

“Beck benefits directly from taxpayer bailout dollars”

Why should he lose his job if he disagrees? (0+ / 0-)

Whether he is working with GM or for GM, why should he quit his job because of big government intervention? Should everyone who works for GM, who disagrees with the bailout, quit their job too?

I think this is a dumb reason for a post...an attempt to smear someone who is on the right...someone who cares about this country enough to shed a tear for it when he sees it going down the tubes.

And need I remind you that he was right about the bailout - GM is finally filing for bankruptcy, something they could have done back in Nov, before we wasted billions propping them up.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 07:38:58 AM PDT](#)

◦ **huh? (3+ / 0-)**

Have you been away? Were they nice there at the sanitarium?
who cares about this country enough to shed a tear for it when he sees it going down the tubes

He sheds a tear to get ratings. He slams GM, slams the bailout, calls those trying to salvage millions of jobs traitors, takes the money. What part of the "free market economy" that he so virulently defends against its "enemies" is involved in his picking my (taxpayer's) pocket to subsidize his show?

by [kay dub](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 07:46:03 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

▪ **are you kidding me? (0+ / 0-)**

So what, no one on TV can do anything sincerely? Everything is just to get ratings? I would say that if you can't see the sincerity in his show, then perhaps you are letting your bias cloud your vision. It's one thing to disagree with him, but another to question his integrity. In terms of GM, he's doing a job and getting income from it. If you want to say that his show is being subsidized by the government, then maybe you need to ask they govt why they are doing it. It's not his fault that Bush N Obama gave GM bailout money. So I'm afraid your complaint is with them, not with Beck.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 07:55:09 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

I cannot stand Glenn Beck.... (1+ / 0-)

...but there are plenty of us who are against, very vocally against, the bailout money that has gone to Wall Street and to the auto industry. Those of us on the left are against government bailouts for very different reasons (we know corporations don't work to further national interests, and often work against them as seen in the mortgage meltdown; we know that corporations rape the environment and stomp on workers' rights) than those on the right (they believe government is, now that the Democrats own the White House, somehow become too big).

That said, if *Car & Driver* magazine has GM ads, are they also not sucking on the teet of big government? Is anyone who exchanges services with GM (like being paid to be a spokesperson or like being paid to provide ad space in a newspaper or magazine) benefitting from GM's bailout money? Is Jed Lewison arguing then that all of us on the left (and those on the right) should boycott GM so that we are not in anyway benefitting from GM's bailout money?

I guess I find this diary to be a very lame attack on someone who is very easy to attack.

This diary only reinforces my belief that *the very right* and *the very left* have the government bailout issue right (again, for different reasons). It's rare that the far right and far left agree on an important issue, and the bailout issue is one of those cases where they do.

by [BoxerDave](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 08:04:59 AM PDT](#)

◦ **EXACTLY! (0+ / 0-)**

You said it much better than I did. If someone has a beef with this, their beef is with the giver of bailout money (govt), not the indirect recipient.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 08:14:57 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

“Conservatives Speak On Gay Marriage”

I'm against same sex marriage because (0+ / 0-)

No. Not because I am a homophobe or anything of the like.

I am against it because it goes against the morality of God, and I can't vote for something like that.

I also oppose the court system legislating it into law.

So it's not always about money, some of us actually believe what we say.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 08:48:21 AM PDT](#)

- **While I vehemently disagree with you, I also (22+ / 0-)**

understand that it's a hard line to draw between your personal morality and that of others.

But please understand that what you are doing is imposing your personal, RELIGIOUS morality on me, in a way that has absolutely no effect on YOU one way or the other. My CIVIL marriage does not impinge on your RELIGIOUS rights in any way. But you are voting to deny ME civil rights because of your personal religion.

Civil is not religious.

Roman Catholics disapprove of divorce and remarriage but manage to coexist with people who are civilly divorced and remarried. As Andrew Sullivan pointed out in his essay on [Modernity and Faith](#), even while acknowledging these marriages as sacramentally invalid, the RC manage a modus vivendi with a culture that allows them.

