
Subject: Let's look at some facts...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 13:38:58 GMT

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

Manual feel free to answer any of these question now if you would like. Following are some cut and pastes from our discussion. These are some of the wild accusations you have made and left unanswered: "how the hell does these religious 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" "I don't know if you are familiar with him but Rush stole his whole act and persona?" "The internet is actually hurting your cause. The vast amount of information trotted out on a daily basis has fractionalised the Republican Power base" Please tell me how religious organizations can force people to vote or campaign for a political party? We'll, leave the press argument for another time if that's ok. Please give me specific examples of how Rush stole his whole act and persona? Please tell me how the internet has hurt the Republican party when in fact (there's that word again "fact"), since the internet has become widely used, the Republicans have gained control of the house and Senate for the first time in 40 years and have won the last two presidential elections? The above facts show that when the people are given access to the facts via the internet (and not through the biased liberal media) they vote for Republicans. On the subject of "Name Calling". Let's look at the facts. You have done the following in just our discussion the these subjects. Called Ann Coulter a "used car salesman", a "Blond Twit". You have also said in reference to Ann Coulter "Back in the old neighborhood they had a name for a woman with her personality" You also mentioned that you think she has an annoying voice. Called Rush Limbaugh - A lousy DJ who has access to strong opiods on a daily basis. I on the other hand I called you a Liberal. Sorry for this insult. I keep forgetting that liberals are ashamed of who they are and what they stand for. In contrast feel free to call me a conservative any time you would like. I take it as a compliment and not an insult. But as you can see it is you doing the name calling and not backing up what you say.

Subject: Re: Let's look at some facts...

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 15:15:25 GMT

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

There you go again! Mixing apples and oranges. Let me ask you something; I asked for your interpretation of what legislating from the bench means. You link me to some other guys interpretation of what it means. I tell you exactly why I think Coulter is a sham and you change the subject and insist I have insulted her. Can you address those reasons I gave by any chance? When I discuss these things with you I expect your carefully thought out opinion. You give me someone elses opinion then crow about it like it was your own. If you want to discuss political opinions; give me yours. If you want to discuss why Rush is a bad commentator deal with my reasons; don't try to side-track the issue. Rush copied Grant. Pretty much a done deal with most people who watch the both of them; but if you have never heard Bob then how would you know? So why question my opinion; why not go see for yourself? Then we can debate. All I get from you are links with other peoples opinions on them. If that is what you want; then link me to them and I will debate them. My opinion of Coulter stands and what you call insults are nothing compared to

her usual spew of viscious invective. Want to go quote for quote with me and her? See who is more vindictive/insulting/disrespectfull? Thats her whole act. Those things I say are true. Look them up this is a conversation between you and me and I don't need any help from anyone else. For every link you provide I can get one that disputes it. So then what do we do; just make a whole thread of contradictory links and be done with it. Man this ain't show and tell.

Subject: Re: Let's look at some facts...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 15:56:12 GMT

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

Sure, glad to help. I would ask you to answer my questions but we both know how that would end. Your question #1 "I asked for your interpretation of what legislating from the bench means." My interpretation is this. Legislating from the bench is when a judge makes up "rights" that are not in any law or constitution. He makes up these rights only to forward his biased political agenda. In other words to overturn laws that he or she doesn't like. In some cases like the New Jersey case I cited. The judges will totally ignore law to create their own laws. Basically they write new laws. This is supposed to be the job of congress and not the judges. Hence the term "legislating from the bench". BTW I don't believe you ever asked me for my interpretation of Legislating from the bench. You said you haven't seen a coherent definition which Ann Coulter certainly provided. Your question #2 "I tell you exactly why I think Coulter is a sham and you change the subject and insist I have insulted her. Can you address those reasons I gave by any chance?" I gave you specific insults that you said of Ann Coulter. I'll repeat for you in case you didn't read past the first couple of lines from my previous post. You called Ann Coulter a "used car salesman", a "Blond Twit". You have also said in reference to Ann Coulter "Back in the old neighborhood they had a name for a woman with her personality" You also mentioned that you think she has an annoying voice. Are these not insults? Regarding giving your "exact reasons why Ann Coulter is a sham" What exact reason would they be? I don't see any other than you didn't think she used the word "prissily" correctly and that you don't understand her remarks. Please give examples and not just call her a blond twit, and I would be more than happy to address them. BTW I didn't change the subject at all. Please provide some examples of how I did this so I can address them. I have not side tracked anything. This is what you do. Please give an example and I would be more than happy to address this. Regarding Bob Grant. Just because you say something doesn't make it so. Let me get this straight. It's common knowledge that Rush copied Grant. But you can give no examples of how. And the only examples of Grants show that you did give "hangs up on people" and says "Get off my phone" Rush doesn't do. So please give specific examples of how Rush copied Grant? If you can get any links that dispute what I have said and shown I would be more than happy to read them and discuss them. So show me a link that proves Church leaders force members to vote or campaign for Republicans, Show me a link that shows the internet has helped the Democrats even though the Republicans keep winning. Etc. Don't just say you can find them. Show me them. Just because you say something doesn't make it true. This ain't show and tell? So you want to make any wild accusation that you want. Not answer any questions about them. Not link to any web sites that support your claims etc. Sounds like good honest debate to me. Let me try one ok, It's common knowledge that Clinton raped several woman. He also killed several people that got in his way. Of course this is not debatable. If you want you can look up the many web sites that prove this. This isn't show and tell so please don't ask me to link to them here. Also please

don't ask me any further questions on this subject because it's common knowledge. Anyone that is intelligent, has access to the facts, and hasn't lived in a cave would no this to be true. Wow, I kinda like your brand of discussion. It's a lot easier.

