
Subject: Re: OT:movie on 911-youve got to see this
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 14:25:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>
>
> >for distortion of any kind. And while I can't really tell you how or
=
>why
> I=20
> >decided that these were my best option, they remain just that. Next
=
>to
> a=20
> >good FOH eng, these are the most significant components in my signal
=
>path.
>
> >I've never looked back. Maybe because my 1x12's were custom built =
>and based
>
> >on an old Pacific (Michael Forest) design and employ high grade, slow
=
>
> >growth, light-but-dense Norwegien fir. I use just one primarily but
=
>when
>
> >the stage is big enough and the players be fine, I switch the old =
>50/50
> to=20
> >stereo and run the twin cabs about 20' apart, 10' away, pointing =
>back, up
>
> >and and slightly in and jump feet first into what one of my gig =
>compadres
>
> >calls "one big luxurious stereo sonic bathtub."
> >
> >W.
> >
> >"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message=20
> >news:450a08d7@linux...
> >> I'm looking at picking up a 4x12 to club gig with. Anybody got =
>experience
>
> >> to share with me about these models??
> >> Is there 'really' a \$1000 dollars worth of difference in tone from

=
>bottom
>
> >> to top with them, is it mechanics (like say, casters and handles)?
> >> I will be driving it with a 60wpc tube amp with a tube preamp front
=
>end.
>
> >> I want the elusive 'brown sound' distortion and super clear =
>cleans...
>
> >> which the amp/preamp combo is certainly capable of giving me. It's
=
>the
>
> >> cabs that suck on my current gear (2 unmatched 2x12's) - I wish to
=
>move
> to=20
> >> one stereo matched cab, and I'm not afraid to rewire it if that =
>matters.
> >> Many thanks in advance!
> >>
> >>
> >> <https://www.zzounds.com/item--MSHMG412A>
> >> \$450.00 \$279.95
> >> Angled-front version.
> >> Power: 120 watts
> >> Impedance: 8 ohms
> >> Speakers: 4 x 12 in. Marshall/Celestion custom-designed speakers =
>(30W
>
> >> each)
> >> Dimensions (W x H x D): 26.4 x 26.4 x 14.0 in.
> >>
> >>
> >> <http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960A>
> >> \$1,150.00 \$649.95
> >> Angled-front version.
> >> Black grille cloth
> >> White piping
> >> Black elephant grain vinyl
> >> Speaker: 4 x 12 in. G12T-75
> >> Power: 300 watt
> >> Impedance: 4 or 16 ohms mono/8 ohms stereo
> >> Dimensions: 760 x 830 x 360mm
> >> Weight: 36.4 kg
> >>

