

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-04/msg02313.html>

- *From:* NoEinstein <noeinstei@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 24 Apr 2008 09:16:52 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Apr 23, 10:21 am, NoEinstein <noeinstei...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Yesterday, for the first time, I heard democracy mentioned as an issue in the democratic party's rules. This was on CNN and concerned whether or not super delegates should be allowed to have more votes than delegates. There are precedents, like in the US Senate, for breaking ties. By most accounts, the race between Clinton and Obama is a dead heat. If a decision is to be made, someone must break the tie. But why is that necessary?

The above comment about super delegates was brought up by a likely Obama supporter. As the present primary mess plays out and the August convention looms those super delegates are in the position to make the correct decision: Nominate Hillary Rodham Clinton. Understandably, Obama supporters don't want that to happen. Oh, it's OK with them that democracy has been raped by not counting the FL and MI votes (yet?). But it isn't OK with them to allow super delegates to break the effective tie. In both cases the anti-democracy DNC rules apply. Because Obama will likely lose after the super delegates have their say, his supporters don't like that rule. But the former rule is quite OK, to punish the innocent voters in FL and MI. Is anyone besides me offended by such Obama must win at all costs hypocrisy?

The principle of democracy is simple: One person has one vote and regardless of their status or importance to any group. So, super delegates, indeed, violate democracy. But their votes would not even be needed, if democracy had not already been RAPED by the DNC's entire primary system! I'll explain:

The simple principle of democracy, above, requires that all votes that are cast have the same importance! Obama clings to that tainted and bastardized principle, in the apt case, when he claims to have more delegates than Clinton. Of course, numerically, he is correct. But from the moment the Iowa votes were counted AND made public, democracy was ground up, burned, and the ashes cast into the sea.

Democracy DEMANDS that votes be taken and counted on the same day!

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Proxy votes that either are not counted, or are not revealed until election day probably pass the standard of democracy, too. I'll make an analogy for how the present anti-democracy primary system works:

An election is scheduled. Voters line up at the polls and begin going into the closed voting booths. But as soon as a voter is about to push the cast vote button, the curtain opens and a persuasive supporter for the unselected candidate comes into your private booth and argues that you should change your vote. Some of the more weak minded voters in the lines yield to that intrusion and switch their votes. Now, the voters go outside and the media descends to poll them regarding how they voted. Almost immediately, the TVs across America are telling the later voters how the race is going. And issues that might sway the outcome are quickly aired in commercials side against side. Finally, at the end of the day, the voters watch their TVs to find out if they won or lost. Under such a system, anywhere from 50% to 100% of the voters are losers, and the smug, overly-paid commentators rejoice that there is so much news to be covered. Of course, the above events are truncated into a single day. But to allow the media into the voting process at ANY point is a supreme violation of sound principles of democracy! I repeat: To allow the media into the voting process at ANY point is a supreme violation of sound principles of democracy!

If the votes in Iowa had not been counted until after all of the primary results are in, such a rule would approximate a democracy. But it wouldn't BE a democracy! Why? Because those who voted for Obama BEFORE his personality and character flaws were revealed, will have had their votes locked in. Surely, many of those would not now desire to vote for Obama. That's the sole reason why Obama remains a viable candidate. The earlier voters, simply, had not yet learned how undesirable a candidate Barack Obama truly is.

Some states have held caucuses rather than conventional voting-booth type primaries. However, ALL caucuses are anti-democracy, and are thus unconstitutional! It goes without saying that Obama loves caucuses, because those allow his highly verbal supporters to persuade more of those attending to vote for him. But a true democracy does not allow the PERSUASIVENESS of any supporter of a candidate to influence any other voters! Each voter must have 100% free will without any last minute counter arguments being allowed in the voting booths or otherwise. Democracy shall never allow the strength, persuasiveness, power or status of others to change the private voting decision of any other voter!

The candidates and the media are well aware of the democracy issues that I am waving. Clinton is correct to now report that more Americans have voted for her, than for Obama. Apparently, she is sticking to her game plan that has turned-the-tide for her. Certainly, her becoming President will be more beneficial for America than Obama would even have had a chance to be! But if she is happy

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

with the present broken system of government in Washington, and defends it& by tradition, America will be just as doomed under her presidency as under an Obama presidency.

