Subject: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 11:35:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ann Coulter:If Americans loved judicial activism, liberals wouldn't be lying about what it is. Judicial activism means making up constitutional rights in order to strike down laws the justices don't like based on their personal preferences. It's not judicial activism to strike down laws because they violate the Constitution. 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. That's why we have a judicial branch, Mr. Sulzberger, publisher of The New York Times. It's not a make-work program for the black robe industry. It's a third branch of our government. You'll learn more about this concept next year when you're in the seventh grade, Pinch. If Congress passed a law prohibiting speech criticizing Bush, or banning blacks from owning property, or giving foreigners the right to run for president — all those laws could be properly struck down by the Supreme Court. That's not "judicial activism," it's "judicial." Invalidating a law that prohibits killing unborn children on the preposterous grounds that the Constitution contains an extra-double-secret right to abortion no one had noticed for 200 years — that's judicial activism. When conservative judges strike down laws, it's because of what's in the Constitution. When liberal judges strike down laws (or impose new laws, such as tax increases), it's because of what's in The New York Times. The left's redefinition of judicial activism to mean something it's not allows liberals to claim they oppose judicial activism and to launch spirited denunciations of conservative judges as the real "judicial activists." This is the Democrats' new approach to winning arguments: Change the definition of words in mid-argument without telling the guy you're arguing with. Chairman Mao would approve. Thus, The New York Times prissily informed its readers: "There is a misconception that so-called activist judges who 'legislate from the bench' are invariably liberal. In fact, conservative judges can be even more eager to overrule decisions made by elected officials." That statement has as much intellectual content as saying: "There is a misconception that so-called activist judges who 'legislate from the bench' are invariably liberal. In fact, conservative judges can be even more eager to play tennis." The very act of redefining "judicial activism" to mean invalidating any law passed by elected officials is precisely the sort of Alice-in-Wonderland nonsense we're talking about. Liberal judges redefine the Constitution's silence on abortion to mean "abortion is a precious constitutional right." Liberal flacks in the media redefine judicial activism to mean "striking down laws." The Times' definition isn't even coherent. If it were "judicial activism" to strike down laws — any laws, ever — there would be no point to having a Supreme Court. We could just have some idiot functionary, like Joe Wilson, rubber-stamping whatever the other parts of government do. Liberals can't win on abortion, gay marriage and bans on the Pledge of Allegiance by allowing Americans to vote. That's why they need the courts to keep inventing rights to abortion, gay marriage and bans on the Pledge of Allegiance. Normal liberals know that, which is why they duck honest argument. But the crazy liberals don't. That's why Bush needs to concentrate on luring them out of their cages. It takes so little to provoke them! Just let us know before Bush nominates Janice Rogers Brown to the Supreme Court so we can arrange for live TV coverage of George Soros' head exploding, OK?

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Damir on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 12:54:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes, yes, yes...!!!
http://lyrics.rare-lyrics.com/V/Velvet-Underground/Venus-In-Furs.html

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 13:07:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Say What??? What did she just say?? Other than the constant conceptual shifts, what exactly was the content of this diatribe? Same old Ann.Can you tell me when exactly is a fetus a child? No one else seems to know. Maybe she is omniscient.Tell her to let us know if it is o'kay to invoke the privacy right written in the Constitution; if thats o'kay with her.She has a sharp tongue thats for sure;"I have no other but a womans reason,I think it so, because I think it so."William Shakespeare

Subject: I realize she uses big words....
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 13:46:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Earlier you posted that you wanted a definition of term "legislating from the bench". She gives a very clear, concise definition:"Judicial activism means making up constitutional rights in order to strike down laws the justices don't like based on their personal preferences. It's not judicial activism to strike down laws because they violate the Constitution."You may also want to note another of her intelligent and concise comments from the above commentary:"This is the Democrats' new approach to winning arguments: Change the definition of words in mid-argument without telling the guy you're arguing with. Chairman Mao would approve." This is exactly what you have been engaging in whenever we debate a subject such as - the US getting very little oil from Iraq or the rich paying almost all taxes collected. Go back and read those threads. Point is that liberals have a finite amount of talking points on any given subject. Once they run out of them they end the discussion or act like the discussion was actually about something else.

Subject: Re:And those are facts? According to whom
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 13:59:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey; I hope you guys aren't actually buying these books? Please tell me you're not; they don't say anything.

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 14:01:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Accurate; very accurate.Say you know Nico has just released a new album; have you heard it?

Subject: See your doing it right now....
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 14:18:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's a definition of "judicial activism". Should be very clear. Of course you wouldn't accept a definition of judicial activism unless it was something like "When Republican judges rule against democrats"How do you know Ann Coulter's books "don't say anything" if you haven't read any?

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Damir on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 15:22:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey, Nico was something, and yes - I bought "Camera Obscura", about 20 years ago..."I was crazy when that actually meant something - today they are all crazy." - Ch. Manson
http://smironne.free.fr/NICO/

Subject: Re: See your doing it right now....
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 17:51:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm sorry; I am not being facetious here; I see no definition whatsoever; only an opinion of what she feels constitutes judicial activism. She's entitled to her opinion but you should offer a explanation deeper than "I think so".

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 17:58:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

AK; what was the point of repeatring that.Lets see:Liberals are lying about it. About what?The New York Times is "Prissy". Excuse me? What the hell does that mean?Chairman Mao would approve. Of What exactly?Extra-double-secret-right to abortion? Whaaa??? Does she mean the Privacy Right in The Constittution?I'm sorry there is not one concrete statement in the whole article; it's all conjecture/opinion/slander/insults/inauthentic and unable to corroberate hearsay. Thats all I see there. Show me one statement of substance that has meaning outside of her opinion.

Subject: Re: See your doing it right now....
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 19:13:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No opinion at all. She is giving a concise easily understandable definition of what Judicial activism means.

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 = arrogantChairman 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.

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.

Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 20:32:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Prissy does not mean arrogant. Thats the problem; definitions.Exactly which liberals are saying this? I would like to read it somewhere.I never read that about Chairman Mao???The privacy right is explained in an earlier post on this site. I don't want to re-write so I must ask you look for it. It is in an exchange between myself and Akhilesh on this forum.What you cite as substance is opinionated speculation.Whoever said that judicial activism is the invalidation of laws passed by congress. If you want to call it that. If the law is unconstitutional then it should be invalidated. Whats so hard about that??Liberals=straw-man. If you have nothing to say you create an antagonist and attack that phanthom to shroud your lack of intellectual rigor in a phony legitamacy.

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Fri, 11 Nov 2005 21:57:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well if you know what prissy means why did you ask what it meant?Show me a link about the privacy right? Or a cut and paste. You say it's in the constitution so it should be a simple matter. I have read the constitution and can not find a "specific" right to privacy. Not to mention that the right to privacy even if it did exist has nothing to do with abortion.

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 01:32:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

As far as what Prissy means I was asking what it meant in the context in which she uses it. Thats what threw me; her syntax is off. The word itself means excessively prim and proper. Using it to describe a newspaper is strange to say the least. It has no meaning in that context.Thats my point; she just don't make a lot of sense most of the time in the way she writes. It's all hyperbole and exaggeration. Like Moe on the three stooges used to do.I really mean you have to scroll down the page to get the description of privacy rights. It is right there on this page. I don't want to re-write it; it's too long.

Subject: Re: See your doing it right now....
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 01:36:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No definition in there. Tell me what the definition is then.

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 11:01:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Here is an explanation for you from the web site below (Things that are "not" in the constitution). Notice that there is no specific mention of a right to privacy in the constitution and that it mostly came from the courts. A right to privacy that is implied is not the same as a specific right to privacy. I should also mention that I am not against a "right to privacy". Just when it is misused.The right to privacy The Constitution does not specifically mention a right to privacy. However, Supreme Court decisions over the years have established that the right to privacy is a basic human right, and as such is protected by virtue of the 9th Amendment. The right to privacy has come to the public's attention via several controversial Supreme Court rulings, including several dealing with contraception (the Griswold and Eisenstadt cases), interracial marriage (the Loving case), and abortion (the well-known Roe v. Wade case). In addition, it is said that a right to privacy is inherent in many of the amendments in the Bill of Rights, such as the 3rd, the 4th's search and seizure limits, and the 5th's self- incrimination limit.
http://www.usconstitution.net/constnot.html

Subject: Prissely
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 11:16:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ann Coulter used the word Prissily in this context. Thus, The New York Times prissily informed its readers: "There is a misconception that so-called activist judges who 'legislate from the bench' are invariably liberal. In fact, conservative judges can be even more eager to overrule decisions made by elected officials." This definition of prissily comes from the web site below:Adv. 1. prissily - in a prissy manner; "the new teacher alienates the children by behaving prissily"Seems like she used it correctly to me. But even so. This has absolutely nothing to do with her intelligence or accuracy of her comments. Instead of arguing that she is wrong with facts. You argue about whether or not she used the world "prissily" correctly. As if to say that anything she says must not be accurate because she used a word that may not have been accurately used in a sentence. Her grammar was off so her facts must be.
http://www.thefreedictionary.com/prissily

Subject: Re: Prissely

Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 12:24:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You asked me why I offered that comment; so I gave you the reply you asked for. Why yell at me for that? It's still a cockamamie idea as is most of her diatribe.

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 12:26:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The Constitution doesn't mention a right to marraige either; so am I off the hook? I don't need to bring home my paycheck anymore? Yet if you are married in one state you are married in all states; is that in the Amendmendts or something?

Subject: I was not yelling at you...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 12:59:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Not sure why you would think that. You brought up the meaning of prissily and I was discussing it with you.

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 13:09:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There is a difference between state laws and the constitution. There are marriage laws from state to state but there is no constitutional right to marriage. So no, you are not off the hook as you put it. In our discussions you seem to confuse the difference between state laws, federal laws, and the constitution. There are many state laws that are not in the constitution. This is not to say the state laws are unconstitutional just that they aren't breaking any constitutional rules. This is the reason why most states are now passing laws to prevent gay marriage. There is no constitutional right to gay or heterosexual marriage so it's up to the states to decide for themselves.

Subject: Re: I was not yelling at you...

Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 13:34:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I know that; I mean't it as a exaggeration for effect. I know when you are yelling because the print gets big.

Subject: Re: Just for you Manual. Ann Coulter on the definition of Judicial Activism.
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 13:41:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Not really. The states that are enacting the no gay marriage laws will be brought before the Supreme Court soon as a result. The Constitution clearly states and the legal precedent backs it up see this:Amendment X The powers not delegated to the states by the constitution nor prohibited it by the states are reserved to the states respectively or TO THE PEOPLE. That and the Bill of Rights tied to the IX Amendment is the basis since the country was founded of the Privacy Right. It is fundamentally founded in our extensive body of decided law.

Subject: We'll see
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 14:02:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't believe you're correct. I am confident the Supreme Court will agree that bans to gay marriage is constitutional since marriage is not a constitutional right. But as I said we shall see. This is probably Several years away from getting to the Supreme Court so we will just have to sit tight.

Subject: BTW
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 14:09:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Clearly the people of the US don't want gay marriage. See link. I thought the Democrats only want what the people want? This is why polls are so important to them. In other words, when discussing topics such as the Iraq war the first thing a Democrat will say is look at the polls.
http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6383353/

Subject: Re: BTW
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 16:14:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I am not sure where this one goes. Democrats want what Democrats want same for the Republicans.Are you suggesting that Republicans don't track polls???Lets forget gay marriage and discuss the real issue here which is how the hell does these religous groups get by with dictating to their parishoners how they must vote/campaigning for Republican Political issues and using the press to launch their Republican agenda and still get a tax deferment on all of their property and their income as organisations. You want to talk about whats fair? Thats rediculous that they get away with that BS.How come Ann doesn't mention that?

Subject: Re: BTW
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 18:30:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, I haven't been to church in years so I can't say for sure. However the people can vote anyway they want. No one is dictating to them how they "must" vote or that they must campaign for anyone. So I would imagine that Ann didn't mention it because it doesn't happen. Explain to me how a leader of a church can force people to vote or campaign for a political party? BTW, when I did go to church I have never even heard politics mentioned. If you want to be mad about something how about unions spending union dues on political campaigns without the knowledge or the approval of it's members? This is something that Arnold just tried to have stopped in CA. Unfortunately for him and the union members it wasn't passed. Of course you realize the unions are spending this money on the Democrat campaigns. Do you disagree with this practice?Regarding religious institutions not having to pay taxes on property. This is for all religions. Not just the Christian religion. Jews generally vote for the Democrats. I don't see how this is unfair in anyway. That said I wouldn't be opposed to ending religious tax breaks. At least not with what I know of them. I must admit I am not familiar with the specifics. So I reserve the right to change my mind.

