Subject: Senate
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 24 May 2005 10:41:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I woke today and for the first time in a while I was proud of my Govt. Disregarding the little child antics of the Frist Crowd, who threatened to shut down the Senate if they could not get their way; some adult's amongst them rose up and did what adults do.. they negotiated and compromised. Way to go guys.

Subject: As much as I hate to do this....
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Tue, 24 May 2005 15:40:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It was the Democrats that were acting like babies and stretching the rules to fillabuster judges. Up until this time judges got a fair up and down vote. Even if the Republicans despised the judge nominated from a liberal president they still gave them an up or down vote in fairness. Example would be Ruth Giensburg. She was given a vote within six weeks of her nomination buy Clinton. By the way it was the Democrats threatening to shut down the gov. if they didn't have their way. Not the Republicans. It was the Democrats acting like babies because they hate bush and can't come to grips with the fact that they lost another election. There is shame on the Republicans this morning for making such a deal with the democrats. None of them live in my area but if they did they would never get my vote again. Hopefully they will pay the price for selling out the people that voted for them.

Subject: Re: As much as I hate to do this....
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 24 May 2005 19:51:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well; the polls taken this morning concerning this episode have 24% for the Republicans26% for the DemocratsAnd 54% positive for the American people. Somebody is looking at this the right way.I would debate the whole thing about who's a child but let me ask you this, have you read an opinion by either of the two Judges that will be confirmed immediately?I hope you don't work for a living because your rights are going down the toilet.

Subject: Re: As much as I hate to do this....
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Tue, 24 May 2005 20:04:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Polls are useless as you know. The judges are conservative. I wouldn't expect someone that has liberal ideas to like them. It's not the point. My response was to your comments about the republicans shutting down gov. and acting like children. Now it seems you don't want to debate this point. I don't blame you. It's hard to debate when the facts are against you. I would have to assume that if you didn't want to discuss this subject you wouldn't have mentioned it. That said, I have been down this road before. It's a dead end. Frankly I do like to discuss politics but the liberals get very angry and nasty. And I just don't need the stress. Not that you have here. I have been trying to stay out of this forum because it harbors hard feelings to discuss politics. You have helped me out with some of my posts so lets just agree to disagree.Hope there are no hard feelings.

Subject: Re: As much as I hate to do this....
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 24 May 2005 21:10:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oh no; I have no problem debating with gentlemen; or not gentlemen except if it degenerates into a fact attack at ever increasing volume.You are obviously a reasonable man but I must offer one correction.I am and have been for twenty years a registered Republican. It is a matter of public record and I vote in every primary and have in the past done campaigning for the party.

Subject: Well, then I guess we think more alike than I thought. (NT)
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Tue, 24 May 2005 21:31:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

NT

Subject: Re: Well, then I guess we think more alike than I thought. (NT)
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 24 May 2005 22:51:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Mr. Vinyll guy; sorry I didn't mean to cut my response short, I hit the post button accidently. I don't want you to think I don't take your post seriously because I do take it seriously.The problem with the debates that revolve around this current administration is the sides are so polarised that they lose sight of the real issues and try to reduce them to a succession of chains of what each side calls "Facts". It starts by both parties rushing to their respective websites and gathering their forces of facts. Lining them up to do battle. But facts are elusive things; they depend on all of the circumstances that surround the issue including past and present conditions. When one side or

the other pontificates they of course use the facts that support their side and conveniently isolate each set of conditions to fit their facts.So consequently it becomes a Fact Attack without any adjustments for the prevailing environment that produced these facts. What I'm trying to say is, just like there is a reference standard in audio; there is a right and wrong in politics. When these positions are reduced to facts they lose the ultimate sense of responsibility that comes with having a personal philosophy and taking a position.In this situation the Senate has for ever recognised that the position of the majority is tentative and the winds blow both ways. That is why we comprimise and do not let the majority lord it over the minority.That sense is missing here. Clinton lost many more appointments due to backdoor negotiations and compromise; and thats the way it should be. This Frist explaining to the people that he will take no prisoners and will have his way is contradictory to the spirit of our govt. No fact can alter or correct that point of view. So when a real man like John M'Cain steps up to the plate and says enough, that is how our govt should work. It's called leadership and only a man would know how to accomplish that. That is the child reference. Even if he had the personal prescence to throw his weight around, he should have had the same to be gracious towards the minority party in public. Boasting and bragging is childlike.Thats why it was great to see M'Cain step in and settle this. A real american who served his country and speaks low but carries a big stick.