My support for Clinton is due to her greater executive self-sufficiency compared to Obama. Clinton is a Gets the Big Picture person, who won't over-defend or over-attack petty details in proposed solutions. Such a generalist will be more open to changes in, say, science and technology. If the latter is so mired as to continue to uphold Einstein's theories of relativity after I have summarily disproved them then there isn't much hope for science and technology& And unless Clinton is open to consider that America deserves a government that works as CNN's Lou Dobbs often suggests then, the unity of our present 81% discontent won't have much chance to affect the necessary changes in our systems of government.

I've talked very little about John McCain. As I've said: His IQ is only 90 or so; he is too old and frail; and he will be, like Bush, a puppet of the (also) corrupt Republican Party. McCain should be very easy to defeat in the race! He would do the whole country a great favor if he would just drop out, now, and let Clinton run unopposed! Then, there would be a unity of purpose which this country needs as it adapts a new and improved form of government. If the latter is going to happen, it will occur under Clinton's watch. And it will become part of her proud legacy!

So, as the campaigns and media coverage continue business as usual consider how much better off each of you would be if DEMOCRACY was the main issue of importance for Americans! With democracy reinstated as a foundation for this great nation, the economy, jobs, international relations, and a new national pride for a united USA will be assured far better than any political party in power could ever assure!

May the shared discontent that we now feel, unite us!

Respectfully submitted,

NoEinstein

On Apr 21, 9:37 am, NoEinstein <noeinst...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

For those Americans still deciding which Democratic candidate to support, last night's beyond-the-prediction win by Hillary Clinton in Pennsylvania provides important insights for making up your minds. CNN filled their studios with commentators and spinners alike. Campbell Brown moderated those well. And John King's analyses of the demographics of the counties won by the candidate seems most telling of the trend both in the continuing Democratic race, and in the likely presidential election in November.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Clinton has had to fight like Rocky to win, and in doing so she shows herself to be an amazingly resilient person and a formidable candidate as Barack Obama said in his concession speech last night from Indiana. Obama spoke before a crowd showing almost as many smiling faces as if he had won each of the last three big states: Texas, Ohio, and now Pennsylvania. Though his speech highlights his resolve, it also reveals, more and more, that Obama has delusions of invincibility.

If being the President actually entailed fighting, Obama might be an acceptable choice. He speaks with the strong voice and level-toned inflection of a man with a high testosterone level. But selecting our President shouldn't be about who has the most testosterone. Those goals that Obama keeps promising to fight for are largely outside of the range of authority of the Executive Branch.

Suppose that the Democratic Party's nominee were to be selected by having a huge tug-of-war. If one wishes to be on the winning team, it would make sense to rush to the side having the strongest looking tuggers. But a true democracy isn't about favoring the strong over the weak. It isn't about who has the most stamina. It isn't about winning just for the pride of being on the winning team. What it should be about is having clear thinking Americans vote for the candidates who will do the optimum things for ALL Americans, not just things for the half that happens to be on the winning side in a tug-of-war.

North Carolina and Indiana are now in the spotlight. NC where I lived for years has been polled to be leaning toward Obama. Such seems to be the case because of the large Black population, there, and because of the affluent people living in the Research Triangle area.

It seems that Blacks are supporting Obama primarily because he is Black. The unwavering voting percentages for Obama in light of his verbal slipups, and his questionable social and religious associations supports such contention. Or, perhaps it is because he seems like a fighter. In the past, the too easy road to power for Blacks has been sticking together, as a voting block, for common objectives. That is the tribal mentality not only of Blacks, but of those who believe that physical prowess should be a factor in determining outcomes. Sadly, many Americans side where they perceive the power to be. This country is largely being run by two political parties. There haven't been enough Reagan years where Americans have felt good just being Americans rather than fighting as Democrats or Republicans.

The cause of America's decline is excessive reliance on group power to gain supposed advantages. Groups inevitably polarize and discriminate. Fighting fair isn't a rule, if winning is the only objective. More and more, fighting dirty and dishonest are acceptable. If a ball game gets decided by a bad call by an official,

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

too often the fans of the winning team rejoice just as much afterward. Should there be any joy felt in winning unfairly? No, there shouldn't!

