

Re: Is this sci.physics, or by accident, am I reading posts on some crackpt political nesgroup.

Re: Is this sci.physics, or by accident, am I reading posts on some crackpt political nesgroup.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy.hydrogen/2008-07/msg00122.html>

- *From:* Fred Kasner <fkasner@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 08 Jul 2008 11:52:27 -0500
-

hhc314@xxxxxxxxx wrote:

.... snip ...

– Show quoted text –

Fred, I will not even attempt to dipute anything that you have said it this post.

I do have major fault to pick with the both leaders of our two major political parties that have permitted this travesty to take place.

Feel free to consider me an 'old fart' Fred, but I rather like the way that the presidential candidates emerged from some consensus at the respective party conventions, where media created images played nearly no role in candidate selections, and certainly not the heavily inluence primary elections, because I don't remember these distractions even existing.

I was pretty young at that time, but as I remember watching it on black and white TV, nearly every state went in to the convention promoting their 'favorite son' candidate. Sometimes even 20–50 votes took place before a candidate was selected. This was because, in those days, the US operated as a Republic, not a Democracy.

The system managed to works quite well, although it was sometime lengthy. Great leaders like FDR and Lincoln emerged as their party nominees.

Fred, I have to ask you this sensitive quetion. Would you see any chance that a man like FDR in the face of a hard core media blitz could emergy the winner in one of today's primary fights. Or, for that matter, Harry Truman as his vice presidential nominee?

Not damn likely, but these to arugably the greatest presidents that

Re: Is this sci.physics, or by accident, am I reading posts on some crackpt political nesgroup.

the US had during the 20th Century.

I give Reagan a great deal of credit, but I do remember that the night he nominated George Bush to be his vice-president, I do remember Black and White TV images of the press going to the door of Bush's hotel suite and waking him up to get an interview. After repeated poundings on his hotel room door, Bush finally emerged in a nightrobe, and after a few brief comments told the press and media to 'get lost' and went back to bed.

Older readers remember this. For me, while Reagan in my mind ended the Cold War, and I really like his style of management (Right, thank you Nancy, but you didn't realize that anyone noticed), I have always considered Reagan's selection of a running mate to have been rather poor.

Again, older readers know exactly what I mean, and why. Since those years, things have turned somewhat downhill. We seem desperately to be attempting to convert a country founded as a Republic into a Popular Democracy. This is a damn dumb move, although it sounds just great. The fact is they throughout recorded history every Democracy in history has failed due to the same reason.

Fred Kastner may or may not like me for saying this, but the fallacy of Democracy is that it places ultimate value on one person equalling one vote. Think about this a little, and it reveals what this leads to. Note that a truly democratic election places nothing on the education of the voter, his I.Q., or if he/she even understands what the issues are.

That's the current problem with the primary elections. Where a football hero to run for election, with sufficient financial backing, who could become a presidential candidate.

Ok' I've ranted on enough on this topic. Unless things change on the presidential slate, this is why I will not vote in the upcoming election, or vote with a "write in" for none of the above. I personally view both of the leading presidential candidates as being equally bad for the US, although in different ways.

Generally I have almost nothing to quarrel with you about the above. It is interesting to note that the New England states worked as Democracies quite well while the other states worked as Republics quite well even if the requirement of property ownership was a problem for those who did not want to move to the frontier to acquire property. Nevertheless even the New Englanders approved the Republican form of government for the new USA. And it has survived in the operation at the state level as well for all 50 states. Of course the sheer numbers of our population have required the indirect voting process in all save small town local elections quite well enough. However it also leads to difficulty at times of ridding ourselves of corrupt officials who

Re: Is this sci.physics, or by accident, am I reading posts on some crackpt political nesgroup.

Re: Is this sci.physics, or by accident, am I reading posts on some crackpt political nesgroup.

earn votes through favors to voters and their friends and families.

The best example of limitations of democracy is the states that run their primaries via the caucus procedure. It is too easy to be swayed into voting for a fine orator and handsome appearance. But another example is the frequency with which California has elected actors with no political savvy as governor or senator. The exposure and the faint sense that the roles they play are the real person leads to ridiculous election results. The democrats started it with Helen Gahagan Douglas and the Republicans followed suit with the song and dance man George Murphy, the not particularly good leading man Ronald Reagan, and then the poor actor action hero present governor. Tennessee elected a TV personality as senator but he went back to TV and then tried politics once again. Good acting some times leads to election (Huey Long) but it requires some savvy to stay there (Reagan).

As far as the elder Bush is concerned, on paper he seemed one of the best qualified presidential candidates in a very long time. What we missed is that he had almost zero leadership skills and little sense at reading the public will. His son was about the most stupid president we have had within memory of people such as me. Although Nixon was a vile person he really was quite clever and in many ways was a good president.

I will vote for what I consider the lesser of two evils in the election. I don't see the freshman senator as qualified but I fear terribly an overwhelming reactionary Supreme Court. So I will vote for the Democrat with grave misgivings. However as he has my state locked up I could really vote for Mickey Mouse for all my vote is needed to get a non-reactionary in the White House.

Awful administrations can come from those who seemed to be a good choice (Grant and Harding) or those who seemed to be not qualified (TR and HST). But one cannot really ignore how important the Supreme Court is. Andrew Jackson put a reactionary and racist fool, Taney, in as Chief Justice and we paid the price of a civil war because cool heads could not prevail.) I fear for the Republic wasting is resources of material and citizen vitality if we follow some ridiculous courses that reactionary justices would have us follow. Nevertheless, Harry, do vote. And find someone who is a rational conservative to write in. Or hope that some miracle occurs during the convention and a good candidate we can trust appears from one party or both.

FK

.