
REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by Voltaire - 2008/05/15 10:56

This thread discusses the Content article: REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Jack you are hitting the nail on the head once again. The sheer arrogance of protecting one's pork and filling their individual coffers, blinds them from caring for and serving the public.

Like I mentioned on an earlier post, we need a new group of soldiers in there to replace this selfish do nothing crowd. There are obvious individual exceptions, but the general trend is in a downward spiral.

In memory of my good friend John Nehring,, who always lived by his principles, these guys and gals don't deserve to be elected!

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by michbris - 2008/05/15 11:57

I remember the same headline from 2006. The Republicans deserve to lose. What a tragedy. There are so many great ideas and solutions to the problems facing our nation that are being offered by conservatives. But from President Bush on down, the Republican party is absolutely incapable of explaining, promoting, or defending them. Like millions of other pro-life, pro-capitalist, anti-big government citizens, I am left completely uninspired by John McCain. How on earth is he the last Republican standing? How on earth is it that among all of the brilliant conservatives working in government at the state and federal level, none have come forward to lead the party? The national Republican party has been taken over by posers and opportunists who claim to share our beliefs, but plainly do not. Some of the true believers also have had other bizarre beliefs or just come across as too weird for public office.

2008 is going to be a Democrat blow-out. I don't care about the latest scandal involving Barack Obama - the American people are going to vote for him, hands down. As Dr. Wheeler pointed out last year, we are going to see a temper tantrum this November, and we conservatives better get used to being in the wilderness a LONG time. Our leaders have failed us. No one has stepped forward. The near future, at least, belongs to the Democrats.

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by martinbb - 2008/05/15 16:46

short term pain for long term gain..... 1994 never would have happened if Slick Willie lost to GHWB.....

McCain is an a**hole who doesnt deserve our support nevermind our cash, lets just hope and pray that after a couple of years of unbound liberalism we can have another 1994 all over again....

keep hope alive !!!!

:laugh: :laugh: :laugh: :P :P :P ;) ;) :dry: :dry: :dry: :dry: :dry:

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by cephran - 2008/05/15 20:35

Michbris,

A ding to you my friend for nailing it. Excellent post!

Also, a ding to Jack Kelly for another spot on article that tells it like it is.

Keep up the great work Jack.

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by michbris - 2008/05/15 21:03

Thanks, Cephraan.

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by mwilwhite - 2008/05/15 21:43

Wait a minute; all is not lost yet. All we need is for the ragheads to jump the gun and do something stupid, or even attempt to do something stupid on our soil. (Or maybe the administration just tells us they attempted something?) Will Americans look to a slick-talking guy from Chicago with an Arabic middle name, who promises some nebulous version of 'change'; or will they look to the tried and true war hero for salvation from the islamist threat. Will they look for the latest version of 'peace in our time' because we can talk our enemies out of anything, including hating us? Or will they look to the closest version of 'give em hell, harry', the deeply flawed, but deeply patriotic, John S. McCain? Who would you choose?

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by jsnape - 2008/05/15 22:53

I get the feeling Barack will be such an utter failure and do nothing president, and the country will be so much worse off that there will be a comeback for republicans in two years.

I just can't see him getting anything done, and his cabinet will no doubt be a freak show of socialists (like Clintons was) that it will be a never ending parade of gaffes and fools that the country will not know whether to laugh or cry.

This whole "change" BS reminds me of some idiot kid who challenges your warning not to stick a fork in an electrical socket. After a while it's more fun to just sit back and enjoy the show. And especially the ending.

I watched McCains prediction of the future today. Actually it was kind of funny because I didn't catch the beginning. So for a while I thought he was talking about now, and had gone off the deep end. But his prediction will be so far from what will actually happen - mainly because in 2013, he'll probably still be a Senator. But a Senator with quite an embarrassing sound bite from 2008.