Subject: Re: Let's look at some facts...

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 17:08:15 GMT

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

So whats your opinion? Should I list all the insults Coulter uses in her essays? Are you really saying that isn't so? Do you really want to go over the legal aspects of the Corzine case? Those Judges were given upwards of a thousand pages of testimony to review. So where do we start? Just because your political organisation picked through the testimony and chose whatever suited their position should we now retry the case and look at all the evidence? That selective approach works both ways. Do I really need to quote Coulter's statements to you? Are you denying she insults people? Here I'll do a couple for you. "The swing voters;- I like to refer to them as idiot voters because they don't have philosophical principals. You're either a conservative or you're a liberal if you have an IQ above a toaster." From her book which I will not name to give out the free publicity. I can get you dozens of these if that makes you happy but it means nothing because by denying that she writes the stuff she does you re-inforce my position that you are not truthfull. Rush copied Grant. End of story. Listen to him and find out or expect me to provide all the information for the debate. I won't. The Corzine case is first of all a state case and I don't have the New Jersey State Constitution. Second the points your friends make are nothing but opinions. Their opinion of what makes settled law. My opinion is just as valid as theirs is. I showed you where in the constitution there is a privacy right and I never heard another peep out of you regarding that. That's what you do. Ignore whatever doesn't fit your scheme. I ask what you think that The Ninth and Tenth Amendment means and ...nothing. Or now I'll get someone else's opinion in a link. Do you have opinions that are not someone else's??

Subject: I never said Ann Coulter didn't use insults. I said you did..

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 17:25:00 GMT

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

You could start by answering the specific questions I asked you and not insinuating that the web site is posted by my friends. Besides that: 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 you're wrong.

Subject: Re: Who Cares? Do You Have Your Own Mind?
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 18:08:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nt

Subject: Now there is a relevant remark.
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 18:44:08 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.

Subject: Now there is a relevant remark...
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 18:44:48 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.

Subject: Meant for below. Sorry (NT)
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 18:45:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NT

Subject: Re: So I notice you won't state an opinion of your own. Too bad.
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 18:48:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nt

Subject: Re:Where's a reply to the first post? Rush can't help you there.
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 18:49:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nt

Subject: Re:It's hard work forming your own opinions ain't it?
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 18:55:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

no opinions from the peanut gallery.

Subject: I was discussing facts. Not opinions. But if you would like here ya go..
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 19:12:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In my opinion, Liberal talk shows are nothing but negativity and name calling. Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. Legislating from the bench is when a judge makes up "rights" that are not in any law or constitution. He makes up these rights only to forward his biased political agenda. In other words to overturn laws that he or she doesn't like. In some cases like the New Jersey case I cited. The judges will totally ignore law to create their own laws. Basically they write new laws. This is supposed to be the job of congress and not the judges. Hence the term "legislating from the bench". BTW I don't believe you ever asked me for my interpretation of Legislating from the bench. You said you haven't seen a coherent definition which Ann Coulter certainly provided. Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. I don't care for Al Sharpton. Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. I like Rush, Hannity and Ann Coulter. Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. I am confident the Supreme Court will agree that bans to gay marriage is constitutional since marriage is not a constitutional right. Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. You may not like Ann Coulter but she is anything but boring. I find her intelligent and very funny at times. Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. 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.

Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. 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. Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. 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. Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. Your problem is that the religious people are voting for the Republicans. Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. And lastly - 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. Oh I gave this opinion already. Sorry. Your right though. I really should give my opinion more often. Sigh.

Subject: No it isn't. See below. (NT)
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 19:13:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NT

Subject: Which post is that? (NT)
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 14 Nov 2005 19:34:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Let me get this straight. I ask you numerous questions that you refuse to answer but even so, I must answer all of your questions. Ok sounds fair. Which question do you want me to answer?

Subject: Re: I was discussing facts. Not opinions. But if you would like here ya go..
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 15 Nov 2005 01:16:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Boy you really riled up this group. By opinions I didn't mean your opinion of people; I mean't your political opinions based on your carefull thought and analysis. Not what Rush said on his radio program. I hate liberals is not an opinion it's a flame. An example of an opinion is something

along these lines; I feel that legislating from the bench is a term that has no meaning. This is why I feel that way. That's an opinion. Saying that all people you consider to be liberals are not intelligent or they would be conservatives is not an opinion it's an attack.