> >>
 > >> <http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960AX>
 > >> \$1,500.00 \$1,049.00
 > >> Angled front
 > >> Vintage-circa early 70's
 > >> Checkered cloth
 > >> White piping
 > >> Medium size white logo
 > >> Black Levant vinyl
 > >> Gold beading on Cab
 > >> Speakers: 4 Celestion G12 M-25w SPKR-00016
 > >> Power: 100 watts
 > >> Impedance: 16 ohm
 > >> Dimensions: 760 x 830 x 360 mm
 > >> Weight: 37.7 kg
 > >> Cover: COVR-00022 optional
 > >>
 > >>
 > >> <http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960AHW>
 > >> \$1,800.00 \$1,200.00
 > >> Loaded with Celestion G12H-30 re-issue speakers.
 > >> To complement the 1959HW's visual and sonic majesty, Marshall =
 >offers the
 >
 > >> 1960AHW (angled) 4x12 cabinet. It boasts basket weave fret cloth, =
 >metal
 >
 > >> handles, "100" logos, and is loaded with Celestion's =
 >highly-acclaimed
 >
 > >> G12H-30 re-issue speakers.
 > >>
 > >>
 > >>=20
 > >
 > >
 >
 >
 >
 >I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?
 ><http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>
 >
 ><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
 ><HTML><HEAD>
 ><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
 >charset=3Diso-8859-1">
 ><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3DGENERATOR>
 ><STYLE></STYLE>

```

></HEAD>
><BODY bgColor=#ffffff>
><DIV><FONT face=Arial size=2>DC,</FONT></DIV>
><DIV><FONT face=Arial size=2>I never thought of that?!!! It =
>makes sense=20
>though.</FONT></DIV>
><DIV><FONT face=Arial size=2>Tom</FONT></DIV>
><DIV><FONT face=Arial size=2></FONT> </DIV>
><DIV> </DIV>
><DIV><FONT face=Arial size=2></FONT> </DIV>
><BLOCKQUOTE=20
>style="PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
>BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
> <DIV>"DC" <<A =
>href="mailto:dc@spammersinLA.org">dc@spammersinLA.org</A>>=20
> wrote in message <A=20
> href="news:45104da6$1@linux">news:45104da6$1@linux</A>...</DIV><BR>I
=
>had a=20
> Mesa MKII-C with a seperate vented box with an =
>EVM12-L.<BR><BR>Yeoww! =20
> That thing was *loud*, and clean too. Good =
>tone.<BR><BR>Most=20
> players don't know that a 1x12 cuts through a lot better<BR>than a =
>4x12, all=20
> else being equal. If you just want a clear, =
>powerful<BR>lead tone,=20
> a single speaker just rules. If you want a huge sound, =
>and<BR>can=20
> live with a bit less clarity, then a 4x12 is the=20
> ticket.<BR><BR>DC<BR><BR>"Dubya Mark Wilson" <<A=20
> =
>href="mailto:mark.xspam@avidrecording.com">mark.xspam@avidrecording.com=
></A>>=20
> wrote:<BR>>I know this will probably be met with a lot of =
>"you-oughta=20
> try's" but I<BR>have <BR>>been using 1x12's exclusively for 21 =
>years. =20
> Moreover, loaded with EV 12-L<BR><BR>>Series II spkrs. Rated @ =
>300w,=20
> most players would run, not walk, from these<BR><BR>>for distortion =
>of any=20
> kind. And while I can't really tell you how or why<BR>I =
><BR>>decided=20
> that these were my best option, they remain just that. Next =
>to<BR>a=20
> <BR>>good FOH eng, these are the most significant components in my =
>signal=20

```

> path.

>I've never looked back. Maybe because my 1x12's =
 >were=20
 > custom built and based

>on an old Pacific (Michael Forest) =
 >design=20
 > and employ high grade, slow
>growth, light-but-dense Norwegien=20
 > fir. I use just one primarily but when

>the stage is =
 >big=20
 > enough and the players be fine, I switch the old 50/50
to =
 >
>stereo=20
 > and run the twin cabs about 20' apart, 10' away, pointing back,=20
 > up

>and and slightly in and jump feet first into what one of =
 >my gig=20
 > compadres

>calls "one big luxurious stereo sonic=20
 > bathtub."
>
>W.
>
>"Aaron Allen" <<A=20
 > =
 >href=3D"mailto:know-spam@not_here.dude">know-spam@not_here.dude> =
 >wrote in=20
 > message
>news:450a08d7@linux...
>> I'm looking at =
 >picking up a=20
 > 4x12 to club gig with. Anybody got experience

>> to share =
 >with me=20
 > about these models??
>> Is there 'really' a \$1000 dollars =
 >worth of=20
 > difference in tone from bottom

>> to top with them, is it =
 >
 > mechanics (like say, casters and handles)?
>> I will be =
 >driving it=20
 > with a 60wpc tube amp with a tube preamp front end.

>> I =
 >want the=20
 > elusive 'brown sound' distortion and super clear =
 >cleans...

>>=20
 > which the amp/preamp combo is certainly capable of giving me. It's=20
 > the

>> cabs that suck on my current gear (2 unmatched =
 >2x12's) - I=20
 > wish to move
to
>> one stereo matched cab, and I'm not =
 >afraid to=20
 > rewire it if that matters.
>> Many thanks in=20
 > advance!
>>
>>
>> <A=20
 > =
 >href=3D"https://www.zzounds.com/item--MSHMG412A">https://www.zzounds.com/=
 >item--MSHMG412A
>>=20
 > \$450.00 \$279.95
>> Angled-front=20
 > version.
>> Power: 120 watts
>> Impedance: 8=20
 > ohms
>> Speakers: 4 x 12 in. Marshall/Celestion =
 >custom-designed=20
 > speakers (30W

>> each)
>> Dimensions (W x H x =
 >D): 26.4 x=20
 > 26.4 x 14.0 in.
>>
>>
>> <A=20