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by Jan - 2008/05/16 05:42

Not much can be done in today's sad reality, when local and national election for many became contest financed by public, private and corporate money and run under banner "You shall remember that you were born with hands bending torch yourself":angry:

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by ella - 2008/05/16 19:33

Just CRAP.....this ruins my weekend....:S

:angry: :angry: :angry:

=====

Anne Coulter article

Posted by spartan - 2008/05/16 19:41

This is a nice segue to Jack Kelly's article. It appears the mistrust of the GOP is being substituted with a different faux conservative. I guess when you stand for nothing, you vote for nothing. The only saving grace; I don't see the Dems keeping these seats with Obama at the top of the ticket. I don't see these faux conservatives surviving with a Chicago liberal as their leader. Look for voter depression/suppression.

Democrats' Hybrid Pickup Trucks

by Ann Coulter

Posted 05/14/2008 ET

Updated 05/14/2008 ET

On the very day of a special election to fill a vacated congressional seat this week in Mississippi, The New York Times accused the Republican candidate of running racist ads against his Democratic opponent.

Talk about dirty tricks! By The New York Times, that is.

The Republican thus accused of racism narrowly lost the election the night the Times article appeared, so I guess the Times can proclaim: "Mission Accomplished."

The ad in question, on behalf of Republican Greg Davis, pointed out that Barack Obama had endorsed Davis' opponent, Travis Childers -- another in a long line of fake-American goobers claiming to be "conservative Democrats," but who get to Congress and promptly vote to ban guns, surrender in Iraq and fund full-term abortions.

These days, I guess you can call yourself a "conservative Democrat" if you refrain from being sworn into Congress with your hand on a Quran.

The ad showed a clip of Obama's pastor g-damning America and mentioned Obama's recent remarks ridiculing rural folks for clinging to guns. It then concluded that Childers "took Obama's endorsement over our conservative values."

The Republicans had also run ads connecting Childers with other Washington liberals, such as Nancy Pelosi and John Kerry. (Times editors are still looking for the racist angle to those ads.)

To call that ad racist is a monstrous libel. Greg Davis and the Mississippi Republicans should bring a defamation action against The New York Times -- although such an action might be perceived as "racist" because some black people work at the Times.

Republicans are constantly linking the local hayseed Democrat to national liberals like John Kerry. The technique goes back at least to Michael Dukakis in 1988.

It is beyond outrageous for liberals to complain about the practice of linking Democrats to the national party when their calculated strategy in race after race in the red states has been to run Democratic candidates who appear to be Americans. They're not Americans. They're liberals! I don't care how much hay is sticking out of their straw hats.

In the 2006 midterm elections, Sen. Chuck Schumer and erstwhile ballerina Rep. Rahm Emanuel (now there's a couple of raw-boned Americans for you!) famously rounded up yokels from the local square dance contests to run as "macho Dems" -- as the Times admiringly called them. Schumer and the ballerina were hailed for their brilliant strategy to fool the hayseeds.

The phony blue-collar Democrats won their elections by driving around in pickup trucks and shooting guns, then moved to Washington and began voting against war in Iraq and in favor of taxpayer-funded abortions.

One of the Democrats' paragons of regular guy-ness that year was Jon Tester of Montana, who wore cowboy boots and had a buzz cut. The crew cut absolutely transfixed liberals in places like Manhattan. Search "Jon Tester and crew cut" on Google, and you'll get more than 200,000 hits. Even this tonsorial affectation was a liberal fake-out, inasmuch as Tester has no military service.

After campaigning throughout Montana in a pickup truck, Tester got to Washington and compiled a voting record more liberal than Chuck Schumer's, according to the liberal Americans for Democratic Action (Tester: 95 percent; Schumer: 90 percent). Tester also has a 100 percent rating from the pro-abortion group NARAL. There's your truck driving, gun-totin' Democrat.

Sen. Bob Casey Jr. was another consumer fraud perpetrated on voters in 2006 by the Democrats. Casey ran for office on the strength of his father's name and his alleged pro-life position. It was the pro-life position of his father -- the popular

Democratic governor of Pennsylvania -- that disqualified Casey Sr. from speaking at the Democratic National Convention in 1992.

