

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-06/msg01328.html>

- *From:* NoEinstein <noeinstei@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 11 Jun 2008 17:20:35 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jun 9, 9:34 pm, NoEinstein <noeinst...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

SOUND MORAL PRINCIPLES SHOULD TRUMP PETTY RULES .

The longer someone has been a political insider, the greater is the likelihood that such person has been corrupted. One escape from implications of corruption, is for the person to simply say that they had been abiding by this or that rule. While abiding by rules certainly sounds like the noble thing to do, too often, rules run counter to sound moral principles. In every case, the latter should override any bad rules which have managed to get made.

Simultaneously, rules can be both the ordering mechanism of complicated processes, and they can be the destroyers of sound moral principles. For years the Democratic Party has had these ignoble rules saying that it can dictate when states hold their primaries. But such are a flagrant violation of simple and sound principles of democracy! Democracy requires that every registered voter shall have his or her vote carry the same weight as every other voter! The only way equality of the votes can be achieved is by basing the outcome of races on the national POPULAR VOTE, and by holding the votes in the different states on the same day.

Few would doubt that the voters in Iowa person-for-person have more power than the voters in, say, South Dakota. Is America well-served by having such inequality? No way!

The Democratic Party has allowed states to substitute caucuses for standard primaries. It's well known that many people don't like going to public meetings. Therefore, caucuses are not representative of a state's population as a whole. And that is anti democracy! At caucuses, the issues facing caucus-goers are open for comment and discussion. Effectively, caucuses will favor the candidate who has the better public speakers in attendance. Yet, speaking ability, alone, doesn't correlate to, nor does it even approximate, which person is the better candidate! It just favors the candidate who can turn out supporters & who are good at speaking in public.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

When the number of caucus voters who support each candidate is closely divided, the majority if they happen to be the best public speakers often elicits responses like this from the minority voters: Oh, I suppose I won't make waves. I'll go along with the majority, this time, so that I can win, too. Folks, having ANY open arguments on election day during a caucus or otherwise that can change the opinions of any voter is flagrantly anti democracy!

Suppose that you are inside your closed voting booth. Just before you cast your vote for the candidate of your choice, someone squeezes through the curtain and stands right next to you. They begin giving you reasons why you should switch your vote. They also tell you that the majority who are voting in that same place are supporting the other candidate. Finally, you are convinced to change your vote when the person says, Side with the winner; that's what everyone else is doing! I ought to know, because I've talked face-to-face with each person who has voted! Using those same type anti democracy tactics, Barack Obama has gotten the numbers to get his party's nomination for President. Sad, but true; sad, but true.

The stodgy Democratic Party Rules and Bylaws Committee believed it was quite OK to punish the voters of FL and MI by reducing the weight of their votes to ½. Day after day, Obama's supporters have used every unfair, and thus anti democracy tactic in their manure pile to persuade super delegates to come out for Obama.

In her concession speech, Hillary Clinton rightly states and I paraphrase: It isn't OK to discriminate against a Black, or even to criticize a Black; but it's quite OK to discriminate against and to criticize a woman. In spite of all of those handicaps, she WON the popular vote! But she knows that the corrupt media would have seen to it that she wouldn't win in November. So, she just shrugged off all of her slights. Her concession speech sounded very much like she had been proclaimed the victor. Nonetheless, it remains to be seen whether any of those 18,000,000 anti-Obama voters care one wit about who Hillary Clinton is siding with, now.

In the 2000 presidential race, the rule saying that the electors should meet to record their votes for President on such-and-such date, was viewed by five justices of the US Supreme Court to be more important than democracy itself. Surely, the processes of government aren't so inflexible that the schedules even the schedule for the presidential inauguration couldn't be shifted by the amount of time necessary to accurately count all of the votes.

My sister works at the polls. Today, she told me that there is an election rule which prohibits having write-in votes for our President and Vice President. In SC, Ol Strom got elected to his first term as a US Senator via a write-in vote. My father once told me that he, himself, got a write-in vote for President. In those

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

days, votes were collected on paper ballots. So, whether or not that one vote was officially recorded, someone must have liked my father better than he or she liked the two choices for president.

Jesse Ventura thinks there should be a voting button for: NONE OF THE ABOVE. If he, or anyone else, registered late, the NONE OF THE ABOVE votes wouldn't go to the listed candidates. Supposedly, if NONE OF THE ABOVE won, there would have to be a runoff election. Yet, our most outmoded Constitution doesn't allow runoff elections. The reason: Based on the information that the founding fathers had, it was assumed that the time required would be too great; and the problem of information dissemination would be too great. But our founding fathers didn't live in this modern era! If they had, they would insist that elections be based on the popular vote including any needed runoff elections.

Various rules are beginning to constrict our choices for President. Since Clinton has shown her true colors, I'm now recommending RON PAUL for President, and DENNIS KUCINICH for Vice President. Both of those men probably want the respective jobs. But are they willing to abandon the umbrella of their political parties however corrupt those happen to be? Senator Joe Lieberman whom I had cheered for to become President in 2004 subsequently, ran as an independent for the US Senate, and he won. So, I suppose it's a matter of attitude, and self-confidence. If Independent doesn't sound catchy enough, Ron Paul could call his party: the Revolution Party!