Subject: Well, see, that's what you get for watching Fox all the time
Posted by wunhuanglo on Tue, 24 May 2005 23:54:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Because the fact of the matter is that over 60 of Clinton's nominees did not get a vote in the Republican Senate, because they never got out of Committee because they never got a hearing.Good job with Ginsburg, though.

Subject: Re: Well, see, that's what you get for watching Fox all the time
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 25 May 2005 00:07:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There go those facts with just a few omitted for brevities sake. Funny how some of those facts get left out ain't it?

Subject: Re: Well, then I guess we think more alike than I thought. (NT)
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 25 May 2005 01:39:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm sorry dude, but I couldn't disagree more. Facts are facts. The fact is that there has been only

one other judge in history that has been fillerbustered and that was in the 1960's. Basically the Democrats are sore losers that can't come to grips with the fact that most people disagree with their views. I vote for Republicans not because I want them to compromise with the democrats. But because I think the Democrats and their policies are destroying our country. I don't want compromise. I want the Republicans to stick to their guns and pass a Conservative agenda. I think the most important thing that the Republicans can do is appoint conservative judges. Not judges that disregard the law and make it up to suit their own agenda. This is one of the single most important problems that the US faces today. I want judges that apply the law not make it up. It's unconstitutional to do anything else. What the vast majority of Republicans were trying to do with this issue in not childish in anyway but brave and courageous IMO. I don't want our representatives in government to stick their finger in the wind and go which ever way the wind or the polls tell them to go. I want the representatives that I vote for to take the higher ground. To stick by their convictions and to do what's right even if it means they will lose power in the future. I think this is what Mr. Frist was trying to do. John McCain is a fraud. He represents himself as a Republican but in fact is a Democrat. No he is not doing the right thing. He is preparing to run for the presidency again and is pandering to the liberal left. Maybe he will get elected but not with my vote. I want men of conviction not men that pander. In my opinion Mr. Frist is the real American here. Not Mr. McCain. Perhaps Mr. McCain should grow a spine and do what he knows is right for the country not what will win approval of the liberal media. Sorry but your view on this issue couldn't be more liberal. I find it hard to believe that you are a registered Republican that normally votes Republican. No I don't like everything that GW Bush has done. But I think he is a man of high moral ground that stands by what he thinks is right. Not by what some poll says or by what some people may think of him. Just the kind of leader I want in office. These are just my views of course. You have every right to disagree. You sound like you're a thinking man. Even though we may not come to the same conclusions. This is good. Hope to have more spirited debate with you in the future.Mr. Vinyl

---

Subject: Re: Well, then I guess we think more alike than I thought. (NT)
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 25 May 2005 10:20:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Food for thought; to be continued.

Subject: Re: Well, then I guess we think more alike than I thought. (NT)
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 25 May 2005 11:41:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Reasonable. However as I have stated facts do not seem to be facts since they are used selectively and without background information.Lets get the issue of presidential aspirations out of the way. Frist is considering a run and that is the only reason he adopted this tough guy position. He thought he had the support of the religous right and the president but they bailed out when the

going got rough.The concept that we elect a representative to take a stand and promote his own agenda is flawed. We elect people to represent the people and to do the peoples wishes, not to fulfill his own personal vision. Leaders who do what they choose should find a non-representative form of govt.The concept that judges should be appointed who seek to roll back existing law because those descisions are proactive is flawed. The constitution was designed to be a fluid document that is capable of responding to changes in society; not to be a rigid manifesto determining for all time what the law is. If it were that way we would still have the jim crow laws on the books. It was activist judges who made those and other historical changes for the good.Our system is designed to govern all of the people not just the most favored. That is why we have an adversarial legal system; so that the rights of the minority are not trampled by a temporary majority. In order to accomplish this we need;ComprimiseNegotiationConscession. Thats how we do it.John M'Cain did what leaders in the free world do; he brokered a comprimise through negotiation and by offering some conscessions in return for some consideration. I humbly submitt that this is not a religious theocracy with a high holy man who dictates whats right and serves it to his acolytes. Its a democratic republic designed to serve and protect all the people. I am I assure you a registered Republican but this group is so far from the basic mission of the party that for all intents and purposes it is unrecognisable as such. Being a registered Republican doesn't mean I march in lockstep with the masses. Actually I won't waste the bandwidth with these arguments everyone has heard. I'll leave it here for your rebuttal.