> =
>href=3D"http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960A">http://www.zzounds.com/ite=
>m--MSH1960A
>>=20
> \$1,150.00 \$649.95
>> Angled-front=20
> version.
>> Black grille cloth
>> White =
>piping
>>=20
> Black elephant grain vinyl
>> Speaker: 4 x 12 in. =
>G12T-75
>>=20
> Power: 300 watt
>> Impedance: 4 or 16 ohms mono/8 ohms=20
> stereo
>> Dimensions: 760 x 830 x 360mm
>> Weight: =
>36.4=20
> kg
>>
>>
>> <A=20
> =
>href=3D"http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960AX">http://www.zzounds.com/it=
>em--MSH1960AX
>>=20
> \$1,500.00 \$1,049.00
>> Angled=20
> front
>> Vintage-circa early 70's
>> Checkered=20
> cloth
>> White piping
>> Medium size white =
>logo
>>=20
> Black Levant vinyl
>> Gold beading on Cab
>> =
>Speakers: 4=20
> Celestion G12 M-25w SPKR-00016
>> Power: 100 =
>watts
>>=20
> Impedance: 16 ohm
>> Dimensions: 760 x 830 x 360 =
>mm
>>=20
> Weight: 37.7 kg
>> Cover: COVR-00022=20
> optional
>>
>>
>> <A=20
> =
>href=3D"http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960AHW">http://www.zzounds.com/i=
>tem--MSH1960AHW
>>=20
> \$1,800.00 \$1,200.00
>> Loaded with =
>Celestion=20
> G12H-30 re-issue speakers.
>> To complement the 1959HW's =
>visual and=20
> sonic majesty, Marshall offers the

>> 1960AHW (angled) =
>4x12=20
> cabinet. It boasts basket weave fret cloth, metal

>> =
>handles,=20
> "100" logos, and is loaded with Celestion's =
>highly-acclaimed

>>=20
> G12H-30 re-issue speakers.
>>
>>
>>=20
>
>
>
</BLOCKQUOTE>
><DIV>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, =
>and=20
>you?
<A=20
>href=3D"http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html">http://www.polesoft.com/refer=
>.html </DIV></BODY></HTML>
>

>;o)

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>I'm never going to start another political thread here as long as I

>live.....which may not be that long because the terrorists

>are.....ahhh...nevermind.....

>

>;o)

>

>"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:450ff17a\$1@linux...

>>

>>

>> Does anybody remember that post from Chuck? ;o)

>>

>> Just a little hint. I love talking politics as much as the next man of

>course...

>> but I refrain these days due to my role as head newsgroup dude...

>>

>> Mind you we seem to be staying fairly civil about things generally which

>> is great to see. No intolerable meaningless abuse that I've noticed.

>Perhaps

>> we could move some of the politics on to the General group though if we

>want

>> to keep it going. I know some on the group aren't fans of politics in

the

>> main group, which I understand and appreciate.

>>

>> Finish your discussions if you feel the need, but any new threads might

be

>> better placed in General if that's cool... I don't want to damp

Subject: Re: OT:movie on 911-youve got to see this
Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 16:28:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gt;>> >

>>>

>>

>>

>

>Bill is most certainly running again.....he's just wearing a dress this time.

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45107e39@linux...

>

> Our situation is directly related to more than half a century of our

> decisions and actions, smart and stupid.
>
> It's of limited usefulness to hone in on the last administration as if
> that's the entire problem, surely you would have to take into account
> decisions made before then and since then.
>
> So while I agree with your point to an extent, it's insufficient to
> inoculate the current admin from its own significant problems.
>
> Bill and George aren't running again so we don't have to argue that one.
> I am not writing off either major party or a third party, but we need a
> change on many levels.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>
>
> DJ wrote:
> >> But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
> >> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
> >
> > Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based
their
> > decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of the
Clinton
> > administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other
reason
> > than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the same
> > misguided souls with the same naive and misguided foreign policy ideas
to
> > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
yes.....it
> > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
> > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in the
white
> > House.
> >
> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:451035a7@linux...
> >> For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided between
> >> both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go around.
> >> It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous administration
> >> on a number of counts.
> >>
> >> And in retrospect, those Dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
> >> vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
> >>

