

---

Subject: Have to learn how to post pics I guess.  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 04 Oct 2005 23:53:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Not much else going on.

---

---

Subject: Re: Have to learn how to post pics I guess.  
Posted by [Damir](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 11:34:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I heard that leeches treatment is good for old an bored people...

---

---

Subject: Re: Have to learn how to post pics I guess.  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 11:48:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ha! Hey Damir; where are the song lyrics to go with that photo my man?I heard this guy here is running for nomination to Bush supreme court.He's better qualified than the past two. Or he is up for DeLays spot.What are you up too; no more vacation photo's; what gives?

---

---

Subject: better qualified than....  
Posted by [MQracing](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 12:00:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

hey... this ninja man might make clarence look likean intellectual giant :=)harriet? Yeah... I fail to see the merits of her candidacy...the confirmed chief justice... at least he brought some provenintellect and skills to the table... I probably won't like his rulings... which reminds me that the real definition of an "activist" judge is just someone who rules against your side of a particular issue. Then you start screaming about how they are "making law" from the bench.cheers,msl

---

---

Subject: Re: better qualified than....  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 13:06:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Touche'; I hope this personal friend of shrub turns on him. I have a feeling about her; she may not like looking like Bush's trained ape. Do they go to school out there? Isn't the whole purpose of the Constitution as taught in my school system to be a fluid document that changes with changing conditions. Maybe we should repeal all amendments and re-instate slavery so we can "not legislate from the bench". Man I hate the guy who taught the Bush to say that phrase. But yes; he is managing to make the Supreme law giving body in the history of the world look like the second string team at the Akron Ohio Pitch and Putt.

---

---

Subject: Re: better qualified than....

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 14:30:04 GMT

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

---

I wondered how long it was going for you to jump on Bush's SCOUTS nomination - very poor choice. She might be great as an advisor, but she is not even remotely qualified, IMO. Not sure I agree with the "fluid" part of the Constitution. It's worked well for the past 200+ years with minor changes. Remember when Arnold was elected Governor of CA, and everyone wanted to change the Law so one did not have to be a US citizen born on US soil to be Prez? Are you for or against judges legislating from the bench?

---

---

Subject: Re: better qualified than....

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 14:56:53 GMT

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

---

Can you explain clearly what exactly constitutes legislating from the bench? I haven't found anyone who can as yet. Lot's of folks use the term but when asked for an explanation they acquire a stutter. What is your argument concerning the fluid nature of the Constitution? Cite a case that would be an example of bench driven legislation and I'll see if I can follow what you mean. That is if you are serious about this; there's a tendency to bail out when the going gets tough.

---

---

Subject: Wow, a personal attack already

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 15:53:46 GMT

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

---

This statement needs an explanation: "there's a tendency to bail out when the going gets tough."

---

---

Subject: Kung Fu - part 2  
Posted by [Damir](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 16:44:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

UK SUBS: "Barbie`s dead"

---

---

Subject: Re: Wow, a personal attack already  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 18:39:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Why do you take it as a personal attack? Maybe a little blunt; but blunt is good it shows you respect the other guy and choose not to waste his time if you are not serious. It's not a personal attack. Calling someone clueless; that's an example of a personal attack. Since I am unknown and far away a personal attack hiding behind a monicker would be cowardly. Not my style. I like to discuss politics in the context of everyday life; that's all it means. So; where were we? Legislating from the bench, right?

---

---

Subject: We're still at "bail(ing) out when the going gets tough"  
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 19:02:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Care to elaborate?

---

---

Subject: Re: Kung Fu - part 2  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 19:10:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Freddy's Dead "It's hard to understand, There was love in this man, I'm sure all would agree, That his misery, Was his woman and things, Now Freddy's dead, That's what I said." "Everybody's misused him, Ripped him off and abused him, Another junkie playin, Pushin' dope for the man, A terrible blow but that's how it go, A Freddy's on the corner now, If you wanna be a junkie wow, Remember.. Freddy's dead." "We're all built up with progress, But sometimes I must confess, We can deal with rockets and dreams, But reality, What does it mean? Ain't nothin said cause Freddy's dead." "Why can't we be brothers, Protect one another, No one's serious and it makes me furious, Don't be misled, Just think of Fred." Curtis Mayfield

---

---

Subject: Re: We're still at "bail(ing) out when the going gets tough"

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 19:15:54 GMT

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

---

Elaborate? We are going where with this?

---

---

Subject: Answer the question

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 19:27:10 GMT

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

---

You said, "....there's a tendency to bail out when the going gets tough." Then I responded, "Care to elaborate?" Where are we going with this? I want to know why you wrote that.....Colin

---

---

Subject: Re: Answer the question

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 19:33:13 GMT

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

---

I thought I explained that; no?What other explanation did you want to hear?

