big place. My grandfather used to work as an Airplane mechanic in Sudan. Sudan is nothing like Egypt, and neither of the two are anything what I imagine South Africa would be like.

To me it just looked like he accidentally threw Africa as a whole into the list right after mentioning

Africa. It wouldn't surprise me.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:47:46 GMT

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

Ethenal wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:44Dover wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 20:43Ethenal wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 18:39Dover wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 20:38Africa isn't a country either.

What's the longest you've stayed in any of those places?

Semantics, you know what he meant.

In all honesty, I don't. Africa is a big place. My grandfather used to work as an Airplane mechanic in Sudan. Sudan is nothing like Egypt, and neither of the two are anything what I imagine South Africa would be like.

To me it just looked like he accidentally threw Africa as a whole into the list right after mentioning Africa. It wouldn't surprise me.

My main point is that you can VISIT lots of places--I've VISITED plenty of places in the world--However, if you haven't LIVED outside the United States (Or whatever your home country may be), you really aren't in a position to make any sort of comparison.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 03:08:38 GMT

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

I agree with you on that.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 03:10:59 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 20:38Africa isn't a country either.

What's the longest you've stayed in any of those places?

Well, the Galapagos I was there for a year. I was studying the marine Iguana's and Galapagos Tortoises. Mexico...I was there for a period of about 3 weeks. Africa, I was there for a period of over 5 months. On that same trip, I visited Egypt, Sudan, Nigeria, and a few others. While in England, I stayed for 7 months. Off the coast of Scotland theres actually an interesting type of Fish which is quite rare, we were hoping to discover one and bring it back to the America's for

analyzation..Unfortunately, we only caught one, and it died on the trip back over. Canada, that was a vacation. Been there twice. Both for 1-2 weeks. Nova Scotia is fairly nice, actually. Singapore...I went there back in College. I was studying a few different things there. The rest of the places were just either vacations or trips to pick up some materials. Nothing more than 2 weeks.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Sn1per74*](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 05:51:04 GMT

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

The reason we lost the Vietnam War was because the soldiers were restricted from doing what they could have done. We also pulled out. If we would have stayed in unrestricted, we could've won.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 06:28:55 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 19:10Dover wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 20:38Africa isn't a country either.

What's the longest you've stayed in any of those places?

Well, the Galapagos I was there for a year. I was studying the marine Iguana's and Galapagos Tortoises. Mexico...I was there for a period of about 3 weeks. Africa, I was there for a period of over 5 months. On that same trip, I visited Egypt, Sudan, Nigeria, and a few others. While in England, I stayed for 7 months. Off the coast of Scotland theres actually an interesting type of Fish which is quite rare, we were hoping to discover one and bring it back to the America's for analyzation..Unfortunately, we only caught one, and it died on the trip back over. Canada, that was a vacation. Been there twice. Both for 1-2 weeks. Nova Scotia is fairly nice, actually. Singapore...I went there back in College. I was studying a few different things there. The rest of the places were just either vacations or trips to pick up some materials. Nothing more than 2 weeks.

Hmmm. That's a pretty health amount of time spent in some of those places, but it sounds to me like you spent more time hunting rare fish than you were doing other things. Supposed there's nothing that can be helped about that, seeing how you're a marine biologist.

In any case, those are all just months at a time, with the exception of the Galapagos, which as you pointed out isn't a country. You've got to really live someplace, long enough to call it home, before you can make any kind of comparison.

[Sn1per74*](#) wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 21:51The reason we lost the Vietnam War was because the soldiers were restricted from doing what they could have done. We also pulled out. If we would have stayed in unrestricted, we could've won.

No. The real reason we lost is (Insert equally unsupported and unprovable theory here). If we (Something that didn't and/or couldn't happen), we could've won. Maybe.

Is it really that hard to accept? America lost Vietnam. AMERICA LOST VIETNAM. Don't say "We didn't lose, we pulled out". That's like saying you didn't lose a match in Renegade because you yanked the power cord on your modem before your base got completely destroyed. 50,000+ US troops died, and the result is the same as if nobody got shipped over to begin with. That's what I call failure. The only place US had a chance in winning is in this "What-if" land that everyone loves to visit when the topic gets brought up.

You lost a war. It happens. Accept it, and move on.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 09:29:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:- Has one of the highest money values of any country
ROFL. I could buy a shit load of your currency now for only half of mine. The Dollars' value has dropped immensely.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 10:51:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 00:55- Its democratic system is unmatched
No, it's not...

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 00:55- Its on good terms with most countries like prasp said, if it decides it's not on good terms with a country anymore - such as not being sold anymore oil - it has a habit of "spreading democracy", such as overthrowing a democratically elected President by a covert coup and installing a puppet pro-Western dictator

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 00:55- Trades with nearly every country in some form or another
quite unethically in some cases

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 00:55- Has one of the best immigration policies in the Americas
yep, your Mexican border is nice and secure, isn't it?

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 00:55Oooh, okay. Tell the half black half chinese left wing guy he's being racist. Right.
You are racist. The Obama thread established that.

And if you think saying you're half-black or half-chinese means you can't be racist, you're not only a racist, you're also a racist hypocrite

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 15:12:07 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 20:29

Let me guess, your a little America-Hating left-wing activist, right?

Let me give you some directions to the front of the store my friend, since you seem to be stuck in the Ignorant Department:

1. Why did we lose in Vietnam? We didn't. We pulled out. We lost one thing. Our brothers, sons, husbands, boyfriends, and friends. Thats what we lost. But we didn't lose the war. And the only reason we didn't WIN it, is because we weren't able to devote ourselves fully to it, and sent about 1/10 as many soldiers over as we needed. My father was in Vietnam, and I know the stories, he told me a lot about it. Not only that, I've done a lot of research myself.

