

Chapter 1 : george bush quote at the beginning of step brothers. what was it?? | Yahoo Answers

George W. Bush "Families is where our nation finds hope, where wings take dream."

Where wings take dream! August 12, 7: Man, maybe I need to get my funnymeter checked, cause this kinda triggered it That was from some special on Comedy Central a while back and I lost my recording of it. I love the odd funny video link on Metafilter. How is this now FPP worthy again? I thought it was very well done -- and funny! Everything else has been unfunny trying-to-hard not-on-his-wavelength uncomfortable silence. Is he some Hollywood cokehead-scene inside joke? Does he just have a really good agent? At one point he was everywhere. Is he some kind of hero to people? Did I miss some past stellar performance of his? Was he a Nixon speechwriter or something? Has that guy ever been funny? Steven Root and the late great Phil Hartman were both hilarious, and having Dave Foley play the straight man was a stroke of genius, after having more or less grown up with his wackiness developed in the Kids in the Hall. Andy may have had a good line or two on the show, but he was definitely one of the weaker performers there. Also, I hear Andy is hung like a musk oxen. The rest of it is all just idle banter. Unfunny, uninteresting and undeserving of fame. Among the less funny than Andy Dick is Martin Short. She has condescending bitch written all over her. IMO, the Bushism jokes should have ended at the 1st term. She just seems so petty and bitter. Nice ranting sexism there. We have a moron at the helm. Arianna would make a far better president, as would Teresa. And I hate Andy Dick. I laughed and was likewise disturbed. Just one more second.

Chapter 2 : FACT CHECK: Make the Pie Higher!

What a moron. Congratulations, America, because without all of you, we wouldn't be observing this anniversary. Click on the above picture's PLAY button to hear Bush actually say it, as part of.

Ralph Basham, director of the U. Secret Service, as defendants. Skulls woulda be cracked. He puts a up with lawsuits and ana lawyers. We wanna our Fascism back! Bush to "stop a acting likea girl" or to severe all ties with Fascism and fascist related policies. Now, get back to work. After outlining the present state of Iraq - bleak - Kerry pointed the finger where blame lays: At every fork in the road, he has taken the wrong turn and led us in the wrong direction. He failed to tell the truth about the rationale for going to war. And he failed to tell the truth about the burden this war would impose on our soldiers and our citizens. By one count, the President offered 23 different rationales for this war. If his purpose was to confuse and mislead the American people, he succeeded. Just last week, Secretary of State Powell acknowledged the facts. Only Vice President Cheney still insists that the earth is flat. The President also failed to level with the American people about what it would take to prevail in Iraq. Bush has jeopardized public support in the event of an actual national emergency. And the war in Iraq has also turned our attention away from more pressing concerns, including the need to hunt down and kill bin Laden and the rest of the al Quada network, "threats like North Korea, which actually has weapons of mass destruction, including a nuclear arsenal. This President was in denial. He hitched his wagon to the ideologues who surround him, filtering out those who disagreed, including leaders of his own party and the uniformed military. The result is a long litany of misjudgments with terrible consequences. They told us we had enough troops to provide security and stability, defeat the insurgents, guard the borders and secure the arms depots. They told us we could rely on exiles like Ahmed Chalabi to build political legitimacy. They told us we would quickly restore an Iraqi civil service to run the country and a police force and army to secure it. In Iraq, this administration has consistently over-promised and under-performed. This policy has been plagued by a lack of planning, an absence of candor, arrogance and outright incompetence. And the President has held no one accountable, including himself. Kerry noted that only those who had offered realistic assessments of what to expect in Iraq lost their jobs in the administration General Shinseki, Larry Lindsey , while the president coughs up yet another excuse for the war 24 by some accounts - the possibility that Iraq might have some day decided to try really hard to get weapons of mass destruction. Yet today, President Bush tells us that he would do everything all over again, the same way. How can he possibly be serious? Is he really saying that if we knew there were no imminent threat, no weapons of mass destruction, no ties to Al Qaeda, the United States should have invaded Iraq? And Kerry offered a clear choice for the future, both with respect to our foreign policy in general and with respect to Iraq: And it makes the choice in this election clear: It is time, at long last, to ask the questions and insist on the answers from the Commander-in-Chief about his serious misjudgments and what they tell us about his administration and the President himself. Bush is re-elected, he will cling to the same failed policies in Iraq -- and he will repeat, somewhere else, the same reckless mistakes that have made America less secure than we can or should be. In Iraq, we have a mess on our hands. But we cannot throw up our hands. Kerry then outlined four specific proposals for dealing with Iraq. Second, Kerry said the president must "get serious" about the training of Iraqi security forces. Third, the reconstruction effort should be revitalized so that real, tangible results can be felt by the average Iraqi citizen. Finally, Kerry claimed that the elections set for January were in jeopardy because of the lack of facilities and the lack of security; therefore, "the President must take immediate, urgent, essential steps to guarantee the promised elections can be held next year. Further, he claimed that "the president misled, miscalculated and mismanaged every aspect of this undertaking and he has made the achievement of our objective - a stable Iraq, secure within its borders, with a representative government, harder to achieve. Bush keeps saying that Kerry voted to use force, which is technically true. Of course, in that vote, Congress required the president to take many steps before using force, which Kerry claims Bush did not do. So which is it, Mr. Are you trying to mislead us now, by saying Kerry voted for you to go to war? Or were you misleading us back then, when you asked for a resolution authorizing your use of force after taking steps to make sure SH