---

---

Subject: Too much junkie business

Posted by [Damir](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 19:38:15 GMT

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

---

Just read some "UK Subs" lyrics (obscure, 2nd wave/2nd league of punk movement), and found some good, even "prophetical" polytical lyrics.And remembered friend of mine who was that impressed with their "Brand New Age" LP that he scrawled all the city with "UK Subs" signs, around 1982. Around 1985. he was dead. Oh well...

Brand New Age

---

---

Subject: Re: Too much junkie business

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 19:53:32 GMT

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

---

Damir; why is that prophetic; in what year did Orwell write 1984?Huxley write Brave New World? This stuff is older than dirt. "Known only to him are the great hidden secrets,I'll fear not the darkness when my flame shall dim,I know not what the future holds,But I know who holds the future,It's a secret known only to him." Elvis Presley

---

---

Subject: Re: Too much junkie business  
Posted by [Damir](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 20:16:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Huh, it`s 23.15 here...another time  
<http://www.plyrics.com/lyrics/clash/policeandthieves.html>

---

---

Subject: Re: better qualified than....  
Posted by [Bob Brines](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 20:29:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The Constitution tells the federal government exactly what it can do. Everything else is left to the states. End of issue. If the people want the federal government to have additional authority, the people, though their state legislatures may amend the Constitution. Slavery and women's suffrage are two examples. Prohibition is a great example of what happens when zealots take over the process. We must be careful what we wish for because we may get it.Rowe v Wade is the current litmus test of ideological purity. The moral righteousness of the issue is irrelevant. There is not a shred of evidence in the Constitution that abortion rights is in the federal purvey. The Supreme Court legislated from the bench a right that does not exist. This issue belongs to the states, as directed by the Constitution. Some states will legalize abortion in all cases, some will outlaw it in all cases, the majority will find a middle ground. So be it. This is what the Founding Fathers intended. If the zealots on either side wish to force their opinion upon all of the states, they may do so through the amendment process. The Supreme Court does not have that right.Of course, here in Arkansas, I import food and manufactured goods from other states. This constitutes interstate commerce. Therefore, the Supreme Court gets the right to legislate abortion rights upon Arkansas through the interstate commerce clause. Sure, THAT's exactly what the Founding Fathers intended!Bob

---

---

Subject: Re: better qualified than....  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 20:41:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm sorry I am not sure what the situation is in Arkansas. How is it the Commerce Clause regulates

abortion rights there?The issue with abortion is whether there is a privacy right implied in the language of the Constitution. Without beating a dead horse I think in a personal vein that if that is true than it would be unconscionable to allow the states to take that right away. So I think that would be the issue at hand.Interesting to see the arguments occuring this week on assisted suicide.Scalia asked if allowing Doctors to use opiates to end a life would lead Doctors to prescribe opiates for the Mentally Depressed in order to make them happy. That is why I am not a fan of the court at this time; due to silly questions like that.To tie your hands with proscriptions against ruling on anything not explicitly stated in the Constitution would seem disengenous to me.Simply put; it seems that the Legislative power is there to accomplish anything the ruling party desires, consequently we have a Judiciary that can spread the cultural changes over a wide span.

---

---

Subject: Re: Too much junkie business  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 20:49:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Good night my friend.23.15; thats 11: 15 PM right?Reminds me of the old joke; Guy in the military asked what time it was and he gets this reply;For you guys in the Air Force it's 23.15all you Navy guys it's 11:15 pm and for you guys in the Army..The big hand is on the 11 and the small hand is....

---

---

Subject: Re: better qualified than....  
Posted by [Bob Brines](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 21:20:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Boy, you sure have an uncanny ability to miss the point when faced with sarcasm and hyperbole.There are NO privacy right specified in the Constitution other than those specified in the Bill of Rights -- amendments. Any rights conferred upon the people of the Republic are contained in the Declaration of Independence. The Constitution is simple the enabling legislation. I'd be very interested to see where you find a right to an abortion. Please quote chapter and verse.Now, before you get your panties in a wad, I am not arguing the moral issue of abortion. I am arguing the legal issue. So don't start sending me pictures of aborted fetuses. YOU DO NOT KNOW WHICH SIDE OF THE MORAL ISSUE I AM ON!!!!!!I'm sorry you do not like the Constitution and the framework the Founding Fathers left for us. Your solution is for the courts to ignore the Constitution and any law passed by the Congress and the various states when a higher moral standard requires it. But who screams depends on whose ox is being gored. Throughout most of the later half of the 20th century, the conservatives screamed because the courts were packed with liberals. Now the liberals are screaming because the courts are being packed with conservatives. If the courts followed the Constitution rather than their moralistic whim, no one would be screaming, or maybe everyone would be softly whimpering. If you feel the need to change the Constitution, you must amend it. You cannot simple ignore it.Bob

---

---

Subject: Re: better qualified than....

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 21:45:14 GMT

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

---

Well Bob; I certainly appreciate you schooling me. Can you say what your position on the Amendments to the Constitution is? Are they invariable by definition or can we assume they have the power to grant proscriptive rights as stated in Article V of the original document? Would your position be that the Founding fathers sought to maintain the document exactly in the position it held in 1789? I don't wear panties I don't know why you would want to assume that. I never said there was a right to abortion; I said there is an implied right to privacy; I appreciate you honoring me by quoting me but please quote me accurately. I don't have any pictures of aborted fetuses; exactly what kinds of folks are you used to dealing with down there in Arkansas? I never asked what side of the moral issue you were on. As soon as your tantrum ends maybe we can convert this to a real and honest discussion. That may be too much to hope for.

---

---

Subject: Again, answer the question

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 21:49:19 GMT

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

---

- Where did you say "no"?- I want you to explain why you made that remark.

---

---

Subject: Re: better qualified than....

Posted by [Bob Brines](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 21:52:49 GMT

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

---

Sigh...OK. Your opinion is a real and honest discussion. My opinion is a tantrum. Oh, well. Bye Bob

---

---

Subject: Re: better qualified than....

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 22:10:25 GMT

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

---

You really didn't state an opinion; you de-constructed my post with; I may add, not a lot of civility. You must admit, since I made it clear I was interested in your view, that you could have stated it without the adversarial exclamations; no? I am still interested in your view except without the insinuation that I am a crack-pot. But I am sure this is the big bail-out. Not to mention I never really stated an opinion except to say I thought the abortion thing came out of the privacy right. But hey; nice way to slip off without a real exchange.

---

---

Subject: Re: Again, answer the question  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 22:18:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Your losing me; I gave you the respect to answer this question once which I would not have done for just anyone so what is this. I am not repeating myself.

---

---

Subject: You attacked, now answer the question  
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 22:28:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Why did you say, ".....there's a tendency to bail out when the going gets tough." You won't be repeating yourself, since you have not answered in the first place

---

---

Subject: Re: You attacked, now answer the question  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 23:47:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hey; look at Bob's post. That's a good example. If you want to know what I mean that illustrates it quite well. I call it the "Big Bail out"; when they have nothing to say they provoke you then...Bail-out. It happens a lot. So when I saw you asked a question I wanted to know if you were serious or if you would do the Bobby's bail out routine. I did not want to have to spend time writing and posting for nothing so I asked. Good enough for you? I mean; I still think it's a good topic. There has certainly not been anything of consequence said as yet.

---

---

Subject: No more discussions with you. I promise  
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Thu, 06 Oct 2005 00:41:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It's pretty obvious that our OPINIONS on most things in life are complete opposites. Outside technical forums, I see very little need for mutual interaction.

---

---

Subject: Re: No more discussions with you. I promise  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 06 Oct 2005 01:42:42 GMT

---



Hey thats why Ice cream comes in flavors; it's hard to come to grips with the fact that you can't always be right. I'm sorry you take such an apocalyptic view of things; to me it's just another day at the beach. But there is a way you carry yourself to be an honest person; you face those who disagree with respect but with a commitment to your personal dignity. And yes everything is opinions; no problem with that. If you are sincere then what others believe should have no emotional effect on you. And what interaction would there be anyway? See I can argue a point because I am honest with myself and others regardless of what side anyone is on and I apologise when I'm wrong. Sneaking a supposedly serious point into a post to draw someones honest response for the express purpose of ridiculing or belittling that individual and then disappearing is cowardly and weak. Thats my philosophy and I stand by it..

---

---

Subject: WTF are you talking about?

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Thu, 06 Oct 2005 02:54:31 GMT

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

---

"Sneaking a supposedly serious point into a post to draw someones honest response for the express purpose of ridiculing or belittling that individual and then disappearing is cowardly and weak." What the fuck are you talking about?

---

---

Subject: Re: WTF are you talking about?

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 06 Oct 2005 06:37:53 GMT

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

---

I notice you use that phrase a lot. It seems simple enough to me whats the problem? Seems to be a mis-communication on a regular basis here. This is what I want to avoid; They ask what seems to be a rational question; wait until you respond in a rational way then instead of responding; post some irresponsible drivel and sign off wasting your time and the bandwidth. I don't know maybe you haven't noticed. It happens a lot and I prefer not to be a part of it. I reply to you here only because you seem somehow unawares that this occurs. Why does this fascinate you anyway; it would seem you would not like this type of snipe posting either; so what gives? Read the exchange with Bobby; it is clear as a bell. That is why I do not wish to waste my time. Thats why I asked are you serious; so whats hard here? Had you replied yes; I am serious; then we would have continued; somehow you were sidetracked and this off the wall exchange occurred instead of a discussion about legal issues. The concept of legislating from the bench is a difficult topic; why start it if we will not finish it. I don't have a bone to pick or any ego issues. I like when people disagree with me; it's a good thing as long as they are reasonable and can lighten up the tone when required. So rather than think and write a long post that will not receive a response I ask...are you serious before I commit to the discussion. No one else here would have received this much accommodation so what is the issue; or is it some hidden agenda here? Like the Bobby

snipe and run scenario. I can't do any more explaining of my posts; it's getting tiresome now. This could have been a productive exchange instead of this whatever it is.

---