2. Bush is the least of our problems. I hate fools like you who look for the apocalypse in everything, saying "OH NO! SINCE WE SOMETIMES ELECT THESE PEOPLE WE'RE GOING TO TURN INTO A POLICE STATE ONE DAY! HORROR, HORROR!". I have some news for you. That happened to England. Guess what happened? America was formed. The government may not be made of the nicest people, but they aren't stupid, and they are the reason we have the freedom we do. If they were to take away our "freedom", there would be some serious shit going down, trust me. The only reason you can even SAY you dislike them is because we still have freedom. Some places wouldn't even give you freedom of speech. NO country is perfect. Not a single one. Because perfect doesn't, and will never, exist. But overall, America is the best country out there. And Canada? Lol. Thats funny.

3. Blacks can't get up in the world? Lol? Let me ask you something. Do you realize that I'm half chinese and half black? I'm also bisexual, and my mother left me and my father when I was 16. And you know what? I make 150k+ a year, I have a wife, a family, a good job as a Marine Biologist, and the fact is, I'm not hurting. I had practically ever disadvantage you could think of, and I still made myself into a success. ONE thing keeps "blacks" from getting ahead. Thats themselves. I'll take a quote from Bill Cosby: "Your dirty laundry gets home at 3pm every day". Hes totally right. These kids go out and cause trouble, and don't study, and mouth off. These kids are they're own problems, and sometimes, honestly, make me ashamed to even be half black. If these kids really wanted to have a life, they'ed do EXACTLY what I did. They would go off, get a job, study, go to college.

4. Canada? BAHAAAAHA! Yeah right. America is so superior to Canada in almost every way its not even funny.

I will go half way with you. America has its problems. Electing dumb asses like Bush being one. But guess what? This is the best god damn country on earth, and the fact that ANYONE who

dislikes it lives here, really baffles me. If you have a problem with it, just leave, and see how long it is before you come back.

I'm glad you've said something about race being tied to success. Yet another living proof that hard work DOES make someone succeed in life. I also love how America continuously looks like the worst among all the countries, even though we foot the most of the bills in terms of international charitable works.

----Rant Incoming----

For some reason there is an external(as well as internal) fetish for people to find controversy with the most successful federal and state separated government on earth. I really do thing some of you have a desire to seek out, and discredit anything successful that the United States achieves. What makes this even more perverse, is that I see Americans doing this very thing. Checks and Balances are fine - that's what a government by the people's duty is. But don't pull a StupidFlyingFuck and make stories seem worse than they actually are(I'm looking at you prasp). To you externals - Your governments have done atrocities that are JUST as bad, or worse in your past histories as we have in our past history. That includes ALL of you. Get over yourselves.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 15:50:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jecht wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:12 To you externals - Your governments have done atrocities that are JUST as bad, or worse in your past histories as we have in our past history. That includes ALL of you. Get over yourselves.

That's a good idea. Let's generalize all governments together because all of them have committed evil.

You are wrong about my country's government.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 18:19:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:50Jecht wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:12 To you externals - Your governments have done atrocities that are JUST as bad, or worse in your past histories as we have in our past history. That includes ALL of you. Get over yourselves.

That's a good idea. Let's generalize all governments together because all of them have committed evil.

You are wrong about my country's government.

Name one that hasn't

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 19:03:44 GMT

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

Bulgaria hasn't.

The history book's idea of Bulgarian "Atrocities" is forcing some Turkish citizens to adopt more Slavic surnames to help reunify them and defuse tension after 500 years of Turkish occupation.

OH NOEZ! THEY HAD TO CHANGE THEIR NAME SO THEY NOT GET LYNCHED!!

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 20:23:45 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 12:19Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:50Jecht wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:12 To you externals - Your governments have done atrocities that are JUST as bad, or worse in your past histories as we have in our past history. That includes ALL of you. Get over yourselves.

That's a good idea. Let's generalize all governments together because all of them have committed evil.

You are wrong about my country's government.

Name one that hasn't

Switzerland.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 20:44:15 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 14:23MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008

12:19Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:50Jecht wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:12
To you externals - Your governments have done atrocities that are JUST as bad, or worse in your
past histories as we have in our past history. That includes ALL of you. Get over yourselves.

That's a good idea. Let's generalize all governments together because all of them have committed
evil.

You are wrong about my country's government.

Name one that hasn't

Switzerland.

Cough Swedish Vikings *Cough*

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 20:48:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 10:19Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008
09:50Jecht wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:12 To you externals - Your governments have done
atrocities that are JUST as bad, or worse in your past histories as we have in our past history.
That includes ALL of you. Get over yourselves.

That's a good idea. Let's generalize all governments together because all of them have committed
evil.

You are wrong about my country's government.

Name one that hasn't

All of Scandonavia?

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 20:52:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 14:44Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008

14:23MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 12:19Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:50Jecht wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:12 To you externals - Your governments have done atrocities that are JUST as bad, or worse in your past histories as we have in our past history. That includes ALL of you. Get over yourselves.

That's a good idea. Let's generalize all governments together because all of them have committed evil.

You are wrong about my country's government.

Name one that hasn't

Switzerland.

Cough Swedish Vikings *Cough*

We are talking about modern governments here. I agree with Dover.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 20:52:04 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 20:48MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 10:19Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:50Jecht wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:12 To you externals - Your governments have done atrocities that are JUST as bad, or worse in your past histories as we have in our past history. That includes ALL of you. Get over yourselves.

That's a good idea. Let's generalize all governments together because all of them have committed evil.

You are wrong about my country's government.

Name one that hasn't

All of Scandonavia?