> >> Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are controlled
> >> by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at some
of
> >> the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
backwards
> >> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
> >>
> >> They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
> >> government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
> >> overall, domestically and internationally.
> >>
> >> Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
> >> At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with
> >> those in charge now.
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> -Jamie
> >> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> DJ wrote:
> >>> The Dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
last
> >>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
> >>>
> >>> How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that they
> >>> created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and
> > blame
> >>> for their decisions so they can vote for the war before they vote
> > against
> >>> it.
> >>>
> >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:450f8aec@linux...
> >>>> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
> >>>> things could have been handled better under the previous government.
> >>>>
> >>>> The transition of power between the previous and current governments
> > was
> >>>> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed the
> >>>> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
> >>>>
> >>>> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
> >>>> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
> >>>> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed
to
> >>>> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;

> >>>> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
 > >>>> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed to
 > >>>> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
 > >>>> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
 terrorism"
 > >>>> for domestic political ends.
 > >>>>
 > >>>> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and
 > > Bush
 > >>>> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of the
 > >>>> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
 government,
 > >>>> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
 > >>>> power in Iraq after the invasion.
 > >>>>
 > >>>> The Dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
 last
 > >>>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
 > >>>>
 > >>>> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
 > >>>>
 > >>>> Cheers,
 > >>>> -Jamie
 > >>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
 > >>>>
 > >>>>
 > >>>> DJ wrote:
 > >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
 > > news:450f3862@linux...
 > >>>>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the
 nature
 > >>>> of
 > >>>>>> the threat.
 > >>>>>> Agreed.
 > >>>>>>
 > >>>>>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
 > >>>>>>> before the 9/11 attack.
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terrorism
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
 > > overreacting
 > >>>>>>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
 > >>>>>>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
 > >>>>>>>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has
 > > always
 > >>>>>>>> been
 > >>>>>>>>> the *clear and present danger* prerogative but it needs to be based

on
> >>>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that
> > Bush,
> >>>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the
invasion
> > of
> >>>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before
> > they
> >>>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
> >>> stomach
> >>>> the hypocrisy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
> > intelligence
> >>>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
> >>> decisions
> >>>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first
> > place.
> >>>> Regards,
> >>>>
> >>>> Deej
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication
> > of
> >>>> some
> >>>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we
blow
> >>> the
> >>>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>> news:450f0b12@linux...
> >>>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not
news,
> >>>>> it's
> >>>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that
> > others
> >>>>> do
> >>>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid
as
> >>>>> well,
> >>>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.

> >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise
 > > money
 > >>>>> and
 > >>>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly.
 It
 > >>>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a
 declared
 > >>>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to
 > >>> have
 > >>>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess.
 > > How
 > >>>>> do
 > >>>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead
 balloon
 > > in
 > >>>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say,
 > > Iraq.
 > >>>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
 > >>>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying
 to
 > >>> get
 > >>>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
 > >>>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
 > >>>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is
 nothing
 > >>>>> holy
 > >>>>>>> about war.
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>> Cheers,
 > >>>>>>> -Jamie
 > >>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>> DJ wrote:
 > >>>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al
 > >>> Quaeda
 > >>>>>>> just
 > >>>>>>>> came out with an ultimatum stating that it's full on war now and
 > > the
 > >>>>>>> west

> >>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to

> >>>>>>> Islam. So

> >>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?

> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message

> >>>>>>> news:450ee7ef@linux...

> >>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of

> > our

> >>>>>>> own.

> >>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.

> >>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>> Cheers,

> >>>>>>>> -Jamie

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

> >>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>> DJ wrote:

> >>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom

> >>> line

> >>>> is

> >>>>>>>> that

> >>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.

> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message

> >>>>>>>>> news:450ec970@linux...

> >>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly

> > not

> >>>>> for

> >>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects,

> >>>>> even

> >>>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things

> >>> have

> >>>>>>>>> been

> >>>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist

> >>>>> Christians.