did not have weapons of mass destruction? This is because he knows that if he runs a campaign on the issues, he loses. Any bets on whether the "news media" gets this story right? Tolkien Fantasy Fiction Award for their epic work of fantasy-fiction, Iraq. For them, Iraq is a wonderful place where schools and hospitals are open and children live in safety and America is adored. In Iraq, I could find work in a new hospital or school or on the police force. It must be a truly wonderful place. I hope it never ends. Literary critic Thomas Hale, not a fan of the fantasy genre, has nothing but praise for Iraq. This is a true work of monumental imagination. You may as well be on Mars. J Simpson Guide to a Successful Marriage. Any relationship to actual people and events is purely coincidental. In other campaign news, President Bush, sworn enemy of all terrorists, the man who refuses to even think about negotiating with the bastards, is now in high level negotiations with Syria, one of a handful of nations that openly and unabashedly supports terrorist organizations. Thank God Al Gore did not get elected!

Chapter 3 : Bushism - Wikipedia

This feature is not available right now. Please try again later.

This work is protected by copyright and may be linked to without seeking permission. Permission must be received for subsequent distribution in print or electronically. Please contact mpub-help umich. Many shifts occur in the nature of war and the character of childhood. The patterns of change in both require vigilance and critical attention because, with regard to war, forms that have been established to hold, confine and define conflict easily fall away and contribute to the proliferation of wars of the sort that the 20th century witnessed. Bush did in talking about the importance of families: He said, "Families is where our nation takes hope, where wings take dream" quoted by Alison Mitchell, A consideration of the manner in which war affects children calls for an analysis of the character of relationships between child and adult, and between child and child, within the atmosphere of tension that accompanies the disruption of the everyday. We need to study "the relation between dailiness and the rupture of dailiness" A. Byatt, as it affects the young. I suggest that there are no wars where children do not walk; that childhood is not another country that is, relationships between adults and children are entwined and children are participants in the social, economic, political and moral conditions of the moment ; and that because children move through childhood, its constituents alter: There is little dispute over the desirability of peace more urgent than that of truth in the view of Emmanuel Levinas, Given the absence of peace in so many parts of the world, many people hold that the child should be separated from conflict and few argue against this with regard to the young child. Contention arises over the experience of children age ten and up. The paper addresses the young aged from ten to 18 years. He describes it as a choice based on insufficient evidence and as an agreement to join the public world when agreement is possible given other conditions in society. The entry to adulthood is, he says, at best an entry into a world of possibilities towards which curiosity reaches. It is a time of reversal of the rites of passage entailing a shift of responsibility of pain from the world to the young War undeniably removes the possibility of choice from many of the young but some engage in it with a consciousness that reflects their views of themselves as integral to sociality and to the limits of sociality. Of adapting to it? Should we credit the revulsion of youth to horror as conceivably political responses, even as they participate? In order to begin to research such questions, it may be useful to ask when it is that local worlds lose the sense of powerful moral constraints that organize collective experience Das and Kleinman, The authors suggest that we trace the "lineaments of interaction of collective and individual experience. War does not leave them out. In writing an account of wars in the former Yugoslavia, Jasmine Tesanovic It led to a revolt and thousands of young people participated between and There is a broad, popular knowledge of the form that the struggle took, yet it is curious how inadequately the contribution of the young is documented and it is distressing how little of their needs and desires have been met during the aftermath of the conflict. During the s, I undertook two studies of the experiences of people who, since their school days, had been politically active in standing against the former regime. The first study was conducted from to with 45 people who were released from prisons, most from Robben Island, after the release of Nelson Mandela. The second piece of fieldwork to was with 14 young men who, in the s, had been leaders of local activists in their stand against the government in a small rural town in the Western Cape: The number of people under the age of 18 who had been directly involved in the conflict is not yet known. No liberation organization has the figures. Nor do the prison officials. The former government carefully obscured the numbers held in detention and the number who had been harmed. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission admitted in its report that it had failed to capture the nature and extent of the role played by the young in helping to achieve a democratic dispensation in South Africa. The report admits that few political activists gave testimony before the Commission. Not knowing how the young fought and with what consequences suggests a lacuna in the description of the recent past in the country. Most of the young who fought within the country have been excluded from pensions granted by the government and by liberation organizations and, at the time of writing, none have received reparations, although some have received interim reparations, from the TRC. Based on my work in the aftermath of war, it seems likely that the young will