Bad example, considering the fact that all of those nomadic Nordic peoples were some of the bloodiest and most powerful warriors ever to be alive. They had good reasons though, considering they were in a constant struggle with people like the Romans for dominance and survival.

AKA: Berserkers.

And yes, they did commit Atrocities. For example, there was once a magical place called Britania, and then, the Saxons showed up

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 20:53:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

WE ARE TALKING ABOUT MODERN GOVERNMENTS. THANKS.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 20:59:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 12:44Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 14:23MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 12:19Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:50Jecht wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:12 To you externals - Your governments have done atrocities that are JUST as bad, or worse in your past histories as we have in our past history. That includes ALL of you. Get over yourselves.

That's a good idea. Let's generalize all governments together because all of them have committed evil.

You are wrong about my country's government.

Name one that hasn't

Switzerland.

Cough Swedish Vikings *Cough*

Uh...

Sweeden != Switzerland. There were Sweedish Vikings, but there has never been such a thing as a Swiss Viking.

But you knew that, right?

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 21:00:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pwned. Some people don't like the truth.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 21:28:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 14:59MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 12:44Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 14:23MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 12:19Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:50Jecht wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 09:12
To you externals - Your governments have done atrocities that are JUST as bad, or worse in your past histories as we have in our past history. That includes ALL of you. Get over yourselves.

That's a good idea. Let's generalize all governments together because all of them have committed evil.

You are wrong about my country's government.

Name one that hasn't

Switzerland.

Cough Swedish Vikings *Cough*

Uh...

Sweeden != Switzerland. There were Sweedish Vikings, but there has never been such a thing as a Swiss Viking.

But you knew that, right?

I say Swedish since they both come from the same area originally. While there were no official "Swiss" vikings, they are essentially one in the same, coming from the same area originally. Sorry if I jumbled that together

Point being, all these tribes raided and plundered and even murdered. Its not suprising.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 21:37:06 GMT

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

Firstly, like Starbuzz pointed out, we're talking modern governments. Lets try to confine ourselves to events of the past 5 centuries? Fair enough?

Secondly:

NOWHERE NEAR EACH OTHER. I thought that as a well-traveled man you'd take a gander at a map once in a while.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 22:08:37 GMT

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

I don't the trust the Swiss. They're too neutral, and too friendly, and they're right smack dab in the middle of Europe.

Personally, I'd be very afraid of the Swiss. You just know they are biding their time, just waiting for the right opportunity. Hell, remember when they invaded Lichtenstein, and the world just laughed? The Swiss now know they can get away with anything. If they can get away with irritating triangular chocolate/nougat candies, they can get away with invading Germany.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 22:39:00 GMT

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

nikki6ixx wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 16:08 I don't the trust the Swiss. They're too neutral, and too friendly, and they're right smack dab in the middle of Europe.

Personally, I'd be very afraid of the Swiss. You just know they are biding their time, just waiting for the right opportunity. Hell, remember when they invaded Lichtenstein, and the world just laughed? The Swiss now know they can get away with anything. If they can get away with irritating triangular chocolate/nougat candies, they can get away with invading Germany.

They probably wouldn't win against Germany though..

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 23:04:22 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 15:37: Firstly, like Starbuzz pointed out, we're talking modern governments. Lets try to confine ourselves to events of the past 5 centuries? Fair enough?

Secondly:

NOWHERE NEAR EACH OTHER. I thought that as a well-traveled man you'd take a gander at a map once in a while.

I also would have thought someone like you, possessing moderately high intelligence would have known a little more about history.

I didn't say they lived right next to each other. I said they CAME FROM THE SAME PLACE. Just so you know, Germans, Nords, Swedes, Pollocks, Brits, and pretty much everyone in those upwardly cold and windy areas of the world all come from the same thing. They're all Anglo-Saxon tribes. For example, the English, Irish, Scottish, and Welsh were originally Germans that migrated over. Then the Gauls, another Tutonic tribe came over, and then the Saxons, yet another Tutonic tribe came over. There were quite a few invasions of England and the surrounding areas, actually. Point being, blood wise, they're exactly the same. Lets not forget, the Swiss were the founders of modern day Russia.

Using your logic, people can't be the same thing if they live far apart. So I suppose all of the Roman soldiers stationed for 400 years in England meant they weren't Roman anymore, right?

The last thing you want to do is get into a debate with me over Tutonic history. I took about 5 different courses on this in College.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 23:52:48 GMT

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

nikki6ixx wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 17:08: I don't trust the Swiss. They're too neutral, and too friendly, and they're right smack dab in the middle of Europe.

Personally, I'd be very afraid of the Swiss. You just know they are biding their time, just waiting for the right opportunity. Hell, remember when they invaded Lichtenstein, and the world just laughed? The Swiss now know they can get away with anything. If they can get away with irritating triangular chocolate/nougat candies, they can get away with invading Germany.

You got the wrong guys. It's Sweden who will fuck you up if messed with. They got their own advanced military-industrial complex. They got one hell of a military that is trained to defend. But they are neutral.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 00:08:41 GMT

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

Switzerland doesn't even have the technology, nor the funds or support to launch any kind of large-scale attack. I'd imagine that if there's anyone to take the place of America as #1 world power, it will either be Russia or China.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 00:16:54 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:08 Switzerland doesn't even have the technology, nor the funds or support to launch any kind of large-scale attack. I'd imagine that if there's anyone to take the place of America as #1 world power, it will either be Russia or China.

