
Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2003 05:07:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America...

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

You say what you want.
I say what I want.

If some famous fuck-head actor (such as Tim Robins(?)) says some gay ass shit about the war, the president or our country guess what I may not ever see one more of that fuck-heads movies ever again. Violation of freedom of speach? -----NO-----
So if some stupid fuck actor starts losing jobs because of his anti-thought stance on the war then TOUGH SHIT.

If you have an anti-war stance thats great, your allowed to.
If I happen to call you a socialist communist psuedo-peacenik piece of shit thats great as well, because I'm allowed to.

I use extremes to prove my point. I do not think everyone who is anti-war is a socialist communist pseudo-peacenik piece of shit. But if you do happen to be a socialist communist pseudo-peacenik than I do think you're a piece of shit.

Whats the problem here ?

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2003 09:39:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd rather be a communist than a Nazi...That's right...the extremes

democrats = Communists
republicans = Neo-Nazis

you're absolutely right...under the first ammendment...you can call me a communist. But on the reverse side...you could be refered to as a Nazi...and I think people would rather listen to a communist than a nazi

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2003 12:52:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Duke of Nukes!d rather be a communist than a Nazi...That's right...the extremes

democrats = Communists

republicans = Neo-Nazis

you're absolutely right...under the first ammendment...you can call me a communist. But on the reverse side...you could be refered to as a Nazi...and I think people would rather listen to a communist than a nazi

Well hitler was a nazi and he had alot more people follow him and allow Nazism then communism ever did.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2003 13:52:04 GMT

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

I think communism was more wide spread then nazism. Nazism was more restricted to germany yet communism spread across eastern europe and asia.

Ok so I am a socialist communist anti-military type. And you have every right to call me what you want. Just as I have the right to call you an angry american who hates those who even slightly move against your fur.

The lord has risen, happy Easter everyone. Even you theOne.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2003 15:02:06 GMT

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

Commando no. 448I think communism was more wide spread then nazism. Nazism was more restricted to germany yet communism spread across eastern europe and asia.

Ok so I am a socialist communist anti-military type. And you have every right to call me what you want. Just as I have the right to call you an angry american who hates those who even slightly move against your fur.

The lord has risen, happy Easter everyone. Even you theOne.

Well ya with Communism the leaders of the countrys got great power. Nazism had the people support. So therefore i think people would rather be under nazism the Communism.

Anti-military. You should be ashamed of yourself. You probobly wouldnt be alive if the military was never used. because no matter what you say every army that has atatched the "good" guys neevr listened to reason or thought like you. So you would be screwed either way.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2003 17:25:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Duke of Nukes!d rather be a communist than a Nazi...

Nazis and Communists aren't exactly opposites. For starters its very misleading to actually refer to a political party as communist. Communism is an economic system, not a political system. The 'communists' in WW2 and beyond are socialists. If you didn't know, the Nazis were socialists too.

Nazis and 'Communists' hate each other because they're both variants of the same philosophy, socialism. They both want to be the sole voice of socialism and so they want to destroy each other.

To say 'I'd rather be a communist then a Nazi' is really saying 'I'd rather be a socialist then a socialist'. How much sense does that make?

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2003 18:56:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neo-Nazi's are all Republicans...that was the entire point I was trying to make. The worst insult you can come up with is calling someone a communist or a hippy...whereas I could call you a member of the KKKK. The entire point of what I said was to be wary of what you call people...because they can probably call you worse.

I am anti-war. Not anti-military. believe it or not...there is a difference. If I were a religious person...I would be praying for them to come home safe...but since I'm not...I'm just hoping they will.

To me...people on one side or the other of this issue scare me. There is no simple solution...just as there isn't with any difficult subject. There's a reason why there's two sides to the arguement...because it's difficult and neither choice is the right choice

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2003 21:32:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Duke of Nukes!d rather be a communist than a Nazi...That's right...the extremes

democrats = Communists
republicans = Neo-Nazis

you're absolutely right...under the first ammendment...you can call me a communist. But on the reverse side...you could be refered to as a Nazi...and I think people would rather listen to a communist than a nazi

Sorry to be mean but here it goes:
Read some damn history before you start your blabbing!