voluntarily become involved in the kinds of fights that rage in many countries now. In Zimbabwe and South Africa, children between the ages of 12 and 18 participated in the fight for democracy. Some elected to join liberation organizations in exile in order to fight. Many of them were placed in schools in other African countries and given rudimentary military training. Some of the young, aged about 17 years or more, joined armed units. In Zimbabwe, it is said that children were abducted from schools and taken across the borders. What is pertinent here is that most of them were aged 12 to 16 at the time and most of them, it seems, had voluntarily assisted the guerrillas. The story of the struggle by the young against the apartheid regime is well known. Less well documented is how young political activist leaders within South Africa were inducted, how they grew in political consciousness, what ethic of behavior they developed, over how many years they fought many did for more than 10 years, and what networks they established to ensure continuity in resistance. Faced with violence, many will eschew a passive role in their own interests or in the interests of others, especially their kin. They are agents in their own life trajectories, which, in turn, affect the experiences of those close to them. Besides, their political engagement has force and this is taken into account in the strategy of leaders in some arenas. Their labor, both as combatants and in an array of other tasks, is valued and a variety of means, including coercion, will be used to draw them into wars. I do not mean to underestimate the forces of control that are exerted over the young, nor the power of obligations and duties that are carved into patterns of family relations, social negotiations and political orders that hold the young and inform their decision-making. Nevertheless, it is hard to keep the young from exploring, sharing moral positions, formulating sets of moral tenets, and acting in accord with them - whether others see their arguments as right, logically coherent, or in the best interests of individuals or groups. Let us take, as an example, one of the ways in which children will be drawn into wars whether or not they actually shoot or maim people. The International Labour Organization recently narrowed their call for the abolition of child labor Convention to the elimination of its "worst forms" Convention, one of which they identify as child labor in armed conflict. There are two broad fronts to examine. The first is to acknowledge that adults need and use children. When the social order is disturbed, people seek fresh means to organize daily life and, therefore, those engaged in conflict frequently draw the young to them as carriers, messengers, cooks and washers; they use them to bolster their status, keep them company, satisfy their sexual needs, act as their shields and accompany them in combat. The young may or may not be able to choose whether to participate and how. Soldiers down the ages have claimed to protect the young by including them in their units. The second front is to acknowledge that new forms of war require descriptions that can lead to the re-consideration of myths, fantasies, negotiation formats, conflict resolution models and the categorization of combatant versus civilian as they affect the situation of the young. To abolish the use of children as soldiers is to abolish only one use to which they are put during war; girls, in particular, may be left unprotected. To know how adults use children during conflict, full cognizance of the kinds of labor they do for whom, at what age, at what cost, within what context, under what conditions, in whose interest; and with what access to protection are some of the questions for which answers need to be sought. Other questions to ask with regard to any child caught in armed conflict include the following: To whom are children tied? Over what time span? How do loyalties shift? Many children have already had to rely on their own resources and seek ties with others where they could. It cannot necessarily be assumed that adults are in situations in which they are able to fulfill the tasks of being consistent caretakers or spokespersons for the young see Reynolds, How do wars strip the everyday of the ordinary, releasing attitudes and behavior into a maelstrom? What does our continuing romanticization of war contribute to its conduct? What are we still saying about war? How are we still allowing it? What are we documenting about it for the archive? In the idealised Western imaginary of warfare soldiers in regular armies are associated with strength, aggression, responsibility and the maturity of adulthood [and] there is a clear boundary between soldier and civilian, battlefield and home, war-zone and peace-zone. A powerful set of cultural prescriptions develops around the concept and conduct of war" Carpena-Mendez, The myth obscures, for example, the involvement of women and the young in war, at the centre or on the periphery. It continues to shape attitudes towards violence in art, history, games, the media and gender stereotyping. And it moulds responses, particularly those of members of international and non-governmental organizations, when conflicts end to the detriment of some of the people