Sigh, I don't understand why everyone thinks China is so powerful military-wise. The vast VAST majority of Chinese are peasants, there is little money per capita as it is spread out over 1.3 billion people. "China" has never truly been powerful. Most people mistake it for the Mongolian Empire. The only time "China" was powerful, was when it was a small, much easier state to manage, thousands of years ago. The amount of money pumped into an army matters very little, no offence, but the US military seems to phail against untrained militia.. The Chinese forces have over 2 Million members, but that means nothing. Take the Battle of El Alamein for example, the Germans outnumbered the British 1:3, and yet, they still won over the odds. It's all about who's the most dedicated, and the one with the most brains.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 00:21:58 GMT

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

cnc95fan wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:16 MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:08 Switzerland doesn't even have the technology, nor the funds or support to launch any kind of large-scale attack. I'd imagine that if there's anyone to take the place of America as #1 world power, it will either be Russia or China.

Sigh, I don't understand why everyone thinks China is so powerful military-wise. The vast VAST majority of Chinese are peasants, there is little money per capita as it is spread out over 1.3 billion people. "China" has never truly been powerful. Most people mistake it for the Mongolian Empire. The only time "China" was powerful, was when it was a small, much easier state to manage, thousands of years ago. The amount of money pumped into an army matters very little, no offence, but the US military seems to phail against untrained militia.. The Chinese forces have over 2 Million members, but that means nothing. Take the Battle of El Alamein for example, the Germans outnumbered the British 1:3, and yet, they still won over the odds. It's all about who's the most dedicated, and the one with the most brains.

You assume it's because they have tons of riches, or perhaps some kind of "advanced" technology. No. It's far simpler than that.

1. China has billions of people (2 billion if I'm not mistaken?) That means, they will never have

funding problems.

2. China is technologically inferior in most ways to all of the other world super-powers. However, they have a huge amount of people, which means more people to choose from for the scientific field.

3. Having so many people simply means its not only harder to destroy them, its harder to keep control of them.

4. They are on VERY good trading terms with countries like America and England, which not only further supply them with money, but give them a chance to get some allies together if they ever go to war with someone.

You'd be correct in saying that china is not a super-power, and probably won't be for a long time. However, they are sort of the "Neutral" people right now. They trade with almost everyone, have huge funds, have huge amounts of people, and their government is comprised of some fairly tricky people. Who knows, they may never return to the days of yore where Mongolia ruled with an iron fist. Lets hope not. But I could definitely see it playing out in the end.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 00:24:17 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 15:04Dover wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 15:37Firstly, like Starbuzz pointed out, we're talking modern governments. Lets try to confine ourselves to events of the past 5 centuries? Fair enough?

Secondly:

NOWHERE NEAR EACH OTHER. I thought that as a well-traveled man you'd take a gander at a map once in a while.

I also would have thought someone like you, possessing moderately high intelligence would have known a little more about history.

I didn't say they lived right next to each other. I said they CAME FROM THE SAME PLACE. Just so you know, Germans, Nordts, Swedes, Pollocks, Brits, and pretty much everyone in those upwardly cold and windy areas of the world all come from the same thing. They're all Anglo-Saxon tribes. For example, the English, Irish, Scottish, and Welsh were originally Germans that migrated over. Then the Gauls, another Tutonic tribe came over, and then the Saxons, yet another Tutonic tribe came over. There were quite a few invasions of England and the surrounding areas, actually. Point being, blood wise, they're exactly the same. Lets not forget, the Swiss were the founders of modern day Russia.

Using your logic, people can't be the same thing if they live far apart. So I suppose all of the Roman soldiers stationed for 400 years in England meant they weren't Roman anymore, right?

The last thing you want to do is get into a debate with me over Tutonic history. I took about 5 different courses on this in College.

Ugh. If you're going to bail yourself out that way, pretty much everything we're looking at on the map (And large parts of the Middle East and India) can trace their liniage back to Aryan nomads from modern day Mongolia/Southern Russia. Common liniage means shit here, since we're all human and we all "came from the same place".

And again, for the fourth time this thread. MODERN GOVERNMENTS. I'm even willing to extend this past to 500 years ago (Which isn't modern anyway)

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 01:59:02 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:21cnc95fan wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:16MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:08Switzerland doesn't even have the technology, nor the funds or support to launch any kind of large-scale attack. I'd imagine that if theres anyone to take the place of America as #1 world power, it will either be Russia or China. Sigh, I don't understand why everyone thinks China is so powerful military-wise. The vast VAST majority of Chinese are peasants, there is little money per capita as it is spread out over 1.3 billion people. "China" has never trully been powerful. Most people mistake it for the Mongolian Empire. The only time "China" was powerful, was when it was a small, much easier state to manage, thousands of years ago. The amount of money pumped into a army matters very little, no offence, but the US military seems to phail against untrained militia.. The Chinese forces have over 2 Million members, but that means nothing. Take the Battle of El Alamein for example, the Germans outnumbered the British 1:3, and yet, they still won over the odds. It's all about who's the most dedicated, and the one with the most brains.

You assume its because they have tons of riches, or perhaps some kind of "advanced" technology. No. Its far simpler than that.

1. China has billions of people (2 billion if I'm not mistaken?) That means, they will never have funding problems.
2. China is technologically inferior in most ways to all of the other world super-powers. However, they have a huge amount of people, which means more people to choose from for the scientific field.
3. Having so many people simply means its not only harder to destroy them, its harder to keep control of them.
4. They are on VERY good trading terms with countries like America and England, which not only further supply them with money, but give them a chance to get some allies together if they ever go to war with someone.

You'd be correct in saying that china is not a super-power, and probably won't be for a long time. However, they are sort of the "Neutral" people right now. They trade with almost everyone, have huge funds, have huge amounts of people, and their government is comprised of some fairly tricky people. Who knows, they may never return to the days of yore where Mongolia ruled with an iron fist. Lets hope not. But I could definitely see it playing out in the end.

1.1,321,851,888

2. Have you seen the Anti-Satellite missiles they developed?

3. Not when you have a communist country and 281 million available conscripts. And, a simple nuke will wipe out millions.

4. And? They are on cold terms with us, Canada because Dalai Lama visited here. They don't like the US either, because of them supplying weapons to Taiwan.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 06:35:46 GMT

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

Yet the seem to make about 95% of America's plastic crap? Interesting...

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 06:58:24 GMT

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

MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:08Switzerland doesn't even have the technology, nor the funds or support to launch any kind of large-scale attack. I'd imagine that if theres anyone to take the place of America as #1 world power, it will either be Russia or China.

Since when did the argument come to arguing about which country has the best fucking military?

MWright967 wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 00:35Yet the seem to make about 95% of America's plastic crap? Interesting...

Yes, it's a tradeoff; more like a marriage of convenience.

Soviet ships stopped by in American ports during the Cold War to get loaded with fucking grains.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 07:08:07 GMT

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

Touche'

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 09:38:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I find it absolutely hilarious that people here thought I was serious about Switzerland.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 09:40:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nikki6ixx wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 03:38 I find it absolutely hilarious that people here thought I was serious about Switzerland.

Yeah, I laughed at some of the posts.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 10:44:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sadukar09 wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 02:59 MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:21 cnc95fan wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:16 MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:08 Switzerland doesn't even have the technology, nor the funds or support to launch any kind of large-scale attack. I'd imagine that if there's anyone to take the place of America as #1 world power, it will either be Russia or China.

Sigh, I don't understand why everyone thinks China is so powerful military-wise. The vast VAST majority of Chinese are peasants, there is little money per capita as it is spread out over 1.3 billion people. "China" has never truly been powerful. Most people mistake it for the Mongolian Empire. The only time "China" was powerful, was when it was a small, much easier state to manage, thousands of years ago. The amount of money pumped into a army matters very little, no offence, but the US military seems to phail against untrained militia.. The Chinese forces have over 2 Million members, but that means nothing. Take the Battle of El Alamein for example, the Germans outnumbered the British 1:3, and yet, they still won over the odds. It's all about who's the most dedicated, and the one with the most brains.

You assume its because they have tons of riches, or perhaps some kind of "advanced" technology. No. Its far simpler than that.

1. China has billions of people (2 billion if I'm not mistaken?) That means, they will never have funding problems.
2. China is technologically inferior in most ways to all of the other world super-powers. However, they have a huge amount of people, which means more people to choose from for the scientific field.
3. Having so many people simply means its not only harder to destroy them, its harder to keep control of them.

4. They are on VERY good trading terms with countries like America and England, which not only further supply them with money, but give them a chance to get some allies together if they ever go to war with someone.

You'd be correct in saying that china is not a super-power, and probably won't be for a long time. However, they are sort of the "Neutral" people right now. They trade with almost everyone, have huge funds, have huge amounts of people, and their government is comprised of some fairly tricky people. Who knows, they may never return to the days of yore where Mongolia ruled with an iron fist. Lets hope not. But I could definitely see it playing out in the end.

1.1,321,851,888

2. Have you seen the Anti-Satellite missiles they developed?

3. Not when you have a communist country and 281 million available conscripts. And, a simple nuke will wipe out millions.

4. And? They are on cold terms with us, Canada because Dalai Lama visited here. They don't like the US either, because of them supplying weapons to Taiwan.

Yawn. Do you think they would conscript 281million Men, Women and children? Where do you think they buy their weapons from

They are not communist any more.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 10:45:37 GMT

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

cnc95fan wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 04:44sadukar09 wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 02:59MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:21cnc95fan wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:16MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:08Switzerland doesn't even have the technology, nor the funds or support to launch any kind of large-scale attack. I'd imagine that if theres anyone to take the place of America as #1 world power, it will either be Russia or China. Sigh, I don't understand why everyone thinks China is so powerful military-wise. The vast VAST majority of Chinese are peasants, there is little money per capita as it is spread out over 1.3 billion people. "China" has never trully been powerful. Most people mistake it for the Mongolian Empire. The only time "China" was powerful, was when it was a small, much easier state to manage, thousands of years ago. The amount of money pumped into a army matters very little, no offence, but the US military seems to phail against untrained militia.. The Chinese forces have over 2 Million members, but that means nothing. Take the Battle of El Alamein for example, the Germans outnumbered the British 1:3, and yet, they still won over the odds. It's all about who's the most dedicated, and the one with the most brains.

You assume its because they have tons of riches, or perhaps some kind of "advanced" technology. No. Its far simpler than that.

1. China has billions of people (2 billion if I'm not mistaken?) That means, they will never have funding problems.

2. China is technologically inferior in most ways to all of the other world super-powers. However,

they have a huge amount of people, which means more people to choose from for the scientific field.

3. Having so many people simply means its not only harder to destroy them, its harder to keep control of them.

4. They are on VERY good trading terms with countries like America and England, which not only further supply them with money, but give them a chance to get some allies together if they ever go to war with someone.

You'd be correct in saying that china is not a super-power, and probably won't be for a long time. However, they are sort of the "Neutral" people right now. They trade with almost everyone, have huge funds, have huge amounts of people, and their government is comprised of some fairly tricky people. Who knows, they may never return to the days of yore where Mongolia ruled with an iron fist. Lets hope not. But I could definitely see it playing out in the end.

1.1,321,851,888

2. Have you seen the Anti-Satellite missiles they developed?

3. Not when you have a communist country and 281 million available conscripts. And, a simple nuke will wipe out millions.

4. And? They are on cold terms with us, Canada because Dalai Lama visited here. They don't like the US either, because of them supplying weapons to Taiwan.

