
Subject: Re: The Humpty-Dumpty defense
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 12:50:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So you make a definition up; then create a red herring issue by accusing some unknown set of judges of being ignorant of what the Constitution means; thereby setting yourself up as an authority without offering a shred of evidence that you have even read the constitution; then offer some unknown set of laws these mythical judges have supposedly struck down. Then without naming any law you assign a reason why these mythical set of judicial activists stike down this law. Because they don't like it.Lets see how many logical mistakes are made in that sentence alone. The Fallacy of Presumption. You presume the justices made those descisions based upon their dislike or like of the law; while maybe it was a fundamental problem with the law itself. But not in your world.Argumentum Ad Populum; becuase there are many right wing anti-justice fans then by sheer numbers they must be right.Poisoning The Well; Because someone holds a different view than you that by definition means they're argument is null.Fallacy of Affirming The Consequent; Because the justices did not rule the way you would like then by definition they must be "Activists"Actually I can go on with all the reasons that little sentence has no meaning but really;...would you get it?? No."When I use a word;it means exactly what I want it to mean..No more, no less."Humpty-Dumpty; from Lewis Carroll