who had participated. What forms of healing are we prescribing in the aftermath of war? In accord with whose assumptions and beliefs? Here the questions imply the need to investigate current claims that talking about gross violations is the start of recovery; that truth heals; that post traumatic stress disorder is widespread among people after conflict and can be cured; that Western psychological and psychiatric models are universally applicable and require intense, systematic therapeutic encounters for healing to occur. Are we assuming that the pursuit of justice at the end of conflict can only happen after certain kinds of war? If justice is transformed into purely political calculation, what are the implications for children who were embroiled in the violence? It could be that one of the effects of international participation in settling conflict will be the quick disbandment of certain groups like those composed of young fighters so rendering them impotent in the claims for redress and reparation. In the interests of children in particular, do we name evil for the "irrevocable harm" Iris Murdoch, The young are deeply embroiled in the everyday life of society: Concentration on the role of children in armed conflict should not obscure our analysis of the way in which powerful forces global and national , including progress in the industry of war, exploit and oppress the young. Pamela Reynolds, a native of Zimbabwe and a citizen of South Africa, is the leading authority on the specific crises of children involved in warfare, civil war and revolution in modern Africa. She has written several books and co-authored *Remaking the World: Comparative Ethnographies on Violence and Recovery* , Berkeley: University of California Press. Reynolds received her doctorate from the University of Cape Town, where she now teaches in the Department of Social Anthropology. She is teaching a course on children in armed conflict this semester. For more information please contact mpub-help umich.

Chapter 4 : - Where Wings Take Dream

Bushisms: George Bush Funny Quotes One of the most quoted Presidents in the history of the United States, George W Bush has spawned a library of quotation books devoted to his sayings.

A Final Night with George W Bush the queue for the ladies loo snaked twice through the lounge and up the stairs, with some 30 women waiting for three stalls. Every so often a male usher would appear to chivy them, issuing threats. Aggressive, unprepared, ill-mannered, anti-women - the production so far resembled the very presidency it lampooned. That afternoon, then, may stand as a rare occasion at which the presence of George Bush as impersonated by Ferrell actually improved matters. Once he turned up in a spectacular, helmeted descent from the flies thoughts of misconduct and negligence actually faded. The concept seems simple: But Ferrell faultlessly captures certain aspects of Dubya the squint, the curled lip, the breathy, stuttering laugh. Devoting a Broadway show to our 43rd president seems odd at this moment. When Bush stepped into that helicopter on inauguration day, most New Yorkers were thrilled to see the back of him. Who would pay for another 90 minutes of face-time? Indeed, few thought the play would thrive. Broadway gossip maven and arch prognosticator Michael Reidel quoted an insider who remarked, "Nobody thought it would catch on the way it has. A one-man show in this market? And with Obama coming in? It just seemed old hat. The "mission accomplished" photo alone kept legions of editorial cartoonists in business. Neither is the format of the show directed by Adam McKay at all innovative. Brief musical interludes and light changes help Ferrell move from one monologue to another, the scene shifting from a battleship deck to the Crawford ranch and on to the Oval Office, where Bush salutes "my cabinet, my posse, my road dogs" and enjoys a raunchy pas de deux, with a panty-flashing Condoleezza Rice Pia Glenn. The show is often amusing, though rarely hilarious and definitely not innovative. The audience, perhaps desperate for some post-traumatic levity, chuckled throughout. Ferrell earns laughs by referring to Obama as "that Tiger Woods guy" and embarking on an extended, surrealistic riff about training a legion of monkey soldiers.

Chapter 5 : Quote by George W. Bush: "Families is where our nation finds hope, where wings take dream"

Where Wings Take Dream Outside the Box By Beccah G. Watson, November 14, On a fall day in , George W. Bush was hard at work on the presidential campaign trail.

Chapter 6 : Where Wings Take Dream: On Children in the Work of War and the War of Work

Gear for Progressives. Democratic posters, t-shirts, buttons, and more.

Chapter 7 : Bushisms: Families is where our nation finds hope, where wings take dream

is Jonan Scheffler's Top Secret Interweb Identity. He's a programmer and he loves geeky things. You can find his github/twitter/email here, and some Goombas.

Chapter 8 : grace muth (@smuthy_king) Instagram photos and videos

The part that says "where wings take a dream," obviously meaning that one needs only pursue the dreams of tomorrow by doing something to reach those dreams today! "The mind is a terrible thing to waste!"

Chapter 9 : Wordnik: bushisms-where-wings-take-dream

Discussion. Bush's use of the English language in formal and public speeches has spawned several books that document the statements. A poem entitled "Make the Pie Higher", composed entirely of Bushisms, was compiled by

cartoonist Richard Thompson.