Nazism and Communism are not opposites. They are from the from the same source: socialism.

And maybe if you had a brain in your head, you'd realize communism would have led to the death and pain of just as much people that Nazism had. Communism is just as evil as nazism, but it just didn't have a chance to prove it to the world. Ronald Reagan put a stop to communism and rampant 20th-century liberalism (which is a unsatble mixture of socialism and universal progressiveism, BTW).

Duke of NukesNeo-Nazi's are all Republicans...that was the entire point I was trying to make. The worst insult you can come up with is calling someone a communist or a hippy...whereas I could call you a member of the KKKK. The entire point of what I said was to be wary of what you call people...because they can probably call you worse.

I am anti-war. Not anti-military. believe it or not...there is a difference. If I were a religious person...I would be praying for them to come home safe...but since I'm not...I'm just hoping they will.

To me...people on one side or the other of this issue scare me. There is no simple solution...just as there isn't with any difficult subject. There's a reason why there's two sides to the arguement...because it's difficult and neither choice is the right choice

First, it's the KKK. Just because I'm white, Christian, Republican and I live in the south, that means I'm an EVIL Nazi-KKK member :rolleyes: .

So a decision is never a right one? That's the dumbest thing I ever heard. So us going into WWII after Pearl Harbor was not the "right decision"? When Moses smashed that golden idol was that not a "right decision"?

Seriously, get a brain that didn't come from a blue light special.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2003 00:30:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thanks...seriously...no one could prove your ignorance as much as you did.

First off...it's the KKKK...Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. Again...I said I didn't mean they were opposites...you quoted where I said that Nazi's are republicans and that's all I meant. Get your head out of your ass.

Ronald Reagon didn't "end" communism...obviously because of several reasons. First off...there's still communism. second off...it ended itself in the USSR...Reagon didn't just all of the sudden just get up and get rid of it...regardless of what you may think.

Again...I said watch what you call people. If you dont like someones views...then tough luck...calling people communists and Nazi's without just cause will make your opinion less and less valuable.

I also said there is no clear answer...just like there isn't for abortion and the death penalty. The reason they're so contraversial is because there is no clear cut answer. If it was an open and closed case...then it would be like killing Jewish people...I dont know a single person that's gonna say we should kill Jewish people...and there's a reason for that.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2003 01:52:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Duke of Nukesthanks...seriously...no one could prove your ignorance as much as you did.

First off...it's the KKKK...Knights of the Ku Klux Klan.

Proving his ignorance with your ignorance, great strategy! :rolleyes:
They are the "Ku Klux Klan", they have been the "Ku Klux Klan" since they first started after the Civil War, only recently have they begun refering to them selves as the "Knights of the Ku Klux Klan", in addition to just plain "Ku Klux Klan".

Both acronymns are correct, but KKK is much more vastly used.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2003 02:56:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Republicans=Neo Nazis? HAH! :rolleyes:

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2003 06:43:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

no, it's: Neo-Nazi's = republicans. Just like Communists = Democrats

and how does that make me ignorant? I was correct...wasn't I? I never said he was wrong...I just said that I am also right. Just because KKK is the more popular saying...that doesn't mean KKKK is wrong...and that's all I was saying.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2003 12:25:30 GMT

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

Duke of Nukesno, it's: Neo-Nazi's = republicans. Just like Communists = Democrats

and how does that make me ignorant? I was correct...wasn't I? I never said he was wrong...I just said that I am also right. Just because KKK is the more popular saying...that doesn't mean KKKK is wrong...and that's all I was saying.

You first said it was the KKKK.

He then corrected you, saying it was the KKK, not the KKKK

You came back, saying how he's ignorant, and that you were right, it's KKKK.