Yawn. Do you think they would conscript 1.3billion Men, Women and children? Where do you think they buy their weapons from

They are not communist any more.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 12:54:19 GMT

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

cnc95fan wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 04:44sadukar09 wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 02:59MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:21cnc95fan wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:16MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:08Switzerland doesn't even have the technology, nor the funds or support to launch any kind of large-scale attack. I'd imagine that if theres anyone to take the place of America as #1 world power, it will either be Russia or China. Sigh, I don't understand why everyone thinks China is so powerful military-wise. The vast VAST majority of Chinese are peasants, there is little money per capita as it is spread out over 1.3 billion people. "China" has never trully been powerful. Most people mistake it for the Mongolian Empire. The only time "China" was powerful, was when it was a small, much easier state to manage, thousands of years ago. The amount of money pumped into a army matters very little, no offence, but the US military seems to phail against untrained militia.. The Chinese forces have over 2 Million members, but that means nothing. Take the Battle of El Alamein for example, the Germans outnumbered the British 1:3, and yet, they still won over the odds. It's all about who's the most dedicated, and the one with the most brains.

You assume its because they have tons of riches, or perhaps some kind of "advanced"

technology. No. Its far simpler than that.

1. China has billions of people (2 billion if I'm not mistaken?) That means, they will never have funding problems.
2. China is technologically inferior in most ways to all of the other world super-powers. However, they have a huge amount of people, which means more people to choose from for the scientific field.
3. Having so many people simply means its not only harder to destroy them, its harder to keep control of them.
4. They are on VERY good trading terms with countries like America and England, which not only further supply them with money, but give them a chance to get some allies together if they ever go to war with someone.

You'd be correct in saying that china is not a super-power, and probably won't be for a long time. However, they are sort of the "Neutral" people right now. They trade with almost everyone, have huge funds, have huge amounts of people, and their government is comprised of some fairly tricky people. Who knows, they may never return to the days of yore where Mongolia ruled with an iron fist. Lets hope not. But I could definitely see it playing out in the end.

1.1,321,851,888

2. Have you seen the Anti-Satellite missiles they developed?
 3. Not when you have a communist country and 281 million available conscripts. And, a simple nuke will wipe out millions.
 4. And? They are on cold terms with us, Canada because Dalai Lama visited here. They don't like the US either, because of them supplying weapons to Taiwan.
- Yawn. Do you think they would conscript 281million Men, Women and children? Where do you think they buy their weapons from
They are not communist any more.
Nice double post, quoting yourself, dumbass. And if you are in a war, yes. And since when does it all have to be Women and children? It could've been all men and women, you are sooooo fucking smart.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 13:27:38 GMT

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

sadukar09 wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 06:54cnc95fan wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 04:44sadukar09 wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 02:59MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:21cnc95fan wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:16MWright967 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 18:08Switzerland doesn't even have the technology, nor the funds or support to launch any kind of large-scale attack. I'd imagine that if theres anyone to take the place of America as #1 world power, it will either be Russia or China.
Sigh, I don't understand why everyone thinks China is so powerful military-wise. The vast VAST majority of Chinese are peasants, there is little money per capita as it is spread out over 1.3 billion

people. "China" has never truly been powerful. Most people mistake it for the Mongolian Empire. The only time "China" was powerful, was when it was a small, much easier state to manage, thousands of years ago. The amount of money pumped into a army matters very little, no offence, but the US military seems to phail against untrained militia.. The Chinese forces have over 2 Million members, but that means nothing. Take the Battle of El Alamein for example, the Germans outnumbered the British 1:3, and yet, they still won over the odds. It's all about who's the most dedicated, and the one with the most brains.

You assume its because they have tons of riches, or perhaps some kind of "advanced" technology. No. Its far simpler than that.

1. China has billions of people (2 billion if I'm not mistaken?) That means, they will never have funding problems.
2. China is technologically inferior in most ways to all of the other world super-powers. However, they have a huge amount of people, which means more people to choose from for the scientific field.
3. Having so many people simply means its not only harder to destroy them, its harder to keep control of them.
4. They are on VERY good trading terms with countries like America and England, which not only further supply them with money, but give them a chance to get some allies together if they ever go to war with someone.

You'd be correct in saying that china is not a super-power, and probably won't be for a long time. However, they are sort of the "Neutral" people right now. They trade with almost everyone, have huge funds, have huge amounts of people, and their government is comprised of some fairly tricky people. Who knows, they may never return to the days of yore where Mongolia ruled with an iron fist. Lets hope not. But I could definitely see it playing out in the end.

1.1,321,851,888

2. Have you seen the Anti-Satellite missiles they developed?

3. Not when you have a communist country and 281 million available conscripts. And, a simple nuke will wipe out millions.

4. And? They are on cold terms with us, Canada because Dalai Lama visited here. They don't like the US either, because of them supplying weapons to Taiwan.

Yawn. Do you think they would conscript 281million Men, Women and children? Where do you think they buy their weapons from

They are not communist any more.

Nice double post, quoting yourself, dumbass. And if you are in a war, yes. And since when does it all have to be Women and children? It could've been all men and women, you are sooooo fucking smart.

Sorry, I've got to side with Sadukar on this one

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 14:21:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

By the way, when I made that statement before. I did not confine it to modern governments...

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 16:42:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jecht wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 08:21: By the way, when I made that statement before. I did not confine it to modern governments...

Conquests, wars and internal-wars, don't count as atrocities. These are the normal part of human nature.

An atrocity when speaking in this context of governments is an "excess" committed against a single person or a group of people based on several factors (race, religion, etc)

Needless massacres, unconventional and clearly unethical ways of dealing with a problem is what counts as atrocities.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 21:15:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jecht wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 06:21: By the way, when I made that statement before. I did not confine it to modern governments...

That's a shame. Apart from the Harappans, I can't think of a single non-modern society/government that HASN'T committed an atrocity. Yet the more modern you get, the less atrocities you see (Or at least, a lesser number of groups committed them). What does that tell you?

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 20:15:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

intolerance is slowing?

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 00:15:15 GMT

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

Jecht wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 12:15intolerance is slowing?

Besides that.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 10:08:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You tell me. I hate guessing games

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 13:40:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jecht wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 02:08You tell me. I hate guessing games

That since atrocities were more common in ages past, their value in determining the worth the worth of a government now lessens the more years have passed since the atrocity being committed.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Chimp](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 14:38:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jesus Christ, shut the fuck up about the atrocities. I don't even get what the argument is about anymore....

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 17:01:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 07:40Jecht wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 02:08You tell me. I hate guessing games

That since atrocities were more common in ages past, their value in determining the worth the worth of a government now lessens the more years have passed since the atrocity being committed.

No offense, but I already knew that. Obviously if bad things happen less, the government is better. The question on whether something is "bad" or not is truly subjective, but not necessarily

confined.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [The Elite Officer](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 17:08:04 GMT

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

Hey! we could just elect Bush again!

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 18:30:27 GMT

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

The Elite Officer wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 17:08Hey! we could just elect Bush again!

Michael Jackon for president.

I bet he wouldn't be bad actually. He would provide excellent healthcare benefits for children under the age of 13.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 21:15:18 GMT

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

Jecht wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 09:01Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 07:40Jecht wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 02:08You tell me. I hate guessing games

That since atrocities were more common in ages past, their value in determaining the worth the worth of a government now lessens the more years have passed since the attrocitry being commited.

No offense, but I already knew that. Obviously if bad things happen less, the government is better. The question on whether something is "bad" or not is truly subjective, but not necessarily confined.

I was pretty sure you already knew that, which is why I expected you to say it, and not me.

This is relevent because of MWright967 wrote earlier, challenging this thread to name governemnts that had not committed atrocities (Making it sound as if NOT committing crimes against humanity is somehow difficult, or a skill that must be mastered). The answers provided included Switzerland, and basically all of Scandonavia. His rebuttle pointed out "atrocities" committed by Swedish Vikings, thus leading to the point I made above:

"That since atrocities were more common in ages past, their value in determaining the worth the worth of a government now lessens the more years have passed since the attrocitry being commited"

MWright967 wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 06:38 Jesus Christ, shut the fuck up about the atrocities. I don't even get what the arguement is about anymore....

I just gave you a summery in my response to Jecht. Do you not want to continue this because it's another "I guess I'll be the man" moments?

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Sn1per74*](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 01:37:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Okay, about the election. What do you think the most important topic is? My vote is economy.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 02:44:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sn1per74* wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:37 Okay, about the election. What do you think the most important topic is? My vote is economy.

That should be on everyone's mind. However, it seems candidates are campaigning on 'change' , and I have yet to have any idea as what 'change' is.

Turning back to the economy, I really don't know how the president will deal with the situation. Reconciling economic issues is going to be so painful to the American population that I doubt a president who oversees a "sound" economic recovery plan will last even one term.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:19:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

More importantly to me: Michigan's economy. 50/50 is unacceptable. I'm still not sure how a president would change that, as the current Democrats and Republicans in Michigan are all complete morons when it comes to their profession. Otherwise: Health Care, Abortion, The War in Iraq, and Tax Reform are also important issues.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Sn1per74*](#) on Fri, 18 Jan 2008 05:53:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The thing is, in my opinion, the media is scaring everybody too much. They always talk about "recession" and such. What does this make people want to do? Sell their stock. What does this

lead to? A recession. The media is helping the cause. The stock market was at the highest it's ever been a while back. Of course it will go down afterwards. I think, if you give it some time it will fix itself.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 18 Jan 2008 06:33:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd like to see someone fix the hyperinflation we're in.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 18 Jan 2008 09:15:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sn1per74* wrote on Thu, 17 January 2008 23:53 The thing is, in my opinion, the media is scaring everybody too much. They always talk about "recession" and such. What does this make people want to do? Sell their stock. What does this lead to? A recession. The media is helping the cause. The stock market was at the highest it's ever been a while back. Of course it will go down afterwards. I think, if you give it some time it will fix itself.

Well, the media are all about sensationalism.

However, the current economic outlook has been caused by actions over the past 20-30 years. The main culprit is market manipulation by central banks, which has created amazing, near unending growth... but, like any living, breathing thing, the market can only be manipulated so much until it breaks. This could have been lessened had people, and governments taken the Dot-Com boom/bust seriously, and instituted much more prudent fiscal policies pertaining to economic decisions.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 18 Jan 2008 13:11:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Fri, 18 January 2008 07:33 I'd like to see someone fix the hyperinflation we're in. I agree.

The main culprit here is probably the price for fuel. America needs to discover alternative fuel sources and release it into the market so that there is competition and prices decrease.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [The Elite Officer](#) on Fri, 18 Jan 2008 19:28:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hope we as humans all die and this stupid planet dies with us and none of us are left to talk shit, flame, spam, or anything else ever again.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 18 Jan 2008 19:46:27 GMT

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

The Elite Officer wrote on Fri, 18 January 2008 13:28 I hope we as humans all die and this stupid planet dies with us and none of us are left to talk shit, flame, spam, or anything else ever again.

That actually doesn't require the end of the world... Believe it or not, all it requires is the meager act of disconnecting your modems power cable. The best solutions are always the most simple ones.