Despite rumors that Schumer had assured Hillary Clinton that Casey was not really pro-life, the good people of Pennsylvania made him their senator, throwing out Rick Santorum, the kind of pro-lifer who actually opposes abortion.

In Casey's first year in office, he voted in favor of an amendment to a foreign appropriations bill introduced by the fanatically pro-abortion Barbara Boxer that overturned U.S. policy against providing taxpayer money to groups that perform abortions overseas. It also granted overseas abortion providers taxpayer money. There's a "pro-life Democrat" for you.

In elections in the patriotic parts of the country, Democrats keep producing candidates that look like they're out of a Norman Rockwell painting but vote like Karl Marx -- which is to say, they vote like the typical member of the Democratic Party. Naturally, Republicans respond to this tactic by linking the local phonies to the national party.

As soon as the Democrats stop running these mountebanks, Republicans will stop exposing them as lickspittles for their liberal masters in Washington.

=====

Re:Anne Coulter article

Posted by jsnape - 2008/05/17 00:28

On the bright side, what can definitely turn the tables of Congress in November is the increase in oil prices.

First off, every dumbocrat in congress is on the record as opposing drilling for oil. And at the current rate of increase a gallon of gas will be about \$5.00 if not more in November. It will be winter, the stories of high "heating oil" prices will be in the news. And not only will it be winter, it will probably be an early and chilly fall this year if the weather trend stays.

The best thing republicans could do would be to goad the dumbocrats up to the podium two or three times a week between now and November to re-affirm their stupidity to the American people.

At a certain price point even the most hopeless idiot among their base is going to turn on them. I just hope their leaders don't notice and pull a quick flip flop, like they did on Iraq. And pretend they were FOR drilling the whole time. Which is why republicans in congress need to push oil drilling like they've never pushed anything. And get those dumbs ON THE RECORD big time. They won't be able to flip flop and then make up a story about false intel.

Sway public opinion on drilling, and drill into their heads how the idiots on the other side are ruining their life. As icing on the cake, drag some poor family in front of a Congressional hearing to testify on how high fuel prices, due to democrats refusal to allow drilling, killed little Timmy, and permanently ruined their life. All they have left is the fight to get the Oil Drilling Act of 2008 (Timmy's Law) passed (a dem trick played back on them) "Those bastids killt mah Timmah!"

BTW - who the hell uses heating oil? Not that I mind the press harping on the price of heating oil all the time, but come on. I think most of the country has upgraded already.

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by ella - 2008/05/17 12:36

I disagree with you, Jack Kelly, when it comes to President Bush. It's not his fault that the Repubs haven't had any spine enough to counter the donkeys and their agenda. They did enough of undermining Bush the way the donkeys do. The President did all he could to fire them up and took them to tasks many times. But they don't listen to him. They are beholden to special interest groups. :dry: :S

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by Jan - 2008/05/17 20:27

The way things are looking now; in a year ahead we may talk about GW. Bush presidency as the good old years.

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by jsnape - 2008/05/18 08:26

The American people, in both parties, are demanding bigger government, less individual rights, more socialism, and they will get it, and they deserve to find out it's the worst thing for them.

This whole campaign has turned in to a sick joke on both sides. Both arguing whose path to socialism is quickest and best.

I don't want any politician on either side to speak of solving anything for me. I'd like to hear one say he's going to mind his own fucking business, and exterminate nations that attack us, or even harbor those that attack us, and exterminate without mercy. And tell me the details are none of MY business.

I'd like to see a politician who say's my health care is none of his damn business, and how much money I make is definitely none of his business.

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by tonova - 2008/05/18 08:43

"... the common people know what they want and deserve to get it good and hard!" :laugh:

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/05/18 09:24

Subject: Difference Between A conservative and a liberal

Fred Thompson and Hillary were walking down the street when they came to a homeless person. The Republican, Fred Thompson, gave the homeless person his business card and told him to come to his office for a job. He then took \$20 out of his pocket and gave it to the homeless person. Hillary was very impressed, so when they came to another homeless person, she decided to help. She walked over to the homeless person and gave him directions to the welfare office. She then reached into Thompson's pocket and got out \$20. She kept \$15 for her administrative fees and gave the homeless person \$5..Now, do you understand the difference?

