
Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 22:49:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Bush tells us to bomb Iraq on grounds Iraq may have bombs. He tells us to bomb Iraq on grounds Iraq curtails freedoms. He tells us to bomb Iraq on grounds Iraq may be abetting terrorism.

What then should we do about a country (the US) that has by far the most bombs in the world and

What should we do about a country (the US) that is currently curtailing freedoms abroad and shamelessly?

both terrorism directed at others and also terrorism which will be unleashed against us in

What should we do about the U.S.? We should curtail its belligerency, change its regime, and fundamentally revolutionize its centers of wealth and power.

Support our troops, bring them home.
Support our troops, provide them housing.
Support our troops, provide them health care.
Support our troops, provide them socially valuable jobs.
Turn military bases into industrial centers for the production of low cost housing, schools, hospitals, daycare centers, rail lines, inner city parks, and other social and public goods that can enrich rather than snuff out life.
Support our troops and one day they will join the fight for unlimited justice for all.
Support our troops."

I just don't understand these fucktard US citizens, that according to them, the US is a terrorist country that oppresses freedom. If they had their way, we would have no military at all. In a perfect world this might be possible, but guess what, we don't live on the Utopian world depicted in Star Trek. If you think that some place like Iraq is a better society to live in, why don't you move there, and after you watch your mom get raped a few times you might change your mind.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 22:52:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That amde nooo sense

Subject: LOL what a load of crap

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 23:18:03 GMT

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

Yeah! We have a moderator on our side! All hail blazer and his intellegence! Not implying the pro-war individuals lack intellegence. Yet they seem to be misguided in applying that intellegence.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 23:36:39 GMT

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

Quote:Turn military bases into industrial centers for the production of low cost housing, schools, hospitals, daycare centers, rail lines, inner city parks, and other social and public goods that can enrich rather than snuff out life.

And get conquered by Mexico.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 23:42:42 GMT

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

Commando no. 448Yeah! We have a moderator on our side! All hail blazer and his intellegence! Not implying the pro-war individuals lack intellegence. Yet they seem to be misguided in applying that intellegence.

I think you misunderstood his post...

Subject: LOL what a load of crap

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 00:08:35 GMT

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

OH SHOOT! That looked like his signature! Sry! So sry!

Subject: LOL what a load of crap

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 00:58:41 GMT

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

I'm neither pro-war nor anti-war. Those words suggest a blind following of one way or another, no matter what the situation. I can understand people who don't want to go to war and protest against it. I don't understand the pacifists who insist there "must be another way". If there WAS another way, I would think we would rather take that way than to go to war. But there are those who insist that we WANT to go to war, and would do it even if there were options available.

You cannot keep crying out "there must be another way", while at the same time offering no other alternatives. You might as well stop breathing and say "there must be another way to get oxygen".

Some idiots would apparently have us totally disband our military...too bad the cries of "there must be another way" won't be much comfort when our country is overrun by terrorist assholes.

War sucks. Nobody wants to be on either the giving or receiving end of it. Sometimes though it is the only solution. If this were a perfect world there would be no wars, but only because in that perfect world there are no terrorists or people wanting to do bad things.

Unfortunately the real world we all live in is much more harsh than that, and there are many who would do us and our friends harm. We have no choice but to defend ourselves and our allies. And yes, defense sometimes includes a proactive action to stop something abroad before we are defending it in our very city streets.

While some view the military action in Iraq as "OMG the big bad US is flexing its muscles and stomping on Iraq just because they can", the fact is we are just nipping a problem in the bud now, before it grows into something which recent history and events has shown will definitely be a bigger problem in the future.

It's quite obvious this action is being done for a greater good, anyone who insists on their wild allegations that the US are "terrorists" or "zionists" are either brain damaged or they just like to argue.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [Bearxor](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 01:20:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What these kind of people fail to see, is that even though the United States has a huge military with arms that most other countries do not have, we don't go threatening our neighbors every six months. We don't drop nukes on our own cities just because we're bored. We don't call our leader a 'president' and elect them by either a military coup, fear, or assassination. We don't suppress our media and execute people because they disagree with our leaders.

America having weapons of mass destruction and a lunatic like Hussein or Jong.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 13:27:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BearxorWhat these kind of people fail to see, is that even though the United States has a huge military with arms that most other countries do not have, we don't go threatening our neighbors every six months. We don't drop nukes on our own cities just because we're bored. We don't call our leader a 'president' and elect them by either a military coup, fear, or assassination. We don't suppress

our media and execute people because they disagree with our leaders.

America having weapons of mass destruction and a lunatic like Hussein or Jong.

The fact that criminals are executed is worse enough in my eyes. And Bush was more or less elected by the Supreme Court.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [Bearxor](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 15:01:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

other presidencies that have been decided outside of the electoral college:

1801: Thomas Jefferson
1824: John Quincy Adams
1876: Rutherford B. Hayes
1888: Benjamin Harrison

We were due for it to happen again, IMHO, and I also feel that the electoral college should be thrown out. It is a relic of old, and current communications technology are more than able to transmit correct information in a timely manner.

Then again, being a native Texan under the GW governship and knowing how bad the state was during ann richards reign of terror, I am a little biased when it comes to GW.