I have no interest in forcing your church to marry gay people. But you are essentially making ME a member of your religion, and that is wrong.

by [I T](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 08:53:20 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **I appreciate what you said, but.... (1+ / 1-)**

It does affect me. It's affected many who disagree with it. For instance, there was a photographer in AZ who was asked to photograph a same sex ceremony and when she declined on the basis that she only photographs traditional weddings, she was sued for discrimination and she lost.

These are the implications of making same sex marriage law, and it has already affected many adversely. I don't remember the name, but

there was a catholic organization in MA who ran an adoption agency. It was against their beliefs to adopt out a child to a same sex couple, yet they were forced to comply with the law. They decided to shut their operation down.

So it isn't as simple as you make it sound.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:04:49 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **and if those same instances ([6+](#) / [0-](#))**
occurred to a black couple, you'd be okay with that?

by [dc 20005](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:09:32 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **huh? ([0+](#) / [0-](#))**
I'm not sure of your point exactly, but you are trying to equate the color of someone's skin to their sexual preference, there's a big difference there.
I know some of you don't believe it's a preference, but I think that there is more to the idea of being "products of our environment" that we want to believe.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:14:01 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Prove it. ([19+](#) / [0-](#))**
Don't you think you should offer a greater degree of proof than "I think" before you and those like you so willingly assign gays to second-class citizenship?

Don't tell me about the "new politics" if you're an asshole.

by [Ms Johnson](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:16:48 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Yes, I do think. (0+ / 0-)**
I was just making an assertion to what I believe.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:25:16 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **So you're saying religious discrimination is OK (10+ / 0-)**

After all, there's NO question religion is a choice - it would be meaningless if it wasn't.

I shall die, but that is all that I shall do for Death; I am not on his payroll. - Edna St. Vincent Millay

by [Tara the Antisocial Social Worker](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:17:48 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **Well, there is that ol' bill of rights (0+ / 0-)**
Not to be snotty, but freedom of religion is mentioned in the Bill of Rights and was part of the founding of this nation.
Same sex marriage is not.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:28:16 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **Freedom of religion (8+ / 0-)**
includes those of of us whose religion **does** allow for same-sex marriage.
It does not equal the right to force **your** religious beliefs on the rest of us.

I shall die, but that is all that I shall do for Death; I am not on his payroll. - Edna St. Vincent Millay

by [Tara the Antisocial Social Worker](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:31:41 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **So....if congress shall make no establishment... (0+ / 0-)**
of religion, then based on your argument same sex marriage should not be made legal.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:33:16 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **No, it means (7+ / 0-)**
religion should not be a factor in whether same-sex marriages are legal or not.

I shall die, but that is all that I shall do for Death; I am not on his payroll. - Edna St. Vincent Millay

by [Tara the Antisocial Social Worker](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:35:14 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **You can't have it both ways. (0+ / 0-)**
Religion is protected against discrimination in the Bill of Rights.
If you claim that same sex marriage is a function of your religion in that it should be protected as well, then it can never be made legal (establishment clause).
Otherwise you have to acknowledge that it isn't mentioned in the Bill of Rights.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:38:47 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **hmmmm am I supposed to be a lesbian? (5+ / 0-)**
By your standard, I should be.
I know some of you don't believe it's a preference, but I think that there is more to the idea of being "products of our

environment" that we want to believe.

I grew up playing with boys toys. I followed dad around the workshop and learned to fix everything from lawnmowers to the plumbing. I can roof a house. I wore boys clothes and avoided girls like the plague when I was young.

It turns out that I'm hetero. I could no more choose to fall in love with a woman than I could choose the color of my hair. I am what I am. I didn't grow up sexually confused. I just refused to conform to society's norm of what a girl was supposed to be.

In other words, I don't buy your argument. pfffft

The smallest feline is a masterpiece. ~Leonardo Da Vinci~
by [FrugalGranny](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:27:41 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Every situation doesn't yeild the same results.**
(0+ / 0-)

I didn't grow up with a positive father figure influence, yet I am not gay.