Do you think the homeless guy understands the difference between the two, or even cares? Anyone who has discovered a way to loot the treasury will be a proponent of big government. After all, the bigger the government, the bigger the treasury; the bigger the treasury, the more to loot. Those looting the treasury only have their immediate wants in mind. They don't have a clue how the money actually gets into the treasury and probably don't care. The Democrats and the Republicans, to a lesser extent, are exploiting this for votes. We are being f***** over by both. They are all whores for votes. Staying in office is JOB ONE and don't you forget it. I'm of the opinion that only a revolution will bring us back to equilibrium. Revolutions are nasty, bloody things to undertake and win. Its been well over 200 years since we had such a cleansing experience in this nation. I don't for a minute believe we have the testicular fortitude to take our country back from the tyrants who currently rule. I'm nearly 60; we should have done this in my 20's. That is my generation's failure. The next generation needs to do it, or there won't be any freedom left on this continent to fight for.

=====

Re:Anne Coulter article

Posted by Voltaire - 2008/05/18 11:33

Here is a karma ding rolling your way, my good man! Hope to see you in August, its been way too long:-)

=====

Re:Anne Coulter article

Posted by kyledr5754 - 2008/05/18 13:48

Jack,

You are right on the money. What needs to happen in November is for the weak kneed and Rhino republicans to be driven out in massive numbers or leave like my sorry senator John Warner who has the gall to cosponser a bill with who else, Ted Kennedy to ressurect amnesty.

Dave Kyle

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by SandTrap - 2008/05/18 21:14

"I'm of the opinion that only a revolution will bring us back to equilibrium. Revolutions are nasty, bloody things to undertake and win. Its been well over 200 years since we had such a cleansing experience in this nation"

To borrow a phrase from Cephraan "My heart hopes that you are wrong but my head suspects that you are right."

I believe we are heading for a cleansing effect much sooner than we may want or desire, but not necessarily in the way that we expected.

Congress seems determined to surrender our sovereignty again by resurrecting their illegal alien shamnesty scam. If so, then I think this is going to place us right on the cusp of The Second Civil War. These dolts just didn't get the message that was sent loud and clear last year when the people clearly stated that they don't want this legislation.

It's chilling reading about the predictions made over 10 years ago in Thomas Chittum's book about the upcoming civil war and breakup of the nation...

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by melliefluus - 2008/05/19 14:22

Jack, I understand and agree with your assessment that Democrats don't deserve to win, but Republicans deserve to lose the coming election....but that's only the Republican POLITICOS - not the Republican people, and it's the PEOPLE who would do all the actual losing.

It's true that our elected louts need to be spanked, but, as we saw in 2006, an electorate temper tantrum is counter-productive. It's like deposing Chairman Mao and electing Stalin – the people just suffer under different slogans. What we really need is to get rid of BOTH of them.

Elected officials, once "in," are only able to be chastised if a better candidate comes along. Until that better option appears, the people have no way to show their displeasure with their rep – so they hold their nose and vote for a Bad, to avoid getting a Worse. And every re-election is taken as a sign of approval. Gak!

Instead of a vote between This person and That person, what we need is a Yes/No vote on every candidate. If they don't get over 50% "Yes," the position stays empty. Wouldn't that be grand??!!! It would be hard for an empty chair to raise taxes or mess with the economy!

Mellie

=====

Re:REPUBLICANS DESERVE TO LOSE

Posted by skye - 2008/05/22 13:59

Want to see a perfect example of why the Republicrats deserve to lose? Watch Senator Grassley's performance in the Senate energy hearing of yesterday. It was the most frightening thing that I have seen since I watched live as the second plane flew into the second WTC tower on 911. Honestly, it was horrific. Go to C-SPAN and watch the entire hearing - it is the ghastly shape of things to come.

=====