Subject: Re: BTW
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 19:16:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It does happen. Big time. And it stinks. And I'm sorry but she is redundent; superficial and boring.How come you guys never mention any of the really thoughtfull and intelligent conservative writers?Where's William F. Buckley?

Subject: Re: BTW
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 19:46:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Look in order to have a discussion you have to give some kind of facts. You can't just say something and not back it up. How can a church leader force it's church members to vote or campaign for a political party? Also what are you trying to say? If this did occur it's only happening with Republicans? You know African Americans are pretty religious and they vote almost exclusively for Democrats? Isn't it "Rev" Sharpton and "Rev" Jackson? Same with the Jewish people. I'm not sure what your compliant is. You may not like Ann Coulter but she is anything but boring. I find her intelligent and very funny at times. But to each his own. William Buckley is great (see link). He's still around. Both Ann Coulter and Buckley (as well as Rush and Hannity) are very good IMO. But I can understand why you wouldn't like them. I can't stand liberal commentators. I do listen to a few but mostly just for the laughs. I really can't stand their negativity. All they do is name call. Sure Rush makes up names for the Dems but it's funny (to me and obviously many other people. He was just given a 300 million dollar contract. The largest in history). Rush is trying to be funny by making fun of the Dems. Rush is never angry. Neither are the other conservatives mentioned here. But every liberal I have listened to is very angry and nasty. Of course you may view them differently. Notice how almost no liberal radio talk show host can make it? It's because they have no concept of facts. Just name call and bitch about Bush. Nobody wants to listen to negativity all day. How is Air America doing lately?
http://www.townhall.com/opinion/contributors/wfbuckley/archive/2005/

Subject: Re: BTW
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 12 Nov 2005 22:07:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

My friend; count the number of times the word "Liberal" comes up in any discussion involving these three you name. Count the number of times you hear the same ten sentences repeated endlessly. It's draining to be redundant. The people who I am familiar with who you might want to call liberal's are either too busy to listen to radio talk shows all day or they are far too advanced in their thinking to tolerate the superficiality and redundancy of the repitition displayed on these programs. I used to listen to Bob Grant for a couple hours each day.I don't know if you are familiar with him but Rush stole his whole act and persona. Grant was a very hardcore conservative; his famous tag line was "Get Off MY Phone!" whenever he was insulted by the stupidity of a caller. But he was never boring/superficial/repetitive and so I liked to listen to him. William F. Buckley is one of my all time favorites in terms of political commentary and I always read the National Review. He too is thoughtfull and analytical.Thats my problem; these other three bore the living crap out of me. They are simplistic and hyper-verbal to no effect.If you actually analyse a paragraph at random; it is empty of meaning. Try it sometime and we can walk through it too see what exactly the individual is saying.BTW; I like Pat Buchanan; never afraid to be controversial to his power base or to take chances provoking his audience to think.

Subject: Re: BTW
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 11:22:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Of course I totally disagree with you. Even if Rush stole his "Act" (which I don't believe) he is obviously much better at it. Rush doesn't tell anyone to "get off his phone". In fact I have never heard him hang up on anyone. He loves when liberals call his show and so do I. Very entertaining. Rush is the most popular talk show host in history. Like him or hate him he is very effective. Ann Coulter and Hannity are less effective. Of all three I find Coulter the best. I love her wit and sense of humor. I find the liberal talk show hosts as you describe which is "boring/superficial/repetitive". Nothing but hate speech. No facts, no point, just name calling. Air America is a perfect example. While Rush's remains the most popular radio host, Air America is floundering. It's only on the air because of rich liberal contributions. This will dry up shortly and they will go the way of all the other liberal talk shows. If Rush was "boring/superficial/repetitive" nobody would listen to him. And please spare me the "liberals are far to intelligent and busy to listen to talk radio" lines. It's just plain silly. If liberals were intelligent they would be conservatives.Look here is the case in point. You come on here and make an outrageous claims such as church leaders are some how forcing people to vote and campaign for the Republican party. When asked how this could possibly be you are silent. You are silent because it isn't true. Same problem with liberal radio. Just wild accusations with no facts filled in with name calling. This is why nobody listens to them. Nobody wants to hear negativity all day. As I said to each his own.