But the absence of a father is a contributing factor to a boy becoming gay. It doesn't mean that scenario will always produce the same result.

one minus one equals zero....only in math. It's not that way in complex relationships.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:31:36 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **I have two terrific parents (6+ / 0-)**
that must be why I'm bisexual. ;)

I shall die, but that is all that I shall do for Death; I am not on his payroll. - Edna St. Vincent Millay

by [Tara the Antisocial Social Worker](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:34:30 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **I grew up with a positive father figure ([13+](#) / [0-](#))**

and yet I am gay. This whole thing was debunked YEARS ago. I'd suggest it might behoove you to not attempt to manipulate the data to support your conclusions. In fact, it might be nice if actually provided some data, rather than mere assertions of entitlement.

by [sfbob](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:38:27 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **oh that's so much horseshit ([12+](#) / [0-](#))**

I didn't have a positive father figure either and didn't grow up gay. Wanna know why? I'M NOT GAY! It's very simple. My parents, good or bad, didn't have anything to do with my sexual preference.

A learning experience is one of those things that says, 'You know that thing you just did? Don't do that.' **Douglas Adams**

by [dougymi](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:38:44 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **You have no idea what you are talking about ([8+](#) / [0-](#))**

My partner is a psychiatrist. When he was in training they had a speaker who was a specialist gender identity and sexual orientation. They studied for patterns that were determinants that someone would grow up to be gay. You know what they found out. there is 1 thing that they all had in common. A fondness of spinning as a child. figure that one out.

by [dc 20005](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:39:22 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Sorry, I still don't buy it (10+ / 0-)**

But the absence of a father is a contributing factor to a boy becoming gay. It doesn't mean that scenario will always produce the same result.

My father, husband, and son grew up without a father figure. They are all hetero and well adjusted (not abusive, etc). My best friend from K through highschool, grew up with a great father figure (great mom too) and he was gay. You try to explain that, using your logic.

You're almost out for the count as your arguments hold no water.

The smallest feline is a masterpiece. ~Leonardo Da Vinci~

by [FrugalGranny](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:40:42 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **At what point did I (0+ / 0-)**

ever say that parents are the only contributing factor. By now, as opposed to when I was growing up, the gay lifestyle is all over tv and perhaps many of you know people who are openly gay.

I was only naming one instance of something that can be a contributing factor, but I NEVER stated that every outcome was the same. There are many variables.

I have a hard time believing though, that an infant can already be predisposed to the gay lifestyle, not even being able to think on a rational basis or speak.

I just don't believe it.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 03:07:50 PM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **Arizona doesn't have gay marriage ([8+](#) / [0-](#))**

and the Mass. agency could have continued to operate, just not with free tax money, because gay citizens shouldn't have their tax money used to fund discrimination against themselves. The agency had the option of continuing to function; they decided it wasn't worth it without the tax-free gravy train.

*I shall die, but that is all that I shall do for Death; I am not on his payroll. -
Edna St. Vincent Millay*

by [Tara the Antisocial Social Worker](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:16:17 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **I think they depended on that money. ([0+](#) / [0-](#))**

So because of a new law that affected them disproportionately, they have to change their business model? If there's no private money to fund them, they go out of business.

After all, they were doing a service to the public in finding homes for children. Now they aren't, which is a travesty.

And BTW, I don't think my money should be funding federal or international abortions, which I vehemently disagree with. Should I be able to direct where my tax money goes? Or stop paying taxes?

by [therightscoop](#) on [Wed Apr 08, 2009 at 09:22:36 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

“Pew Poll: People have Confidence in Obama, Not Republicans”

why did my comment get deleted? (0+ / 0-)

don't care for a different **opinion?**

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:22:03 AM PDT](#)

- **It wasn't deleted (6+ / 0-)**

This site does not delete comments.

It was given a troll rating by enough trusted users that now only TUs can see it.

And why was it given TRs? Because we thought it was garbage. Try again.

"But your flag decal won't get you into heaven anymore"--Prine 4240+ dead Americans. Bring them home.

by [Miss Blue](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:25:20 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **So you don't like a difference of opinion (0+ / 0-)**

Ok, I got it. Just like the Obama Administration.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:26:44 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **I won't speak for everyone else.... (4+ / 0-)**

but as for me, I have no problem with a difference of opinion. What I can't stand is Republicans. Therefore, I consider you the bottom of the barrel. Hence, anything you have to say has no importance whatsoever.

