

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-05/msg02350.html>

- *From:* NoEinstein <noeinstein@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 29 May 2008 19:44:24 -0700 (PDT)
-

On May 26, 4:47 pm, NoEinstein <noeinst...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

THOSE WHO BURY HEADS IN SAND WILL GET THEIR ASSES KICKED!

The corrupt news media looks at what its cohorts in crime are doing, and says: I m OK; you re OK. But the media is sick really sick! It has no corporate moral judgment nor conscience. Its motives: Fill time or column space; get viewers or readers; make lots of advertising money; and if anyone will listen, screw up democracy and any hope for the long-term survival of the USA.

All of this will come to a head, soon, when the corrupt DNC resolves the FL and MI primary issues by, it is hinted, giving the voters in those states only half of the delegates that they deserve. It seems from the Democratic Rules Committee s perspective that what it says trumps democracy itself. Where is it written in any document that innocent voters can be punished for decisions made by legislatures controlled by the opposition party?

Another sick bit of rationale by some Democrats (mostly Obama supporters) is that the the UNITY of the Democratic Party justifies prodding super delegates to commit before the August convention. Ever since that Super Tuesday when Obama jumped into the lead, he and his tribe of con artists have been bragging victory. And they have been promising everything including the kitchen sink to get influential backers to perhaps swing delegates his way.

Nancy Pelosi has endorsed Obama. Her high position demands that she not& peddle influence. But she is pretending objectivity by saying that the will of the people counts, while she calls super delegates to get the last (and the likely best) of those to commit for Obama.

Experience has shown that the corrupt people in Washington like being on the winning side. Those super delegates who haven t committed surely feel those same motives. But Hillary Clinton is winning the popular vote, And she s on the moral (good girl) side. Clinton hasn t had the luxury to stampede delegates her way. And she hasn t

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

been the candidate spending the most money on advertising. What's her reward for being the most qualified candidate by far? She's fair game for all of those irresponsible types, like Jay Leno, who get to poke fun for pay. Stiff shirts like Wolf Blitzer do that more slyly by paraphrasing every negative assessment about the numbers for Hillary. The machine at CNN, and the rest of those networks, is corrupt from top to bottom. A few good guys like Lu Dobbs are probably afraid to make any real protests, lest they be fired. He is just the fair and balanced that isn't.

The poll that is most telling about Obama is the weight that he has lost in the last week or so. Apparently his heart is healthy, but his motives for becoming President aren't. Barack is looking more like the featherweight that he is. How well would he fare on prison food, I wonder? Obama is at the top of the list of those who are more than willing to kick dust in the face of democracy, if that dastardliness can get him nominated.

Imagine, if you will, that my New Constitution now has the following stipulation subject of course, to being ratified by the people on, say, the first Tuesday in November of 2010: The will of the people is the foundation of government. So, Citizens' votes shall have parity without compromise. Because principles of democracy shall reign supreme in the USA, any civil or private person(s) who uses the authority or influence of their job to actively or tacitly argue against democracy shall be guilty of a crime. Any person so acting, beginning with the 2008 Democratic Party primaries, shall be held culpable, retroactively. Those found guilty can be punished up to and including the death penalty.

The citizens of Puerto Rico get delegates, but not electors. Why is that? For decades those people have desired to be made a state. But the corrupt powers—that be in Washington don't want a new practical thinking state to, perhaps, interfere with the failed power structures already in place. My New Constitution leaves controversial issues up to the direct vote of the People. That way, there are no clandestine influences to deny Puerto Rico their own star. The American Flag can be designed with the extra star. I'm in favor of it!

So, as Obama supporters (in the media or otherwise) keep taking pot shots at Clinton, people like Nancy Pelosi and Howard Dean should try to imagine how well they will fare on prison food. Unless they, and a thousand more of their ilk, start distancing themselves from the sinful ways of the status quo, they could well find themselves as defendants in trials that can only be good for America. Stay tuned!

In the most positive light, please vote for Hillary Rodham Clinton for President of the United States of America!

Respectfully submitted,

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

NoEinstein

On May 21, 11:16 pm, NoEinstein <noeinst...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

SENATORIAL CANDIDATES, SAVE YOUR MONEY!

Comedians can make fortunes by poking–fun at politicians. And many politicians get themselves elected by making the opposition look like the laughing stock. Quite often, the voters will choose those who are the most interesting characters as their representatives and senators. How else can you explain the long tenure of Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia? Is having fiddling talent a justifiable reason for electing someone to be a senator? Probably not. But having the appeal to get one's mug in the national media as often as possible, reassures the voting public that their representative or senator has more power than the rest. That very assumption constantly reinforced by the irresponsible media slaps at the face of democracy.

The senatorial race in Minnesota is drawing attention, there, for the first time since former MN governor, Jesse Ventura, hammed–it–up in the wrestling ring. Al Franken that genius at twisting words can't decide whether he would rather have us laugh or cry& regarding the decline in our government and in our lives. Because very smart people tend to be more moral than those less blessed, if all of our elected officials for the past century had been as smart as Franken, we would probably be in fine shape, now. Instead, as many as 85% of those polled say they are dissatisfied with the direction this country is headed. So, Al Franken will have his work cut out for him, if he's elected.

CNN's Larry King values the celebrity of Jesse Ventura, sufficiently, to regularly invite Ventura to be a guest on his Larry King Live. Ventura is one of those unpredictable characters whom the viewing public will watch, expecting to be entertained. Maury Povich draws a particular segment of the viewing public to watch those marital–un–bliss, cat fights. It seems that wrestling and Povich's show have a common thread: For–pay, put–on fights. We're a nation that is longing for a fight& But most are contented to let our various sports and recreational pursuits substitute for actually coming to blows, ourselves.

Jesse Ventura surprised Larry King by saying that he, Ventura, will likely be registering, soon, to vie for that open senate seat in MN. Ventura says he will be running as an independent. To his credit, Jesse promised his father that he won't bet his bank account to seek public office. Folks, imagine how much better off this country would

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

be if no candidate spent more money than the average working American makes in a single year. Wow! Is there any logic other than to feed candidates' egos to spend more money getting elected than the jobs being sought will pay? Of course not!

Barack Obama has raised hundreds of millions of dollars trying to win by hook-or-by-crook the Democratic Party's nomination for President. Jobs and the economy are major issues. Tell me, how can people who are in need, be served by routing ANY of that money into the hands of the media whose only need is greed? Is it any wonder that the TV network bosses choose to support the candidate(s) who will be spending the most money on advertising? Ask yourselves: Is it right that the amount of money available rather than the worthiness of the candidates gets to decide who can win public office?

Democracy would best be served by putting all contributions into a common pot and allocating equal funding for each candidate's ads. Winning by fund-raising is like winning by having a tug-of-war. Democracy must never pit the strong against the weak. My New Constitution will GUARANTEE that every registered voter gets a fair and equal say—so in government. And such will be irrespective of how persuasive they speak, or how much money they can spare to BUY the candidate of their choice.

Some of you readers have heard me explain that I'm an expert graphologist. Last May, TIME Magazine showed a sample of the, then, six top candidates for President. I commented that John Edwards can't be bought. Right after the West Virginia landslide for Clinton, Edwards combed his hair and endorsed Obama. I wondered if I had been wrong last May. Soon, I realized that Edwards wasn't bought. He just sold-out for selfish reasons alone. Edwards would love to get the number two spot on the Democratic ticket. What better way would there be for him to do so than by, possibly, causing the decisive rush of the super delegates to Obama? If Edwards had caused such a rush (but he didn't), fate might, subsequently, have made him President. Or, perhaps, he would have an inside track for the nomination in 4 or 8 years.