Ignorance, you failed to look into rather plain 'KKK' was correct also, instead you came back to flame him and say you were right, and he was wrong.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2003 15:37:13 GMT

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

Duke of Nukesno, it's: Neo-Nazi's = republicans. Just like Communists = Democrats

and how does that make me ignorant? I was correct...wasn't I? I never said he was wrong...I just said that I am also right. Just because KKK is the more popular saying...that doesn't mean KKKK is wrong...and that's all I was saying.

Republicans arent Neo-Nazis. There are almsot no simularities. Same thing with deomcrats being communists. Maybe their Ideals but not the way they turn out to be. Democrats may resemble the Ideal communism on paper but not real life. and Republicans arent so much like Nazism. Mostly because Republicans aren't ery imperialistic. but they do beleive in nationalism.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2003 20:08:59 GMT

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

I never said he was wrong for saying it's the KKK...I said he's ignorant for correcting me when I'm right. You say toe-may-toe, I say toe-mah-toe (cant really do it without saying it)

I never said Republicans are Neo-Nazis...I said Neo-Nazis are all Republicans...and I continuously said that it was only to prove a point that you shouldn't be making comments like that to discredit the other side

Subject: Freedom of Speech & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2003 21:57:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Duke of NukesI never said he was wrong for saying it's the KKK...I said he's ignorant for correcting me when I'm right. You say toe-may-toe, I say toe-mah-toe (cant really do it without saying it)

Ok, you were both ignorant... Fair enough?

Subject: Communism and Nazism
Posted by [dietzy](#) on Sun, 27 Apr 2003 17:53:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ok. Communism and Nazism are not the same thing. They are opposites. Complete opposites. Not in reality they aren't. But on paper they are. Communism is the people own everything. Everyone has an equal share. There is no free enterprise. No one can make large sums of money. The government controls everything. Under Nazism there is free business. People are free to do as they wish. Except with Nazism, the dictator has the power to do whatever he wants. Which means that if he wants control of a business, he'll take it and no one will stop him. Communism is radical democratic and Nazism is radical republican. They are opposites but always in the end some mad man on a power trip ruins both for the entire country.

Subject: Re: Communism and Nazism
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 27 Apr 2003 19:24:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

dietzyOk. Communism and Nazism are not the same thing. They are opposites. Complete opposites.

They are not opposites. They are varieties of socialism. In communism all citizens and businesses are controlled by the government. In Nazism businesses are allowed to be owned by ordinary citizens because the citizens are already controlled by the government. So basically, Communism is Nazism taken even further.

Look at the names of the Nazi's and the Soviet Union. Nazi is short for National Socialist, the Soviet Union's full name is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Their own names give away what they really are.

Here are some exact opposites:

Socialism: People serve the state.
Democracy: State serves the people.

Subject: Re: Communism and Nazism

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Mon, 28 Apr 2003 11:16:16 GMT

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

NeoSaberHere are some exact opposites:

Socialism: People serve the state.

Democracy: State serves the people.

Yet what is the state? And interesting question. One that can easily topple your statement. The state can be considered the people, land, economy, ect... of a nation. Therefore it could become the people serve the people and the people serve the people. Not opposites at all. So you may want to correct yourself in that the people serve the government and the government serves the people. Yet even then such a black and white veiw is arguable. You just can't properly look at government in black and white. I could argue that the socailist government serves the people by ensuring that the people are made equal. And I could argue that democracy has all these problems of government officials wasting tax money (yet I do admit this can happen in socialism).

But then again I am just looking to teach lessons less then I am looking for a good discussion.

Subject: Re: Communism and Nazism

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Mon, 28 Apr 2003 16:52:20 GMT

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

Commando no. 448Yet what is the state? And interesting question. One that can easily topple your statement.

Don't be an ass. State means government.

Commando no. 448I could argue that the socailist government serves the people by ensuring that the people are made equal.