"But your flag decal won't get you into heaven anymore"--Prine 4240+ dead Americans. Bring them home.

by [Miss Blue](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:29:10 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **instructive, but not important (2+ / 0-)**

his little whine just above is a pretty cool micro case study.

1. He comes to the preeminent Dem blog in cyberspace
 2. Expects that a slam of Obama with no information at all will somehow be treated like a Thomas Paine pamphlet
 3. Doesn't read the site rules, the FAQ's, or anything else
 4. When those rules (as observed by the six and counting TU's-including mine-that hid his wittle blogfart) kick in, he assumes he's been sent to the online version of a FEMA camp
 5. He comes right back to that same Dem blog in full-on WATB mode
 6. He then expects someone to take the time to handhold him through this difficult experience, apologize, and set it all right
 7. When that doesn't happen, he attacks the messenger.
- It's really quite instructive, isn't it?
Is that you, Newt?

During the campaign, CHANGE was always in caps. I will not settle for small change.

by [kamarvt](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:43:16 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **Yeah, I'm a repub, so I must be like all other (0+ / 0-)**
republicans. You know, many people don't like to be judged by a label. Is that really what you are doing?

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 08:45:08 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **You obviously have not figured out what site you ([2+ / 0-](#))**
are on. Perhaps you should read more and learn; THEN offer constructive criticism.

by [Phil S 33](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:38:24 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **I am aware of the site. ([0+ / 0-](#))**
Just thought I would join the discussion. Doesn't Obama preach bipartisan support? I am here to talk.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:43:19 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **bring some facts and data to the discussion ([2+ / 0-](#))**
and you are most welcome.
Just some friendly advice.

"Politics is the art of looking for trouble, finding it everywhere, diagnosing it incorrectly and applying the wrong remedies." - Groucho Marx

by [DemFromCT](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:48:28 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **I did, I just didn't want 2 retype my blog entry ([0+ / 0-](#))**
I mean, there is a link system here, so I didn't feel like I was doing anything wrong.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:53:31 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **So you didn't bring them ([1+ / 0-](#))**
How hard is it to copy and paste? I don't jump to links if I have no idea what they are discussing. Do you?
Maybe you knew you had nothing to defend your

claim so you decided to play victim instead.

[Single payer universal healthcare coverage](#)

saves money and saves lives.

by [freelunch](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 09:07:23](#)

[AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Ok, then I apologize. (0+ / 0-)**

Next time I'll be more clear. I simply thought my blog post was clear enough, but I understand your point.

Thanks.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at](#)

[09:15:49 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **No,,,, (1+ / 0-)**

You aren't here to talk - you are here to insult, slam, and badger.

They will learn that Obama is going to harm this country far greater than any other president ever has. Unless they fall for the "blame it on the bush administration" approach:

This is your entire post, without the link to your blog.

Now why the hell would I click on a link to the blog of an obvious troll, based on that comment?

If you wanted talk, you would come here with an open mind, ask questions, present your solution to whatever issue you were on about, and then courteously respond to feedback.

You have done nothing of the sort.

Sorry, but when you go into enemy territory, it is on you to earn enough credibility to be listened to. You have failed.

"But your flag decal won't get you into heaven anymore"--Prine 4240+ dead Americans. Bring them home.

by [Miss Blue](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 08:02:40 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **So did you not see me here yesterday? (0+ / 0-)**

I was discussing...listening to other point of views. Today, I just decided that I had already made a case on my blog and didn't want to retype it. If you don't want people to link to stuff, then you should ask that they disable it.

And btw, where's the insult? Have I called someone a name? Have I come and just fired off insults at people? I don't think so. And if you do, then perhaps you should check out my comments under my profile.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 08:48:33 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Ummm,,,,, (0+ / 0-)**

you insulted President Obama. Didn't criticize a policy, didn't complain about a decision, just insulted him with nothing to back it up.

Further, no, I did not see you yesterday. Thankfully.

And as stated previously, you have shown yourself to be an obvious troll. Why the hell would I click on one of your links? Since retyping a post seems to be so friggen hard for you, did you ever consider cut/paste? No? Not a surprise - you

Republicans seem to find thinking a major problem as well.

And yes, I am insulting you. I have no use for those who, when presented with overwhelming evidence of failure, criminality, and fraud by the Bush administration, still support that administration.

I would have some semblance of respect for you if you had said you oppose the positions of Barack Obama, you support the Republican Party, but you realize the Bush administration was a complete and utter failure. But no, you clearly show your continued admiration for the biggest failure in politics this country has ever witnessed, and slam Obama for not what he has done, but what you assume, with no basis in fact, will result from what he might do in the future.

And why I am still addressing you is beyond me. Believe me, no Republican posting on this site in five years has gotten this much communication from me. I love my country, and you people have shown that you don't. You love your Party - right or wrong, doesn't matter to you. As proven by your blind 100% support of the Dumbass in Chief and the piece of shit who gave

him his orders - Dick the dick Cheney.

*"But your flag decal won't get you into heaven anymore"--Prine
4240+ dead Americans. Bring them home.*

by [Miss Blue](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 09:15:20 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **So I approve of Bush for the most part. (0+ / 0-)**

I do disagree with the bailouts of 2008, and realize that communication with the American public was one of his major weakness, but do I support his policies for the most part (apart from immigration, and perhaps education), yes I do. I think the republicans over spent themselves when they were in power and Bush saw to that with the signing of the bills. But spending isn't the thing that Libs criticize, it's IRAQ. Bush was on par with the Clinton administration and all of the intelligence that suggested someone needed to do something about Saddam Hussein. Was the intelligence bad? Yes. Is the world a better place without him? Yes. Should Obama be thankful that he doesn't have to worry about Hussein? Yes. But the thing that gets me is that many people feel as though Bush made up fake evidence for the war, which is preposterous. If that's the case, then Clinton was wrong as well. Everyone believed that the Iraq war was needed until it got messy, until they couldn't substantiate the claims with the WMD's that everyone had previously thought he had. Then many turned on Bush, but what was he to do? Abandon the war he started? No, he went until victory was had.

So do I support Bush for the most part, absolutely. And I am not apologizing for that just to get someones respect.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 09:25:30 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Try the Google (0+ / 0-)**

Because once again you show your utter lack of the facts.

Bill Clinton warned Dumbass about **AL-QUEDA**.

Not Saddam, al-Queda.

But gee, they're interchangeable - to Republicans - like socks.

Further, the evidence is overwhelming that the intelligence was gamed. At best. At worst, it was lies made up from whole cloth.

And if you are so naive, stupid, close-minded, whatever, to think that Iraq is the only complaint about George Bush, you have most definitely NOT been paying attention.

DoJ? Katrina? FEMA? The economy? The deficit? The spending? NCLB? FISA? What the fuck - the list is practically endless. He did **NOTHING** right. Nothing. Name a topic - he fucked it up. Christ. Are you better off than you were in 2000? Are you? If so, you are one in a million and must be related to Cheney.

"But your flag decal won't get you into heaven anymore"--Prine 4240+ dead Americans. Bring them home.

by [Miss Blue](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 09:32:41 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Did I ever say the only thing? (0+ / 0-)**
Once again you change what I said. I said spending wasn't the thing libs criticized, it was Iraq. I never said it was the only thing. Do you remember HR 4655? I'll give you a link, but if you don't trust it you can search google for it. President Clinton signed it. It's called the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998:
<http://thomas.loc.gov/...>

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 09:40:14 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Bill Clinton didn't sign,,, (0+ / 0-)**
an authorization to invade a friggen
sovereign country.
Hated Saddam, but guess what?
None of my fucking business. Not.
My. Country. Oh, and let's not forget -
Iraq never did a fucking thing to us.
Last I looked, America did not
preemptively attack other countries.
No matter how much we dislike them.
Why is the Constitution so hard for
you guys to remember?