As for executing criminals... I'm not even going to touch that with a 20 foot pole.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 15:11:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Our election processes, while flawed, work. It is what allows the peaceful transfer of power from one political party to another. It is the best expression of that peaceful tranfer of power in the history of human civilization. Even the Roman Empire, while just as influential for it's time, didn't have peaceful transfers of power when public opinion swayed. It usually took an assasination.

So, in conclusion, would you rather have the most destructive forces on earth held accountable by electoral processes of the democratic instutions, OR do you prefer power struggles, and assasinations and the instability they bring?

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 16:27:55 GMT

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

KIRBY098Our election processes, while flawed, work. It is what allows the peaceful transfer of power from one political party to another. It is the best expression of that peaceful transfer of power in the history of human civilization. Even the Roman Empire, while just as influential for its time, didn't have peaceful transfers of power when public opinion swayed. It usually took an assassination.

So, in conclusion, would you rather have the most destructive forces on earth held accountable by electoral processes of the democratic institutions, OR do you prefer power struggles, and assassinations and the instability they bring?

Uh...I think that's a little too far from what I was saying (not that that really matters), I just mean that the US election system should be popular, not via states.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 16:37:56 GMT

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

The Electoral College not only was put together because of the difficulty in communication at that time, but it prevents the more populated areas from completely ruling the less populated areas. States like Montana and Wyoming would be completely voiceless. This form of balance is also noticed in the Senate where each state gets an equal amount of Senators (2).

Not to mention changing the process would make HUGE changes to the Constitution and you can imagine how many years it would roll around in the House and Senate before anything (if ever) happened.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [Carl](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 18:35:39 GMT

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

the thing is, electing a president isn't about each state's opinion (or it shouldn't be).

When it comes to FEDERAL elections, it should be a FEDERAL vote. In other words, EVERY citizen as one group. Every citizen with equal voice. and the electoral college does not save Montana from not having a voice. they get less electoral votes. But that's not the point. It's not about a state's voice when it comes to pres. election. it's about individual voice.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 18:44:42 GMT

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

Carlthe thing is, electing a president isn't about each state's opinion (or it shouldn't be).

When it comes to FEDERAL elections, it should be a FEDERAL vote. in other words, EVERY citizen as one group. Every citizen with equal voice. and the electoral college does not save montanto from not having a voice. they get less electoral votes. But thats not the point. Its not a hout a states voice when it comes to pres. election. its about individual voice.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 19:30:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's right, little Carl is more intelligent than our forefathers... those who built this nation and this form of government over 200 years ago. What were they thinking?

I found a VERY good article that illustrates my point in plain, simple English as to why the Electoral College absolutely can not be taken away.

<http://www.rubak.com/article.cfm?ID=10>

I recommend it for everyone, even if you support the Electoral College, as it gives you even more arguments against the idiots.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 19:46:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This does bring up some very good points, but if you change it from Rep by State, to Rep by Region, it balances it out, such a system works in Canada, but we have a much smaller population, that is much more spread out. Like one seat is located around Vancouver, while in my town we have a much larger zone, but with the same number off people

So if we have say City Alpha with 10,000,000 people
And Town Bravo, Charley, Delta... Hotel, India, and Juliet with 1,000,000 people each, you would put City Alpha in its own Riding, with all those towns in another. So you two areas, equal population, equal number of seats in the government.

With the US you have a bigger problem, you have cities that are massively sprawling with like 6,000,000,000 people so to balance out the ridings, you would need either one riding that takes up half the country, or very small ones in your cities.

Also with so many ridings, you would have a lot of seats, which means more senators (?), which means a slower democratic process.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 20:24:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Another link that describes the voting system and the history of which even more... great reading.

<http://www.backwoodshome.com/articles/silveira18.html>

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 20:42:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Carlthe thing is, electing a president isnt about each states opinion (or it shouldnt be).

When it comes to FEDERAL elections, it should be a FEDERAL vote. in other words, EVERY citizen as one group. Every citizen with equal voice. and the electoral college does not save montanto from not having a voice. they get less electoral votes. But thats not the point. Its not a hout a states voice when it comes to pres. election. its about individual voice.

this is why we use the electoral college, to make sure that the majority are represented. to give each individual a vote toward election directly would ensure only that the states with the most people are represented while those with less population are not. the needs of those in california and new york are vastly different than the needs of those in nebraska and alaska. to go one for one would not ensure proper representation for all states. it is about a state's voice in election, that is the whole point. states take care of their people, the president takes care of the states that is how it was meant to be and that is how it should be.

edit: keep in mind that bush won 30 out of 50 states. that means that the majority of the population in the majority of states wanted bush.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 21:26:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[quote="spotelmo"]Carledit: keep in mind that bush won 30 out of 50 states. that means that the majority of the population in the majority of states wanted bush.

What bothers me is that if in a state only 51% of the people vote for Bush, all votes of that state go to Bush.

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 21:37:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

51% would be the majority now wouldn't it? :rolleyes:

Subject: LOL what a load of crap
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 21:40:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, but if a state has 4 votes in the college, and 51% votes for Bush, imo it would be more fair to give Bush 2 votes from that state, and not all 4.