Subject: None of Clinton's judge nominations were filibustered...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 25 May 2005 12:18:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I would dispute the 60 figure you quote. Anyone can come on and state supposed facts. But lets assume your figures are correct. Please keep in mind that Clinton's party didn't have control of the House and Senate. This means that he would have less nominees get appointed than say Bush who's party does have control of both houses. I can also show you web sites that claim that Clinton actually had many more judges, percentage wise, appointed than Bush. Who has had more nominees blocked by the other party is up for debate and doesn't really matter. What matters is which party has decided to block judges by an unprecedented stretch of rules and block TEN qualified judges. Based not on the fact they they are unqualified, but because they don't agree with their political leanings. The Fact is this. The law says that it only takes a majority of Senators to appoint a judge (51). It doesn't say it takes 60 or more. Using this tactic of the Democrats it would always take 60 votes and not the 51 because the other side could simply filibuster any judge they didn't like. So then why would the law say only a simple majority? I have nothing against one side using the rules to block judges. But to stretch the rules (which the Democrats seem to do well) is not acceptable IMO. Now if you are going to say that the law allows for a minority to filibuster judges and even though it was never used, they are following the law. Well then the law also says that the Senate can change these rules with a simple majority vote. So the Republicans are also following the law (In fact the rules for filibustering have been changed many times in the past. For instance the law used to say that a Senator actually had to filibuster by standing up and reading stuff. If he left to go to the bathroom or have lunch the filibuster was over. The rules have since been changed to allow a filibuster to be just threatened and not actually done). So both sides are doing nothing wrong. The problem occurs when the Democrats

threaten to shut down the senate if they lose. This takes things too far and IMO is quite childish.Your comment about Fox News is also off the mark. This is just a disguised insult against me. Let's stick to facts. By the way I don't find Fox News to be Conservative or Liberal. I find them Fair and Balanced

---

Subject: Re: Well, then I guess we think more alike than I thought. (NT)
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 25 May 2005 12:49:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Wow, where do I start. I'll try to take it one at a time. Yes Frist is planning a run for the Presidency. Your point is correct in that he may be doing this for the same reason McCain is doing what he did. I do not agree that Bush bailed out on Frist in any way. Bush has said from the beginning that he wants all of the judges he has nominated to get a fair up and down vote as has been the courtesy of the Senate in the past. Our representatives are elected by the majority of the people. Therefore I would expect them to do what they were elected to do. "His own personal vision" as you put it, "is" why he was elected. So I expect him or her to follow that vision.Yes the constitution is designed to be a fluid document. To be changed by the House and Senate! Not to be changed by judges at will who disagree with any particular law. This is simple high school information. The House and Senate make the law and the judiciary applies the law. Judges have no constitutional right whatsoever to make law from the bench. And any judges that do this should be impeached IMO.Let's get something straight. I am not a religious fanatic. I don't even go to church, although I believe in God and Jesus. I don't believe Bush is a religious fanatic and I don't believe he was elected by religious fanatics either. I don't walk "lock step" as you put it with the Republicans (an attempt on your part to compare the Republicans with Nazi's). I disagree with some of the things that the Republicans are doing. One example would be the use of stem cells for research. This government is set up to be run by the representatives we elect be that congressman or the President. They are elected by a majority. Therefore they are doing what the majority want them to do. And if they don't they don't get re-elected. Yes the minority party has rights. That's why there are laws protecting the minority party in congress. Let's stick to the law. I stick by what I said about McCain. He was not elected to compromise with the Democrats. Why is it that the Democrats always talk about compromise when they are going to lose but never when they are going to win? That said, if the people like what McCain is doing then he will be re-elected. But consider this, why didn't McCain run as an independent??? He runs as a Republican to fool people into thinking he follows the ideas of a conservative. This is disingenuous. If he believes in compromise he should run as an Independent don't you think? I would expect an Independent to go against both sides at times. This has been a good debate. I'm sorry but I just don't have time to sit at the computer all day. I am going to sign off for now. If you would like to continue our discussion that's fine but I may not be able to answer as quickly as I would like to.Good listening and may the force be with you! (sorry saw Star Wars this weekend)

Subject: Re: Well, then I guess we think more alike than I thought. (NT)
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 25 May 2005 14:17:11 GMT

Mr Vinyll Guy my friend; You can read this at your leisure, no rush; we ain't goin' nowhere.I need to address this first though. I never insinuated you were religous and regret if that is what it sounded like. Please; no Nazi references, Lock step has a meaning quite outside that one.Interesting how we really differ. Forget please the fact thing; I stated already how I feel about that. You will qoute the websites you read and I will quote the one's I read and we end up with dueling factoids. We might as well cut and paste the blogs onto the post and do something else with our time.I believe that John M'Cains duty as a Senator lies with his;Country first,Then his states electorates,then the party. The party is an affiliation; nothing more. The people of Arizona elected John M'Cain; who happens to be a Republican, they did not elect a Republican who happens to be J.M. He belongs to the GOP because he believes in their core principals, but he is not obligated to obey their every tenent and to support their every platform. His first responsibility lies with the people of AZ.The job of the legislature's is too do the business of their constituents and if that conflicts with the party agenda, he must support the people who elected him.I don't vote for a Republican; I vote for a man. What he did was to support the business of govt in defiance of those who would put their party above their responsibility to the people. The Judiciary; define the word Judge. They will define the legality of the laws that congress passes. If that law that as written by the Legis. is in contradiction to the fundamental law of the constitution as they see it, then it is their duty to strike it down; they cannot write law, only prevent unjust laws from being enacted. Show me a just law that has been unjustly stricken so I have an example of what disturbs you.You know this is good; on the political blogs it has degenerated into the fact wars; completely useless.