*"But your flag decal won't get you into
heaven anymore"--Prine 4240+ dead
Americans. Bring them home.*

by [Miss Blue](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009
at 09:47:52 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Well, it was pretty much the
step before auth. (0+ / 0-)**
to war. I mean, the title is:
"Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 -
Declares that it should be the
policy of the United States to
seek to remove the Saddam
Hussein regime from power in
Iraq and to replace it with a
democratic government."
He knew Sadam had to be
removed because he was a
threat. He knew they needed a
democracy. Maybe he didn't
want to give the next
administration a war, who
knows. But he signed it into
law. But you can keep believing
that they manufactured the
evidence. But this was evident
to the previous administration,

and congress agreed.
I don't think it's me who is
naive.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 09:57:02 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **Oh, and one other thing ([1+](#) / [0-](#))**

You notice the high approval ratings Obama gets from Democrats? Well, your fuck-up-in-chief got that same thing after 9/11. We all wanted him to succeed. We all stood behind him and with him. Democrats. We didn't have our public mouthpieces go on the air pleading for his failure. Our politicians gave him everything he wanted, with our blessings. So yes, we do walk the walk. We aren't asking anything of Republicans we haven't given first. You lost. The country has told you loudly, in poll after poll and election after election that you fucked up. George fucked up and so did his enablers. And still you cry and whine and insist you are right. And the loudest thing you can scream now is that you want Obama to fail. Not because his failure is the best thing for America - oh no. But it would be the best thing for your worthless Party. Yep, that's patriotic as hell, isn't it? You offer NO ideas, NO solutions, NO suggestions. All we get from you is the Democrats are evil, Obama sucks, George Bush Forevah! Sorry, but since half the country is fucking dying here, that ain't going to cut it.

"But your flag decal won't get you into heaven anymore"--Prine 4240+ dead Americans. Bring them home.

by [Miss Blue](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 09:23:02 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **No dear, I've never said I want him to fail ([0+](#) / [0-](#))**

Don't put words in my mouth. But he will fail with his current policies and he will take the whole country with him.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 09:27:19 AM PDT](#)
[[Parent](#)]

- **And by the way.... (5+ / 0-)**

How fucking stupid are you?

You come to a Democratic website - by definition - and you post insults about our newly-elected Democratic President.

What did you expect? We'd applaud you?

Sorry, but we on this side of the aisle are not batshit crazy, as you all seem to be.

"But your flag decal won't get you into heaven anymore"--Prine 4240+ dead Americans. Bring them home.

by [Miss Blue](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:27:45 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Seems to me that the insults are coming from you. (0+ / 0-)**

Don't blame me for what you are doing. We are seeing enough of that in the current administration.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 08:50:01 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Posting right-wing garbage will usually get you (2+ / 0-)**

a hide rating. Back up those statements in a diary and then let the discussion begin.

by [Phil S 33](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:36:34 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Once I can write a diary, I will. (0+ / 0-)**

But I think I am still too new to do it. I don't see the option to create one yet.

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:40:56 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **I doubt you'll last that long, troll. n/t ([1+](#) / [0-](#))**

The lesson of that history is that you must not despair, that if you are right, and you persist, things will change. -Howard Zinn

by [blueyedace2](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:42:28 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **So what classifies me as a troll? ([1+](#) / [0-](#))**

The fact that I want to discuss politics? The fact that I am open to listening to opposite side? Can't we disagree and still get along without the name calling?

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 07:45:02 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **Disagreeing is one thing, being disagreeable ([0+](#) / [0-](#))**

is another.

Flinging insults and offering no supporting evidence is the second. Act civilized or you will never be allowed to post a diary.

[Single payer universal healthcare coverage](#) saves money and saves lives.

by [freelunch](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 08:46:43 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]

- **When have I been uncivilized? ([0+](#) / [0-](#))**

If you would have clicked my blog post, you would have seen the facts, with links and all, to my argument. It was a long post so I simply decided to link to it instead of reposting it here. Is clicking links out of the question?

by [therightscoop](#) on [Thu Apr 09, 2009 at 08:53:21 AM PDT](#)

[[Parent](#)]