Don't make me laugh. Sure people are equal in socialism, equally enslaved by the government. It hardly serves the people to be slaves to the person in power.

Subject: Re: Communism and Nazism

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Mon, 28 Apr 2003 19:58:47 GMT

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

NeoSaberCommando no. 448Yet what is the state? And interesting question. One that can easily topple your statement.

Don't be an ass. State means government.

Commando no. 448I could argue that the socailist government serves the people by ensuring that the people are made equal.

Don't make me laugh. Sure people are equal in socialism, equally enslaved by the government. It hardly serves the people to be slaves to the person in power.

That was bad socialism. It wasn't well built in the beginning. Just like when parliament first appeared after dethroning a king it became corrupt and then it was shut down and a king was appointed. The ideal socialism is to have near equal wages (if they were totally equal no one would do unwanted jobs) and equal benefits. And we would have to rebuild society gradually. For if too many people desire to be the best over the rest then there cannot be the ideal socialism. And it would not be the job of the head of government, a special wing of the government would have to be formed to "direct" business in the right directions. We may still need boards of directors for businesses but they would have to deal more into keeping the business running then planning its future. I could go on about my theories on how to make socialism work but I won't right now.

State does not automatically mean government. Even in that context. The United Governments sounds more like an alliance of nations then one nation. Yet using it in the manner I suggested sounds much more correct.

Subject: Re: Communism and Nazism

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Mon, 28 Apr 2003 21:56:31 GMT

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

Commando no. 448State does not automatically mean government. Even in that context. The United Governments sounds more like an alliance of nations then one nation. Yet using it in the manner I suggested sounds much more correct.

The word state does have several meanings, based off the context of its use. In science, state means form, but this is a political forum. In politics, state means government. Your use of the term United Governments is actually somewhat correct. Each state in the US has its own authority, its own government. All the states then unite to form a national government that has some authority over all states. So the US really is one country consisting of many countries. Kind of bizarre to think about. Shows why the debate of State authority vs Federal authority has gone on for so long.

The United States of America can be referred to as the United Governments of America or even the United Nations of America. All three mean the same thing in principle. The founding fathers just chose to go with United States.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2003 10:48:26 GMT

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

Ah yes. Provincial authority vs federal authority. Something I also feel strongly about. I side with federal authority. But let's not pull this topic futher off the path.

Unless you want to. I wouldn't pass up a good discussion.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2003 15:37:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I wish you would side with shutting the fuck up, as every opinion you have gets grinded into the dirt.

Gets old after a while. Really old.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Tue, 29 Apr 2003 19:33:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well is it my problem if everyone here hates my views on the world? I am here to share my views even if no one agrees. Because a view never shared is a waste of a thought.

Never gets old for me. Good practice if I want to join the debating team. I don't care if I win or lose anyway. I have a dang good time playing the game.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 30 Apr 2003 01:31:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Commando no. 448Never gets old for me. Good practice if I want to join the debating team. I don't care if I win or lose anyway. I have a dang good time playing the game.

Good practice for what? Coming up with stupid comments, that all get shot down immediately? Practicing on good techniques so the opposing side would win? You must be doing a very good job.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Wed, 30 Apr 2003 09:06:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Politics is an interesting subject. One where I am forced to a level equal with my colleagues. But I can step above and beyond them in matters dealing with science, technology, and history. Yet I may find equals here on those topics, so please let us stay on politcs as I prefer this subject for now.

Subject: Freedom of Speach & The First Amendment.
Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Wed, 30 Apr 2003 09:22:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You really should try visiting <http://www.delphi.com> to see how you stand up. Please remember your on a Command & Conquer : Renegade fan sight. Take that as you will I chat on delphi all the time.

Anyways as I recall the 'arguments' you have posted don't hold much, if any water. Of course I haven't read the all but would gladly debate you in another thread or email on any issue concerning the war in Iraq.

I truly hope you take up my offer and suggestion.