> >>>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain

> >>>>> extremist

> >>>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps

> >>> seem

> >>>>>>> to

> >>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more
power
> >>>>>> hungry
> >>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
> > religious
> >>>>> wars
> >>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left&q

Subject: Re: OT:movie on 911-youve got to see this
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 16:37:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

uot; or
> > "secularists"
> >>>>> or
> >>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I
> > think
> >>> a
> >>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants.
> > It
> >>>>>>>>> doesn't
> >>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
> >>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here,
> > too.
> >>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep
> >>> does
> >>>>>>> that
> >>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would
have
> >>> been
> >>>>>>> an
> >>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only
> > very
> >>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
> >>> hung
> >>>>> on
> >>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
> >>> universe
> >>>>>>>>> while
> >>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
describes
> >>> the
> >>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.

[illegible]

in
> >>>> power.
> >>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason
and
> >>> the
> >>>>>>>> focus
> >>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
> >>>> victory.
> >>>>>>>>>> ;^)
> >>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
> >>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
interested.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> -----
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> >>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

of
> >>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a
God
> >>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law
of
> >>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
> > belief

> >>> Benedict
> >>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
> >>> humanists
> >>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded
the

> >>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the
> > clash
> >>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
> > Manuel

> > there
> >>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his
> > command

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top
Shiite
> >>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> >>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him
of
> >>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >>>>>>>>>>

Islam

> >>> and
> >>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage
that
> >>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that
> >>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>> The
> >>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to
force
> >>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need
not
> > be

only
> >>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> >>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is
> > created

> >>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of
some

> >>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any

> >>> to

> >>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western

> >>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought

> >>> than

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> > cleric

> >>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

Pope

> >>> to

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope
was,

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,

Pope

> >>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is

> > not

> >>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims

> > and

> >>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he

> > not

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point
is
> >>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
> >>>>>>>>>>

over

> > is

saying

> >>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are
waging
> > a
> >>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
jihad.

> >>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >>>>>>>>>>

flip

> >>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than
in
> >>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
> >>> Islamists
> >>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and
> > demand
> >>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs
> > of
> >>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> >>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
> > secularist
> >>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
> >>> editorializes:

> > Islamists,
> >>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power.
While
> >>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of

Subject: Re: OT:movie on 911-youve got to see this
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 17:43:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

```
> >>>>>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there  
> > can
```

```
> > pact  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the  
> > collapse  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is  
having  
> > to
```


> > administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other reason
> > than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the same
> > misguided souls with the same naive and misguided foreign policy ideas to
> > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
> > yes.....it
> > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
> > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in the
> > white
> > House.
> >
> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:451035a7@linux...
> > >
> > > For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided between
> > > both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go around.
> > > It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous administration
> > > on a number of counts.
> > >
> > > And in retrospect, those Dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
> > > vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
> > >
> > > Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are
controlled
> > > by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at some
of
> > > the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
backwards
> > > in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
> > >
> > > They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
> > > government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
> > > overall, domestically and internationally.
> > >
> > > Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
> > > At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with
> > > those in charge now.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > -Jamie
> > > <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > DJ wrote:
> > > > The Dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
> > last

> > > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
> > >
> > > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that
they
> > > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and
> > blame
> > > for their decisions so they can vote for the war before they vote
> > against
> > > it.
> > >
> > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:450f8aec@linux...
> > >> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
> > >> things could have been handled better under the previous
government.
> > >>
> > >> The transition of power between the previous and current
governments
> > was
> > >> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed
the
> > >> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
> > >>
> > >> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
> > >> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
> > >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed
> to
> > >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
> > >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
> > >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed
to
> > >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
> > >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
> terrorism"
> > >> for domestic political ends.
> > >>
> > >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and
> > Bush
> > >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of
the
> > >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
> government,
> > >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
> > >> power in Iraq after the invasion.
> > >>
> > >> The Dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
> last
> > >> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.

> > > >

> > > > Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."

> > > >

> > > > Cheers,

> > > > -Jamie

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

> > > >

> > > >

> > > > DJ wrote:

> > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message

> > news:450f3862@linux...

> > > > > Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the

> nature

> > > > of

> > > > > the threat.

> > > > > Agreed.

> > > > >

> > > > > We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999,

> well

> > > > > before the 9/11 attack.