Subject: Re: Well, then I guess we think more alike than I thought. (NT)
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 25 May 2005 14:48:46 GMT

Hi,I disagree with your perception of McCain lets just leave it at that. John McCain ran as a Republican because if he ran as an Independent (which he is) or as a Democrat (which he is becoming) he would not have won in Arizona. IMO. It is impossible to have debate without facts. I don't know how to try to persuade you that your opinion may be wrong without stating facts. The job of the legislature is to do the business of the constituents that "elected" them to office. Not to pander to every group of people. We have gone over this already. I am not talking about judges that are deciding whether or not a law is constitutional. I am talking about judges that make up there own laws. You want an example and there are many but I will give you one. It concerns the New Jersey Supreme Court and their decision to disregard law and allow the democrats to put in a substitute for Sen. Torricelli who was falling way behind in the polls during an election for the Senate because of scandal. This substitution was allowed even though the law clearly stated that it was not allowed. See the link below which explains this case. I really don't wish to discuss this case in depth because my point is that the liberal judges in this case clearly didn't like the fact the Sen. Torricelli was going to lose and changed and/or disregarded the law in order to allow an more viable candidate to be substituted in at the last minute. There are many other examples of Judges making law. Not interpreting them. Such as the Mass supreme court ruling recently about

gay marriage etc. Problem is a judge can easily change law or legislate from the bench simply by saying anything they don't like is unconstitutional with no basis in fact.
http://www.cwfa.org/printerfriendly.asp?id=2587&department=cwa&categoryid=misc

---

Subject: Re: Well, then I guess we think more alike than I thought. (NT)
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 25 May 2005 16:49:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well here's a fact then. Every poll taken on both sides since the compromise has an overwhelming majority of constituents of both parties supporting it. It's the revolution of the reasonable and about time too. Now lets get these guys out of Iraq. You know the truth is Gay Marriage just doesn't orbit in my universe, let the .001% of people who want this have it. Having been married twice it just ain't all it's cracked up to be. And where in the constitution does it say they shouldn't be allowed Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness like the rest of us?

Subject: I see we are back to polls again...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 25 May 2005 18:03:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Please if you are going to state polls as fact at least provide a link showing this data. I have absolutely no problem with the war in Iraq. And no it's not for oil. The liberals just don't learn from history. Saddam was a huge threat to us and the rest of the world. Leaving him in power would have been a disaster waiting to happen. This is how Hitler took over half the world. I will leave this subject with this quote:"There is no avoiding war, it can only be postponed to the advantage of others." N. Machiave I brought up gay marriage only as another example of judges making law. The liberal judges in Mass didn't like the law against gay marriage so the made up their own. The constitution saying Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness has nothing to do with gay marriage. Note that I didn't say whether I was for or against gay marriage. You stated polls as saying that most people agree with this sell out by McCain. Well most polls show overwhelming support for making gay marriage illegal. Does that mean you think it should be made illegal by a federal law? That the democrats should vote for such a law because after all, the representatives vote into office are supposed to do the will of the people right??? Or is that just when you agree with the out come?All of that said, I notice you didn't comment on the subject of my post. You requested examples of judges making up law. I provided one. You didn't respond. Maybe you agree with this example because you agree with the outcome. In the words of the late great Ronald Reagan "This is just feeding the crocodile hoping it will eat you last" Keep in mind it works both ways. Eventually the Conservative judges will start legislating from the bench. Then maybe you will think it's more of a problem then. Whether Republican or Democrat, this is a huge problem that everyone needs to watch carefully.