Another signature that I've analyzed, and generally like, is that of Face the Nation's Bob Schieffer. He is a friendly and conventional-thinking good-guy. I've admired his aura of fair news coverage for years. He seems believable and trustworthy. But lately Schieffer's reasoning ability is slipping. I've noticed that he keeps stressing the inevitability of an Obama victory because of the numbers. He said, yesterday, that we are a nation of rules. And he said, Businesses have rules. Schieffer was reasoning, wrongly, that the DNC doesn't have to give-in to pressure by Clinton supporters, like me, to let Clinton have her fair share of the delegates in FL and MI. Why can't Schieffer see that democracy is being raped? And why doesn't he care?

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

For too many Americans, the news is limited to what the corrupt news media will allow to be aired. Since no one has aired my assertions that our political parties are anti democracy, Schieffer won't let such trivia make him feel guilty. For a man who made his fortune covering politics, it is too much to expect such an insider to admit that the majority of our system of government is simply screwed-up, and needs to be scrapped. In my New Constitution, one part of government that will be scrapped is the entire, anti-democracy branch known as: The US Senate. Those elitists have screwed-up America long enough!

Unlike Al Franken, I don't see anything about the Federal Government that's a laughing matter. Bill Mahr is another political comedian who has more good ideas than bad. But unfortunately, Bill makes too much money just by belly-aching about bad government. Otherwise, he might be more willing to ramrod some of his good ideas.

We all know that this country has an energy deficiency. Instead of depending on petroleum, we could start increasing ethanol production. One way to do that which has repeatedly and unfairly been squelched is to allow our farmers to grow HEMP. That weed could save us economically and politically. Such salvation seems more important than the possible hurt to some, because of the TRACE of the marijuana drug in its fibers. My guess is that the oil lobbyists don't want an ethanol source to be available that might compete with oil. Didn't those five oil executives, seated at that long table in the congressional hearing room, look like five criminals at, say, the Nuremberg trial following WWII? The high price of crude oil is the genre of excuse that oil companies need to keep getting more and more favorable incentives from government to increase oil exploration and processing efficiency. But as has always been the case, the public pays, while the fat cats (and oil company shareholders) keep getting fatter.

Barack Obama did an acceptable job filling-in for an ailing Senator Ted Kennedy as a commencement speaker. I've never faulted Barack's poise as a speaker. But from day one, I have faulted his personality (influenced by Barack's high testosterone) that causes him to be too strong-willed to make a good executive. Strong-willed people tend to assign authority, begrudgingly. And they won't allow those under them to get job satisfaction by using their talents, effectively.

Because Obama has ZERO executive experience, he's now stressing how he will use diplomacy in foreign relations. Here again, Obama's personality is a mismatch. The best diplomats are laid-back, affable people. When they enter a room they don't broadcast their delusional superiority by the strong, level tone of their voice, nor by starring-down those who are talking. A natural born diplomat is our good-neighbor-type-President, Jimmy Carter. He can empathize with the viewpoints of others, while seeking a common issue around which to build a mutually beneficial accord. Obama totally lacks the ability

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

to see things from anyone else's perspective, but his own.

After Senator Tom Daschle brushed-off James Carville's suggestion that Clinton's supporters pay to have the MI primary re-held, I knew that it was Obama's moral imperative to side with democracy. Yet, his monumental ego prevented him from doing the right things. For Barack, if a corrupt and unconstitutional political party system benefits HIM, he's all in favor of it. That man has shed no tears at the daily slights to Clinton. But without those slights, Clinton would be ahead in the pledged delegates, too.

The time has come for one or more reporters with a modicum of decency to ask Obama this: Is it true that you value getting elected more than you value the principles of DEMOCRACY on which this country was based? If you disagree, then, why haven't you insisted that Hillary Clinton get her fair share of the delegates in Florida and Michigan? Unless, and until Barack Obama answers those two questions, he will remain the scourge of the USA.

Mike Huckabee made a genuine Freudian slip when he speculated on the cause of backstage noise by saying it was just Obama being defensive. Mike has already let it be known that he would accept the VP spot under ...

[read more »](#)