
Subject: chat is over

Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Mon, 27 Jun 2005 07:19:52 GMT

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

say that im interested in instead of

>the useless standard bullshit? israel, rabin anyone? anyone

>care to loose a word about the only man that ever effectively

>reduced terror in israel? nada.

I said I'd talk about Israel when I had time... I have posted a new thread

Subject: Re: chat is over

Posted by [Kim](#) on Mon, 27 Jun 2005 07:48:34 GMT

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

before you even think it, how may I help you?"

>>Caller: "If you know what I'm thinking, why do you need to ask

>>how you may help me?"

>

>

>hahaha. i didnt get it, but im sure it was funny. funny is good. thanks.

You didn't get it? It was a refence to your statement "i knew that was coming" or whatever the exact verbage was.

Neill received a mix from a local AE a few days ago and I'm totally mind boggled.

There are instruments and vocls placed outside the normal stereo image...like 12" outside of the speaker

Subject: Re: chat is over

Posted by [Rob Arsenault](#) on Mon, 27 Jun 2005 12:23:17 GMT

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

ts in particular), while at the same

time giving arafat enough to present a negotiation path to

his people that seemed promising enough to keep the power,

which was also the power to at least mostly keep the terror

under control. of course, that was when the terror really

was still mostly PLO business.

it looked all very promising. PLO was da shit, hamas was

not, and arafat was powerful (and even determined) enough

to just chase and kill hamas people. it was the last

time arafat could actually claim to have an influence on

whether there would be terror or not, at least a very very big influence on how much terror there would be.

i was very impressed by rabin. of course, the timing and surrounding was right, and its very ironic but also absolutely true that only an ex general on the one side and the terrorist leader on the other side had enough credit from their people to go through with this, since the people would only trust guys like these to be acting in their own countrys interest.

enter religious idiot stage right - boom. oh man.

&g

Subject: Re: chat is over

Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Mon, 27 Jun 2005 14:30:57 GMT

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

less
the ultimate extremist and head of terror, he now was more or less the "diplomat who didnt get us anywhere", and definetly NOT the leading terrorist anymore, PLO? hamas is where the terror came from. so, since arafat always was a selfish asshole, he went back to selfish asshole mode and the following years, the whole sad struggle began with clinton going in and out and in and out and in and out, ultimately ending in arafat denying a peace plan he would have agreed on only years before. it was all some stupid theather play, that was now doomed right from the start. especially considering that arafat was negotiating something he had no influence anymore, the amount of terror. what a joke. was he head of hamas or something? of course he wasnt.

so, whose fault was it? was it the religious idiot that shot the man that was close to write history? (and, one cant stress that enough, since this is basically the heart and center of the giant cultural and religious conflict were currently facing, this could have changed history with a lot more being affected than that ridiculously small piece of oh so sacred land down there). was it netanyahu who failed to smell the historical opportunity? was it the people in israel who were stupid enough to vote for that guy, even though they were as close to actual peace as never before? (note that voting for netanyahu

was basically a vote for at least a gradual return to the
politic concept of showing force and strengh - did it pay off?

Subject: Re: chat is over

Posted by [Nappy](#) on Mon, 27 Jun 2005 14:43:43 GMT

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

was nothing to support, you forget
all that, just like neil. how convenient. how cheap.
ill go and continue my discussion with don, this is just
a pile of shit not worth discussing.

oh, and its SCHROEDER.

g-e-r-h-a-r-d s-c-h-r-o-e-d-e-r.

"Mr Simplicity" <animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote:

>(sigh).....and furthermore, whether you want it to be about

>Iraq.....everything is about Iraq.....and was for a long time before

>we took Sadaam out if the premise of the United Nations being a viable

>entity has any validity at all. I appreciate that Germany supported the
US

>during the time that Bill Clinton was sitting on his ass"DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in
message news:42d70b9b\$1@linux...

>

> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>

>

>>Thats truly impressive, although I'm curious about the ambuity of the 'no

>

>>drugs' thing whether that includes alcohol or not. To me alcohol is a

>>much

>

>>more powerful drug than reefer.

>

>

> Took my first drink at the age of 29. Today, I drink abou

Subject: Re: chat is over

Posted by [Deej \[3\]](#) on Mon, 27 Jun 2005 15:04:52 GMT

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

t 3 beers

> a year. My experience is that there is nothing, and I mean nothing
> that screws up the brain worse than regular pot use.

I know what you mean... however you should be aware of the hard drug epidemic sweeping the nation. Oxycontin is the same as heroin. Crystal Meth is truly an epidemic. That shit will kill you. Dumb 15 year old kids are DYING all the time from this crap, but at the same time I hear people saying reefer is the REAL problem. Its interesting.

