

---

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.  
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 19:30:25 GMT

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

---

Ok, I'll give it a go. "Liberals are lying about it." About what? She is saying that the liberals are lying about what judicial activism means. Calling it "voting to invalidate laws passed by congress" Her point is that the liberals are trying to change the definition so as to apply it to Republicans. But liberals have recently taken to pretending judicial activism is — as The New York Times has said repeatedly — voting "to invalidate laws passed by Congress." Invalidating laws has absolutely nothing to do with "judicial activism." It depends on whether the law is unconstitutional or not. That's really the key point. Prissy = arrogant Chairman Mao would approve of the ability to "Change the definition of words in mid-argument without telling the guy you're arguing with" Extra double secret right to abortion = There is no such "right" in the constitution. This is her point. The judges made it up. As for your right to privacy being in the constitution. Could you please show me where it says that specifically?" Show me one statement of substance that has meaning outside of her opinion." ok: "Judicial activism means making up constitutional rights in order to strike down laws the justices don't like based on their personal preferences." The rest is her opinion.

---