I love how some economists are spinning this economic situation as something that'll only be in a slump for the next few months, and by the end of the year, everything will be all hunky-dory.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [The Elite Officer](#) on Fri, 18 Jan 2008 19:52:40 GMT

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

nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 18 January 2008 14:46 The Elite Officer wrote on Fri, 18 January 2008 13:28 I hope we as humans all die and this stupid planet dies with us and none of us are left to talk shit, flame, spam, or anything else ever again.

That actually doesn't require the end of the world... Believe it or not, all it requires is the meager act of disconnecting your modems power cable. The best solutions are always the most simple ones.

I love how some economists are spinning this economic situation as something that'll only be in a slump for the next few months, and by the end of the year, everything will be all hunky-dory.

Lol my modem does not have a power cabal.....

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 19 Jan 2008 23:39:09 GMT

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

The Elite Officer wrote on Fri, 18 January 2008 11:52 nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 18 January 2008 14:46 The Elite Officer wrote on Fri, 18 January 2008 13:28 I hope we as humans all die and this stupid planet dies with us and none of us are left to talk shit, flame, spam, or anything else ever again.

That actually doesn't require the end of the world... Believe it or not, all it requires is the meager

act of disconnecting your modems power cable. The best solutions are always the most simple ones.

I love how some economists are spinning this economic situation as something that'll only be in a slump for the next few months, and by the end of the year, everything will be all hunky-dory.

Lol my modem does not have a power cabal.....

He was basically trying to tell you to become an hero politely.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sun, 20 Jan 2008 16:29:59 GMT

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

Main problem for the USA, not depending on the candidate that will be chosen, is the economy. Technically speaking every USA citizen has a dept of \$30,222.10. To be more precize, that's the debt your goverment has to other countries, mainly being europe and for an even bigger part, your hated China.

China only borrows you so much so that they can continiue to sell their products. Once you stop buying thier products, they will probably want their money back. Ththat would effectively mean the end for the USA economy, as without foreign money nothing can be bought from foreign countries.

Your luck at this moment is that OIL is (still) sold in USD, once the arab countries decide that the USD is too weak and unreliable, they will switch to the EURO, or some other important currency. I would not know what that would be though.

Once the OIL prices go up serverly the USA is pretty much fucked, and will have to pay for the many years they pretended that energy was endless with thier SUV's etc. This because even now the USA is not doing much to prevent waste of energy, and why would they? They pay near nothing for oil, unlike the Europeans for example.

I don't think any President can prevent something like a recession, the question is just, how bad will it get?

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 14:41:25 GMT

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

So now Obama erases Clinton's lead and McCain seems to be the GOP frontrunner.

Let's say the Dems let Obama represent them against McCain in the final national elections. Who will win? I think McCain would because the nation as a whole may not give enough votes to Obama.

What does everyone think about that?

Please answer...and correct if I am wrong. Someone told me this.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 06:20:46 GMT

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

give da black man a chance

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Chimp](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 06:32:02 GMT

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

Rocko wrote on Wed, 06 February 2008 00:20give da black man a chance

Because nothing says black pride like taking pity on the "poor ni88er". Barack 08'.

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 07 Feb 2008 05:35:05 GMT

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

barak 4 life

Subject: Re: Election '08

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Thu, 07 Feb 2008 23:41:26 GMT

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

I read a nationwide poll the other day that said the nation favors even Hillary Clinton to John McCain... something like 51 to 47%. In a theoretical matchup between Obama and McCain, Obama wins by around 8 percentage points.

Most of the Republican party's base hates McCain... he seems to be a bit divisive among people, especially with that "100 years in Iraq" remark he made not too long ago (which is going to haunt him in the general election). I would say, that McCain is the Hillary Clinton of the Republican party.

Oh, and to all the people saying that if Hillary wins, they're moving to Canada? Last time I checked, Canada has universal health care and all sorts of ultraliberal institutions. And you're afraid of what Hillary's gonna do? Well, don't let the door hit your ass on the way out!

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Fri, 28 Mar 2008 22:58:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryan3k wrote on Thu, 07 February 2008 19:41

Oh, and to all the people saying that if Hillary wins, they're moving to Canada? Last time I checked, Canada has universal health care and all sorts of ultraliberal institutions. And you're afraid of what Hillary's gonna do? Well, don't let the door hit your ass on the way out! That's not why (for most people I guess), Hilary's implementation differs from Canada's.

There are much things to dislike about Hilary, and that's why most people don't like her. She's a chronic liar and very corrupt. Just a little more corrupt than McCain.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Fri, 28 Mar 2008 22:59:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

small error, remove this post.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [u6795](#) on Sat, 29 Mar 2008 01:32:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I REMEMBER LANDING UNDER SNIPER FIRE

THERE WAS NO RECEPTION CEREMONY

THEY BASICALLY JUST TOLD US TO RUN WITH OUR HEADS DOWN TO THE TRUCKS AND THAT IS WHAT HAPPENED.

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Sat, 29 Mar 2008 03:21:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LIEZ

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Sat, 29 Mar 2008 06:27:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hillary was lucky the enemy didn't have noobjct rifles.

Actually, it would have been better if they did.
brb, FBI?

Subject: Re: Election '08
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sun, 30 Mar 2008 18:46:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

u6795 wrote on Fri, 28 March 2008 20:32I REMEMBER LANDING UNDER SNIPER FIRE

THERE WAS NO RECEPTION CEREMONY

THEY BASICALLY JUST TOLD US TO RUN WITH OUR HEADS DOWN TO THE TRUCKS AND THAT IS WHAT HAPPENED.

rofl.

I AM FIRST FIRST LADY SINCE ELANOR ROOSEVELT TO VISIT A WAR ZONE!! lol

Bullshit, she isn't even in the whitehouse anymore.

I wish the snipers hadn't been shooting at each other...