Subject: Re: I see we are back to polls again...
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 25 May 2005 18:55:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I chose not to reply based on your expressed wish not to discuss this episode in your post. There was no law against gay marriage there was a law restricting the interpretation of the concept of marriage as being between a man and woman. So Saddam was a threat ehh? To whom?The Machiavelli qoute was taken out of context. It deals with the King Loius of France maintaining his colonies in Italy. Machiavelli also said;" When the prince is obliged to shed someones blood, he should do so only when there is proper justification and manifest cause, but above all, he must abstain from taking the property of others, for men sooner forget the death of their father than the loss of their land."I can't start listing polls like a shlub; they are in all the newspapers today, including Washington Post, New York Times, Christian Science Monitor etc. Just google news.Jeez; Iraq?We are doing real well over there. The people just love us.What really intriques me is the concept of making anything that has to do with personal behaviour illegal. Providing it does no harm; then why?? This I find truley baffling.

Subject: Ok let's try Gallop...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 25 May 2005 19:43:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Here is a summery of a poll taken by Gallop from yesterday. May 24, 2005Public Conflicted in Filibuster DebateA third say both parties acting like "spoiled children"by David W. Moore A substantial majority of Americans are paying little attention to the debate over the Senate's filibuster rule, according to the latest CNN/USA Today/Gallup survey. After being informed about the issue, 48% of respondents say they favor the Democrats' side and 40% favor the Republicans' side. However, when the question is posed differently, 35% of respondents favor the position that Republicans are arguing for, while 19% favor the position that Democrats prefer. Clear majorities of respondents say the Republicans and, separately, the Democrats are acting like "spoiled children" rather than "responsible adults." However, a majority believes that at least one party is acting responsibly.Hardly seems like a slam dunk for either side to me. You can find the rest on Gallops web site if your so inclined.I said that I didn't want to debate the case I sighted. I wanted to debate the principle. Which I am still willing to do. You are avoiding the discussion that you yourself brought up.Saddam was a threat to the USA and the world as I said. Not to mention the fact that he signed a peace agreement (after attacking and occupying a neighbor country starting a war.) stating that he would comply with any and all UN Resolutions. We allowed him to stay in power if he agreed to allow inspectors etc. If not the war continues and he gets removed from office. He broke how many of these UN resolutions? I'm sure Machiavelli said a lot of things. I was posting his quote in this instance because it makes perfect sense and pertains to our discussion. Just look at history. I believe the vast majority of people in Iraq are supportive of the US and are very grateful. Of course these people are never given any press. If democracy is achieved in Iraq (A big "if" I grant you) and that leads to peace in this part of the world, GW Bush will go down in history as one of the great presidents. Of course the Democrats can't have this so they will sell out thier country to make sure it doesn't happen. They are doing everything in thier power to make

sure the US fails in this war along with thier willing accomplices in the media. You want to talk about doing the right thing for the country? Consider this question: Why is it that what's good for the country is good for Bush and the Republicans (Peace achieved in Middle east etc.) but what bad for the country is good for the Democrats (Bush fails miserably in the middle east)? Gay marriage goes far beyond personal behavior. It is a subject that has far reaching implications and I don't wish to get into right now Not because I can't debate it but simply because it will take too much time. I wish just once with these kind of discussions the participants could stick to just one subject at a time. The subject I have been trying to stay on was the deal (or sell-out) by the handful of Senators about Bush's nominees.Ok manualblock. You win. This is starting to effect my day so I give up.

Subject: Re: Ok let's try Gallop...
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 25 May 2005 20:21:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

V-man; check the posts; you brought up the marraige thing. My earlier post expressed my feeling that there was no winner or loser on the fillibuster issue if you look more carefully, I endeavored to point out that the people did in fact want the process stopped and the Senate to return to business. Remmember; 24% Reps 26% Dems and 54% niether??In your last post you said you had enough of the M'Cain thing so I dropped it.The principle of active judges; well I said what I thought in the previous post; the law is fluid and must be allowed to adapt.Peace will not be achieved in the middle east and it has nothing to do with Elephants or Donkeys; it is the nature of the beast. The Greeks/Turks/French/British, and now us have tried. You must read history more carefully.Lets check the rolls of representatives who actually served in the military; and see what we have. If the Dems want out of Iraq it is because of the waste/futility/and piracy that is happening, not because they are seeking to undermine American interests and the American people.Suggesting that all Democrats are disloyal does not deserve repeating.

Subject: As Bill O'Reilly is found of saying "I'll give you the last word" (NT)
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 25 May 2005 21:09:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

NT

Subject: Re: As Bill O'Reilly is found of saying "I'll give you the last word" (NT)
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 25 May 2005 21:25:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I grew up around the corner from Bill; he was a grade ahead of me in Island Trees high school. I used to see him in gym. Tall and very quiet.

Subject: Re: As Bill O'Reilly is found of saying "I'll give you the last word" (NT)
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 25 May 2005 21:36:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Actually it was Junior High. I think he left to go to a parochial high school.