Subject: Re: BTW
Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 12:53:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Liberal radio; as you call it..since it tells the truth is really all of radio except the loud/boring/obnoxious repeaters like Rush. Just because the borscht-belt commentators give something a name doesn't mean that name has any validity.Hardcore rant radio like Rush is as old as the hills. Look up Alan Burke and Joe Pine; he actually would punch guests who didn't follow his conservative agenda on the show.There are no facts to look up. Check/red state/blue state and religous attendance figures and which churches predominate. Then watch the 700 club; see where their contributions come from and how they all vote the same ticket. I don't mean Republican or Democrat I mean issues. The same tired old hot button issues that the trolls focus on. Becuase they are simplistic and easily understood by anyone of any simple mind. They require no thought or insight whatsoever; just follow the herd.

Subject: You used the word "forced"...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 13:35:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Suggesting that someone vote a certain why is totally different than "forcing" them too. You also said Campaigning. How is anyone forced to campaign for the Republicans. There are no facts to look up because your accusation is false. Church members and religious people may vote a certain way but nobody is forcing them to. I have already given you examples of religious people that vote for the Democrats. Your theory doesn't hold water. As with most liberal theories. The real thing that is bothering you is that many Christians vote for Republicans. Not because some one is forcing them to. See, liberals can never admit that they lose elections because the people don't agree with their politics. So they make up stuff in their minds, like people being forced to vote for Republicans. Democrats being kept from voting, voting machines being fixed, voter fraud etc. It's beyond the comprehension of the simple minded liberals that people no longer agree with them. Thanks to the internet, the people are starting to get the real facts. Bad news for the Dems.

Subject: Re: You used the word "forced"...
Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 17:00:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You are correct regarding Black voters who do disproportionally vote the Democratic ticket due to their religous affiliation. But they only make up 8% of the vote.The National Baptist Council gives it's parishoners a recommendation regarding the vote for every election. Same with many of the other fundementalist organisations. You know that.Thats fine if that recomendation was a carefully thought out examination of all of the issues. But we know it isn't.Regardless; no organisation that promotes any political position should be awarded a tax relief.The internet is actually hurting your cause. The vast amount of information trotted out on a daily basis has fractionalised the Republican Power base and allowed many who would not have been exposed to the reality of this administration to see the effects of their policies. The constant repetitive drone of Liberal; Liberal has resulted in the semantic satiation effect manifesting in control subjects. The inhibition-extinction process that results in loss of meaning will eventually; as is happening with much of the marketted message endlessly repeated by the political hucksters like Rush, is filtering the impact of the keywords used by these salesmen. This is a well known phenomena observed very seriously by ad and marketing researchers. So please; do us a favor and keep hammering away at those critical stimuli. The semantic satiation effect will do our work for us.

Subject: Hmmm.. Then how do you explain the fact that the Democrats keep losing?
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 18:09:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The republicans have gained control of congress for the first time in 40 years and have kept it since the internet has sprouted? Not to mention winning the last two Presidential elections? Again your problem is that the religious people are voting for the Republicans as this post clearly points out.

Subject: Re: Hmmm.. Then how do you explain the fact that the Democrats keep losing?
Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 20:33:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The elections sway from side to side in a predictable way. This is simple political science.Why is that my problem? Your taxes paid for them also. Even the ones who voted Democratic.Lets see how they go this time around.

Subject: Yeah, we'll get em' next year...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 11:31:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You said that the internet has helped get the facts out and is bad for republicans. Of course this is totally wrong. The internet helped get the facts out and the republicans gained control of congress for the first time in 40 years plus the last two presidential elections. These are called facts. Obviously I am correct and you are not.

Subject: Re: Yeah, we'll get em' next year...
Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 18:10:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The Democrats had it for 8 years and they will have it again. Read history and turn off the radio.

Subject: Democrats lost control of the house and senate during those eight years.
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 19:07:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You might want to check those history books yourself. Look up "Contract with America". That should give you the info you need to get your facts straight.