As I explained, recently, Blacks have discrimination issues that need to be addressed. But can that be done by siding with THE most polarizing man in America, Obama? The assertiveness that his hormones cause will surely pique the resolve of those in Congress to resist him. Males don't like yielding to anyone simply because they are out-talked or out-lasted. No government nor business would hire Obama to be a diplomat or PR man because he enters the room as if ready for combat with everyone there. Good diplomats must be more low-key. They must not offend people by seeming pushy. I ask you: Isn't Barack Obama's pushiness personified? If you've got a pushy boss, do you like that person? If for no other reason, Obama should not be President because he is too pushy! His fight for you attitude will assure his failure. Such fights would be more appropriate in Congress not within the daily realm of the Presidency.

A huge part of the unfairness in the Democratic campaign is the delay in resolving the FL and MI primaries. If Clinton's share of the delegates in those states had already been appropriately allotted to her, there likely wouldn't be that clinging invincibility that Obama still has. For him, his contributors' dollars are votes to continue running a win-at-all-costs fight for them. Obama has said, in effect: To hell with democracy! I want to be President! If he manages to get elected, the last bit of air will have been let out of the balloon that was democracy. Never again will there be hope of: fairness for all Americans; and she will surely fall.

Obama has smiling faces like Jamal Simmons and Roland Martin to reassure those passengers on Obama's sinking Titanic that the inevitable tragedy won't happen. PA Senator Bob Casey spins favorably for his man, Obama, to increase his own chances of getting a position in an Obama White House. Casey is one of the most recent endorsers of Obama, and surely knows that Obama has rejoiced because democracy wasn't being served in FL and MI. Casey is thumbing his nose at democracy. He should be considered a TRAITOR to America and to the US Constitution which he has so lightly sworn to uphold.

Understandably, if selfish interests like: affluent voters desiring to keep more of what they earn, are to be satiated, that can best happen if those affluent people will side with the 81% of adults who are dissatisfied with the direction this country is headed. That way, the groundwork is set for CORRECTING the waste and inequities in government. But if the affluent, instead, side with Obama, they are assuring the continuing group-against-group divisiveness in America, that has brought this country to the brink of ruin. Folks, we can either solve this country's problems, or we can SINK on Obama's Titanic.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Hillary Clinton has an affable personality most close to Ronald Reagan. She doesn't get the rancor up of those she approaches. Clinton would be a much better diplomat for America than Obama. In the area of foreign policy, as in most others, she is prepared From Day One to serve the best interests of this country!

A new and improved America shouldn't require years of long campaigning to select our President. The toll being taken on the candidates demands that the process be streamlined, while still informing Americans about the candidates' qualifications.

As those undecideds try to make up their minds in NC and IN, please realize that your hopes and dreams for your futures are valid ones. Any new and improved America should benefit you! However, it is URGENT that you all know this: If this country is to survive & it must part ways with all undemocratic group influences! Group against group has been proven time and again not to work. And that's why we are in our present messes. But a new hope is on the horizon! Remember, United we stand; divided we fall.

Vote for Hillary Rodham Clinton for President of the United States of America!

Respectfully submitted,

NoEinstein

On Apr 15, 10:25 pm, NoEinstein <noeinst...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Heretofore, we humans have tried to find security by siding with a strong group with a strong leader or leaders. Often this had been for the protection of our own physical well-being, not just to gain some vague economic or sociological advantage. In the last two centuries Blacks have rallied together for their common cause of reducing discrimination against their numbers. Though they have been hugely successful, there are areas in which discrimination still exists. So, any ideal America must address the concerns of Blacks fairly and equitably.

There has never been a Black President of the USA. Jesse Jackson, Colin Powell, Al Sharpton, and now Barack Obama are smart Black men who have each been considered for this country's highest office. A

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

recent poll showed that 76% of voters would be willing to consider a Black candidate for President. Since Obama is the Black candidate of the moment, his spinners quickly implied that 76% of the voters want him . But his viability as a candidate is being brought into question because of the recent negative press over Reverend Jeremiah Wright's 'damn the USA' sermon, and due to Obama's candid remarks showing his frustration in trying to appeal to those who have fallen on hard times in the 'small towns' of Pennsylvania, and across America.

In recent weeks I've explained how the apparent unity of the Black community behind Obama is, actually, an ominous sign for America. How could that be? Obviously, there would be racial pride among Blacks in finally having a Black elected President. But is that pride a sufficient justification for electing Obama?

A prudent observer would expect that a candidate's support would vary up and down as new revelations about his or her qualifications are aired. When negative aspects concerning Obama surfaced before the Texas and Ohio primaries, Obama's support among Blacks should have varied, too.

...

read more »– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –