

---

Subject: Still waiting for the COHERENT explanation of legislating from the bench  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 13 Nov 2005 20:38:21 GMT

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

---

She certainly didn't provide it. After forcing myself to re-read that tripe I am unable to make sense of it. And I resent the time I wasted trying to follow that gibberish. Next time I demand a reasonably capable argument. I will not be trifled with again. Nonsense. Used car saleswoman; actually... naah; I've heard more reasoned arguments from used car guys and I should not insult them that way.

---

---

Subject: You have been given a COHERENT explanation and also an example.  
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 11:25:38 GMT

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

---

Please tell me what is so hard to understand about these words?"Judicial activism means making up constitutional rights in order to strike down laws the justices don't like based on their personal preferences."click on link for an example of legislating from the bench. Funny you asking for a COHERENT explanation of something. You really need to re-evaluate your thought process. All of this trouble you are having with facts and answering questions means you are either very uninformed or WRONG. Think about it.

<http://www.cwfa.org/printerfriendly.asp?id=2587&department=cwa&categoryid=misc>

---

---

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

---

---

Subject: The article I linked to gives in great detail the reasons why...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 13:04:14 GMT

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

---

the New Jersey supreme court was "legislating from the bench". But you wouldn't know this because you didn't read the link? Again if you disagree with something in the link feel free to mention it. I made up no definition. It's a definition that Ann Coulter mentions. I don't know where she got it. But because it's easily understandable I would think that most people would get it. What do you expect something in Webster's dictionary? You mention a bunch of stuff that has nothing to do with the definition given.

---

---

Subject: Re: The article I linked to gives in great detail the reasons why...

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 14:44:17 GMT

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

---

Well; thats the point. I see you lump all of my arguments in one pile and dismiss them as usual since they are harder to follow than Rush and they don't repeat incessantly so you must remember them. This is what she does; promotes irrellavent arguments then acts as if they are legitimate reasonable positions. As soon as you examine them closely; poof! they disappear. I expect an understandable definition of legislating from the bench and all I get are insults to some straw-man liberal ghost that doesn't exist.

---

---

Subject: Re: You have been given a COHERENT explanation and also and example.

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 14:46:51 GMT

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

---

Geez; this is an easy one except it will take time. You want to take it one paragraph at a time and we'll see the flaw in the reasoning of this link. Thats why I don't link. They left out some of the facts as usual.

---

---

Subject: Re: The article I linked to gives in great detail the reasons why...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 16:00:21 GMT

---

Since you have shown yourself to be completely incapable of answering even the simplest of questions, refusing to back up your wild accusations, and basically just spewing tripe, I am done with our debates being discussed below. You do nothing but spit out liberal talking points and when called on to verify or even discuss the points you yourself bring up you stay silent. It is a waste of time discussing anything with you because no amount of reason, facts, or common sense will get you to admit that your wrong. A basic liberal.

---

---

Subject: Re: You have been given a COHERENT explanation and also and example.

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 16:10:27 GMT

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

---

Since you have shown yourself to be completely incapable of answering even the simplest of questions, refusing to back up your wild accusations, and basically just spewing tripe, I am done with our debates being discussed below. You do nothing but spit out liberal talking points and when called on to verify or even discuss the points you yourself bring up you stay silent. It is a waste of time discussing anything with you because no amount of reason, facts, or common sense will get you to admit that your wrong. A basic liberal.

---