> > > > >

> > > > > http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terrorism

> > > > >

> > > > > We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of

> > overreacting

> > > > > or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted

> > > > > preemptive attack policy. :^)

> > > > > I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has

> > always

> > > > > been

> > > > > the *clear and present danger* prerogative but it needs to be based

> on

> > > > > accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that

> > Bush,

> > > > > Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the

> invasion

> > of

> > > > > Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's

> before

> > they

> > > > > were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to

> > > > > stomach

> > > > > the hypocrisy of the democrats whose policies neutered our

> > intelligence

> > > > > services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the

> > > > > decisions

> > > > > made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first

> > place.

> > > >
> > > > Regards,
> > > >
> > > > DeeJ
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > -Jamie
> > > > <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > DJ wrote:
> > > > > I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is
indication
> > of
> > > > some
> > > > > sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we
> blow
> > > the
> > > > > threat away before it pays us a visit?
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:450f0b12@linux...
> > > > > > Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not
> news,
> > > > > it's
> > > > > > an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that
> > others
> > > > do
> > > > > > something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid
> as
> > > > > well,
> > > > > > my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise
> > money
> > > > > and
> > > > > > convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly.
> It
> > > > > > works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a
> declared
> > > > > > interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial
to
> > > > have
> > > > > > the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole

mess.

> > How

> > > > > do

> > > > > > you declare war on a tactic?

> > > > > >

> > > > > > Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead

> balloon

> > in

> > > > > > the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say,

> > Iraq.

> > > > > >

> > > > > > Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist

> > > > > > tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying

> to

> > > > get

> > > > > > by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are

> > > > > > attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group

with

> > > > > > fantasies of violence in the USA.

> > > > > >

> > > > > > Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is

> nothing

> > > > > holy

> > > > > > about war.

> > > > > >

> > > > > > Cheers,

> > > > > > -Jamie

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

> > > > > >

> > > > > >

> > > > > >

> > > > > > DJ wrote:

> > > > > > I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet.

Al

> > > > Quaeda

> > > > > just

> > > > > > came out with an ultimatum stating that it's full on war now

and

> > the

> > > > > west

> > > > > > will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to

convert

> to

> > > > > Islam. So

> > > > > > where to you draw the line between irrationality and self

> defense?

> > > > > >

> > > > > >

> > > > > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:450ee7ef@linux...
> > > > > > Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality
of
> > our
> > > > > own.
> > > > > > There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Cheers,
> > > > > > -Jamie
> > > > > > http://www.JamieKruz.com
> > > > > >

Subject: Re: OT:movie on 911-youve got to see this
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 17:46:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

r />
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > DJ wrote:
> > > > > > It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The
bottom
> > > > line
> > > > is
> > > > > that
> > > > > > it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:450ec970@linux...
> > > > > > The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity.
Certainly
> > not
> > > > for
> > > > > > Lutherans, and for good reason.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian
> sects,
> > > > even
> > > > > > other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher
> things
> > > > have
> > > > > > been
> > > > > > said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
> > > > > Christians.
> > > > > > And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
> > > > > extremist
> > > > > > Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both

> camps
 > > > seem
 > > > > > to
 > > > > > > > be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more
 > power
 > > > > > hungry
 > > > > > > > ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
 > > religious
 > > > > wars
 > > > > > > > for their own questionable ends.
 > > > > > > >
 > > > > > > > It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
 > > "secularists"
 > > > > or
 > > > > > > > even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I
 > > think
 > > > > a
 > > > > > > > whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he
 wants.
 > > It
 > > > > > > doesn't
 > > > > > > > matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality,
 Papal
 > > > > > > > > > declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics
 here,
 > > too.
 > > > > > > > > > Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how
 deep
 > > > > does
 > > > > > > that
 > > > > > > > > > go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would
 > have
 > > > > been
 > > > > > > an
 > > > > > > > > > exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
 > > > > > > > > >
 > > > > > > > > > The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which
 only
 > > very
 > > > > > > > > > recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The
 church
 > > > > hung
 > > > > > > on
 > > > > > > > > > tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
 > > > > > > > > > universe
 > > > > > > > > > while
 > > > > > > > > > > > denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
 > describes