>>> That doesn't make me better, it just shows that it can be done.
>>> And, there's a lot more of us than Rolling Stone mag would have you
>>> believe. My dad hung with Frank Sinatra before the famous
>>> Paramount show that launched his career. I was not raised by
>>> prudes or Victorians. He told me that dope makes

Subject: Re: chat is over

Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Mon, 27 Jun 2005 15:25:57 GMT

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

you stupid, and

>>> I have never seen any evidence to prove otherwise.

>>

>>Fair enough... especially if you think I'm stupid.

>

> That's the POINT dammit. I DON'T think you're stupid. I see a

> strong intelligence at work in all the stuff you think about. You

> would be Yoda without the dope. Sorry. Just my opinion.

Actually I'd be in jail for beating the shit out of people without the reefer.

>>> There's a whole underground of people who just love the music,

>>> not the drugs, not the bling, not the pussy, just the music.

>>>

>>> You should join us.

>>

>>But I need ONE crutch... I have reduced my smoking from daily to once a

> week

>>or so, and am pretty much just addicted to lifting weights.

>

>

> And I eat too much, so I can't judge others.

Pretty much everyone that's quit drugs and booze have universally turned into food addicts. My buddy who quit smoking now eats Krispy Kremes by the

DOZEN.

> I don't have the facts to discuss it. But I do not believe that Bush
> is padding his buddies pockets on the blood of this war, at least
> not as an intention.

I strongly disagree with that.

This is worth reading as one example of what I'm referring to:

http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20050627/pl_nm/iraq_halliburton_d_c_3

If its a choice between incompetence and intention, I'd have to go with intention, because I dont believe they're stupid one bit.

>
> My buddy's brother worked in WTC7 and he can tell you there
> was none of the nonsense prattled on about in the conspiracy
> theories because he was there. (The CIA had an office there,
> so that makes it a hotbed for theories) There was 40,000 gallons
> of diesel in there for electricity backup in a tank near the top
> of WTC7; the wreckage from the towers set it off and the
>

Subject: Re: chat is over

Posted by [Deej \[3\]](#) on Mon, 27 Jun 2005 17:36:20 GMT

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

ng in German

>at the table next to me, I was able to recognize the particular
>accent/dialect & I said: "You're from Mainz, aren't you?" and
>they said: "Wiesbaden" (which for those of you who don't know,
>but may be reading this, is right across the river from Mainz).
>And thanks also for the great beer, and the eiswein, and the
>kick-ass trains that get you nearly anywhere you want to go
>quite easily, and thanks for the C-class coupe that I drive
>right now... we don't build cars that are that good here.

>
>All I wanted was "thanks for no tanks!", and you're still
>missing that point... I never said it was America alone that
>was responsible for ending the cold war. Our presence on your
>border was 100% responsible for the Soviets staying closer to
>Halberstadt than Herzberg, and closer to Bad Langensalza than
>Bad Kissingen before said cold war came to a close... that's
>all I was saying.

>
>
>>
>>

>>as to the rest, whats there to say when you completely
>>ignore all of my points...
>>
>>- about germany and the possibility that it might NOT have
>>been a case of complete sucky ungratefulness but a case
>>of strong disagreement about the second iraq war (even more
>>likely since germany wasnt exactly the only nation that
>>didnt agree)? nothing.
>>
>>- the stuff i say that

Subject: Re: chat is over
Posted by [Kim](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2005 07:30:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ere of Europeans who were *from Europe*
>>
>>
>
>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:42d71940\$1@linux...
>
> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:
>>
>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:42d70cad\$1@linux...
>>
>>> Well, that was a bunch of good typing wasted on someone who
>>> wouldn't believe the facts if said facts could sing & dance &
>>> put on a Broadway musical to better get your attention &
>>> illustrate their point.
>>
>>You're way off base.... Not that I really care, but you said something
>
>>about how I should get off my ass, based on some bizarre assumption. I
> post
>>that I do try to be active on the issues, and you reply with what?
>
> It' wasn't a matter of you getting of your ass, it was a
> question of you feeling like the government is keeping you
> down, fucking you over, preventing you from achieving your
> goals - that seems to be an underlying thread to everything you
> post when this sort of subject matter comes up.

I never said that... I think the current administration is corrupt. I
think the military industrial complex is profiting off the war. How do you
extend that to me saying the government is keeping me down?

>Being active on

> the issues is NOT the same as taking the attitude of: "Dammit,
> I'm going to get where I want to be, and I'm going to overcome
