
Subject: An interesting read

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Jul 2005 05:24:09 GMT

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

ou want to hate Bush, fine. Why not try to look at both

> > sides rather than letting left wing interest groups do your tinkering for

> > you?

>

> You're absolutely crazy Deej.

>

> My thoughts have been formed the last week primarily viewing mainstream

> network news.

>

> You're stuck in partisan mode, and someho

Subject: Re: An interesting read

Posted by [erlilo](#) on Tue, 19 Jul 2005 07:01:50 GMT

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

has always faced - building

> a

>> city below sea level is a nightmare waiting to happen, unless you build

>> 100ft high, 100ft deep concrete barriers all the way around.

>>

>> Wetlands are not a sufficient barrier between a city and water, and the

> fact

>> that part of New Orleans was built on filled in marshlands doesn't help -

>> saturated ground, surrounded by water, below water line is prime

>> territory

>> for flooding - it's only a matter of time. There were many articles and

>> speculation that New Orleans could not survive a major hurricane - the

> city

>> was living on borrowed time unfortunately. All the political blame in

>> the

>> world won't change the fact that this disaster happened b

Subject: Re: An interesting read

Posted by [Kim](#) on Tue, 19 Jul 2005 13:19:03 GMT

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

/>

I will quote stats only from your approved list...

Come on,, step up bitch.Guliani was a *Mayor*. He took charge of a situational disaster unlike the

mayor of New Orleans. Bush showed up for that one too in case you didn't notice. He showed up because he could get to the area. So what was Bush to do Jason? Rent a pirogue and pole himself into the middle of the Super Dome without any security detail? Clinton wouldn't have done that either. It was, and still is, an uncontrolled situation and very different, logistically, from what happened in New York.

"jason Miles" <Jmiles45@aol.com> wrote in message news:431b29ba\$1@linux...
>
>

Subject: Re: An interesting read
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 19 Jul 2005 14:19:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

,
> if
>> >> > you
>> >> > take the LA times and balance it's coverage with that of any number
> of
>> >> > other
>> >> > news sources, you are likely to get something approximating reality,
>> >> > but
>> >> > never from just one news source. For me to quote from an approved
> list
>> >> > would be bogus because I don't have one. I look at numerous sources
> and
>> >> > try
>> >> > to cull a semblance of reality from different points of view. You
> post
>> >> > articles here by a single source that happens to support your view.
>> >> > Fair
>> >> > enough. It's suspect though because it's the same old crap every
> time.
>> >> > I
>> >> > see
>> >> > no attempt at objectivity.....bitch
>> >>
>> >> Exactly. So how do you rectify that with your outragage at my
>>

Subject: Re: An interesting read
Posted by [emarenot](#) on Tue, 19 Jul 2005 20:33:05 GMT

> wrote in message
news:431b5c53\$1@linux...
> Amidst this horrible human loss and destruction you bring to the table
> more suffering, anger and destruction of personal relationships man.
> Think about it, brother.
> AA
>
>
>
> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compounded> wrote in message
> news:431b3644@linux...
>> deej is coppin out...
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>> news:431b359b@linux...
>>> no dout man, but this is fun... u got pwned
>>>
>>> I checked back into this thread because I expected a cheap shot from
>>> you.
>>> I'm in the process of setting up 10 mics for a trackin

Subject: Re: An interesting read
Posted by [justcron](#) on Tue, 19 Jul 2005 22:00:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

g session but I'm
>>> going to take a second here to clairfy your out - of -context spin of my
>>> statement.
>>>
>>> I said that there is always credibility to a number of new sources
>>> *depending on what they are reporting*. The obvious bias of the LA times
>>> calls their agenda into question. Had you been at all objective in your
>>> thinking, you might have looked to more than one source before showing
>>> your
>>> ass with something like this.
>>>
>>> Now, whether you beileve it or not, I've got work to do.
>>> C'ya
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compounded> wrote in message

>>> news:431b30d3\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:431b300e@linux...
>>>> > You want to talk about credibility, yours is
>>>> >> being ripped to shreds, by your own logic.
>>>> >>
>>>> > So my credibility is suspect because I don't cull my information from