> > > the
> > > > > > > > actual way the solar system works.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
> similarly
> > > > > > > > insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is
> > only
> > > > > > about
> > > > > > > > 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations
> and
> > > > > clever
> > > > > > > > (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
> centuries
> > > > > ago,
> > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the
> > contrary.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian
> churches
> > > > > who,
> > > > > > > > feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and
ever-mounting
> > > > > evidence
> > > > > > of
> > > > > > > > evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
> clothing,
> > > > and
> > > > > who
> > > > > > > > seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who
pay
> > big
> > > > > bucks
> > > > > > > > to spread denial about global warming for short term gain.
> Who
> > > > push
> > > > > to
> > > > > > > > control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns
> > blazing,
> > > > > our
> > > > > > > > soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
> > > > > sometimes
> > > > > > > > hide behind Christianity to do so.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who
find

> > ways
> > > > to
> > > > > > > pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And
> in
> > > > > > spreading
> > > > > > > this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them
> in
> > > > power.
> > > > > > > And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason
> and
> > > the
> > > > > focus
> > > > > > on the use of force.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
> > > > victory.
> > > > > > ;^)
> > > > > > > Have a great week!
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Cheers,
> > > > > > -Jamie
> > > > > > <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > DC wrote:
> > > > > > > I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
> interested.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Have a great Monday!
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > -----
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> > > > > > > By Andrew Walden
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial
> > > > > > > speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's
University
> of
> > > > > > > Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a
> God
> > > > > > > > whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the
law
> of
> > > > > > > > non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
> > belief
> > > > > > > > in a God not bound by anything-including his own words.

> > > Benedict
 > > > > > > > > > further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
 > > > humanists
 > > > > > > > > > who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
 > > > > > > > > >
 > > > > > > > > > In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded
 > the
 > > > > > > > > > Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
 > > > > > > > > > genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
 > > > > > > > > > Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the
 > > clash
 > > > > > > > > > of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror.
 His
 > > > > > > > > > analysis also explains the underlying cause of the
 alliance
 > > > > > > > > > between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
 > > > > > > > > >
 > > > > > > > > > Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
 > > > > > > > > > Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
 > > Manuel
 > > > > > > > > > II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and
 > > there
 > > > > > > > > > you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his
 > > command
 > > > > > > > > > to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
 > > > > > > > > >
 > > > > > > > > > Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
 > > > > > > > > > unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top
 > Shiite
 > > > > > > > > > cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling
 party
 > > > > > > > > > likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused
 him
 > of
 > > > > > > > > > reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
 > > > > > > > > >
 > > > > > > > > > "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks on
 > Islam
 > > > > and
 > > > > > > > > > jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage
 > that
 > > > > > > > > > many fear could burst into violent protests like those
 that
 > > > > > > > > > followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet
 > Muhammad."
 > > > > > > > > >
 > > > > > > > > > Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the
 Pope's

[illegible]

> was,
 > > >>>>>>>>> "calling a spade a spade".
 > > >>>>>>>>>
 > > >>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,
 > "Pope
 > > >>>>>>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false. The
 > Pope
 > > 's
 > > >>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason
 is
 > > not
 > > >>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What
 Muslims
 > > and
 > > >>>>>>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to enter
 > > >>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare
 he
 > > not
 > > >>>>>>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the so-called
 > > >>>>>>>>> "insult."
 > > >>>>>>>>>
 > > >>>>>>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize"
 for
 > > >>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the
 point
 > is
 > > >>>>>>>>> lost on them.
 > > >>>>>>>>>
 > > >>>>>>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the world
 > over
 > > >>>>>>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war -
 > jihad -
 > > is
 > > >>>>>>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence." In
 > saying
 > > >>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are
 > waging
 > > a
 > > >>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
 > > >>>>>>>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this
 > jihad.
 > > >>>>>>>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your
 > 'spiritual
 > > '
 > > >>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
 > > >>>>>>>>>
 > > >>>>>>>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The
 > > >>>>>>>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely the

> flip
> > > > > > > > > side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear
than
> in
> > > > > > > > > the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
> > > > Islamists
> > > > > > > > > are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and
> > demand
> > > > > > > > > to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging
mobs
> > of
> > > > > > > > > semi-lite

Subject: Re: OT:movie on 911-youve got to see this
Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 18:12:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not
reason.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope
> > was,
> > > > > > > > > "calling a spade a spade".
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,
> >

Subject: Re: OT:movie on 911-youve got to see this
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 18:24:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ave
>>>>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess.
>>> How
>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead
> balloon
>>> in
>>>>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say,