Having a good person become President, i.e., a person who is light on strings-attached, and heavy on patriotism, lets the climate be right so that the American people can vote on a New Constitution. Almost yearly, the citizens of some country in the world get to do just that. Surely, there are no rules to prevent the will of the American voters from being heard. If there were such rules, then it would be time for the American voters to go to their windows and shout: I'm mad as hell, and I'm not going to take this any more!

With the United Will of the American People there shall be a way!

Respectfully submitted,

NoEinstein

On Jun 7, 7:47 pm, NoEinstein <noeinst...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

HAVING CHANGE MEANS NOT DOING BUSINESS AS USUAL .

The campaign slogan of Barack Obama touts: Change you can believe in! But any change which doesn't correct our government's near total departure from principles of democracy, is missing the most

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

important thing that needs to be changed!

From the beginning, Obama has had the backing of the Democratic Party's leadership. And that's contrary to sound principles of democracy. If the latter had been adhered to, the party leadership wouldn't have taken sides nor would they have played favorites. In state-after-state Obama got the block vote of 90 plus percent of Blacks. Block votes regardless of the sex, race, color or creed of those in the block are anti democracy, plain and simple. That's because voting decisions should be INDIVIDUAL ones not based on the consensus of any biased group. The latter should never be allowed to be substituted for the might-have-been wisdom of those individual voters! Nor should voting decisions be based on the subtle, or not so subtle, endorsements of anyone in the media; in government; nor in the private sector. IN A DEMOCRACY, VOTING DECISIONS MUST BE MADE BY EACH INDIVIDUAL VOTER WITHOUT ANY BIASED, OUTSIDE INFLUENCES WHATSOEVER!

I agree, in principle, that there's nothing wrong with having a Black become President. Many Blacks are intelligent, fluent people. A good President of the USA needs to be an intelligent, fluent person. But the main justification for electing a Black to be President must have a more important basis than just the color of his (or her) skin. Skin color, ipso facto, isn't a qualification for holding any public office. And if skin color was the standard for judging one's qualification to hold public office, such a standard would be unconstitutional even in our present and most outdated document.

To have REAL change, we must depart from the ways of the past! Barack Obama is bragging about how he can appeal to both sides of the aisle. But by saying those simple words, Obama is touting that he is ANTI DEMOCRACY. Political parties, and the UNCONSTITUTIONAL rules of Congress, are for the express purpose of allowing certain people to have more power than the Constitution grants. All of the seniority and majority party allocations of power are now, and always have been, anti democracy!

Barack Obama is deluded if he believes that he can bring about real change simply by continuing to embrace the failed processes of the past. His chances of success vary from slim to none. The REAL impediment to having worthwhile changes enacted by Congress is this: Big Business is in bed with our supposed representatives. That shameful interaction goes much further than the more or less public influences of lobbyists. The axe that businesses hold over Congress's heads and in many cases, over the heads of those in the Executive Branch is that it costs hundreds, if not thousand of times more money to get elected to public office than should be required! So, it isn't too difficult to see why the corrupt media will do everything in its power to be sure that the candidate or candidates who spend the most money on advertising will get elected to their respective public offices.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

The founding fathers had to include in our government an anti democracy US Senate in order to get the disparate, thirteen states to ratify the original Constitution. Now, in the best interests of democracy, I have ELIMINATED the entire US Senate! There s no unfair discrimination against any state. Oh, some the small states might not like losing their having the same number of senators as large states. When the small states did have such equality, they had more influence than a well–principled democracy would allow. State governments which have modeled their constitutions on the US Constitution will have to eliminate their senates,too. Of course, when my New Constitution is ratified, the prestige of saying that one is a senator, anywhere, will be no more. But rejoice, People! The efficiency of our governments will nearly DOUBLE and while cutting the costs by Billions, if not trillions of dollars!

Firing the collective anti democracy senators will be a simple and prudent thing to do. But correcting that pseudo branch of government known as the media will be much more involved. Due to dire necessity, the First Amendment s guarantee of& freedom of the press has been changed in my New Constitution. The new wording is: &freedom of a PRO DEMOCRACY press. That simple change will send to the unemployment lines every single person in the media who comments on; give assessments of; polls regarding; or who openly or tacitly endorses any candidate for public office; or who touts even the slightest nuance of any pending public policy as being good or bad. In short, no professionals in the media shall be entitled to influence the outcome of any governmental process above the one–person–one–vote influence guaranteed by the New Constitution!

On a typical day, there is more news in the colored scrolls of type coming across the bottom of your TV than you ve ever see or hear on the purported news programs that are appearing LIVE, just above. Even with those scrolls, biased editors weed out 95% or more of what the general public is entitled to know. They favor information about celebrities or media figures over mundane news that involves John Q. Public. The media s mantra that shall be changed is: We in the media, and only we in the media, determine what Americans are entitled to know.

Be it
known: The
media, as
well anyone
who holds,
or has held,
a
government
office or job
shall be

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

culpable,
retroactively,
if any of its
members
interfere
with in any
manner
whatsoever the
ratification
processes
for the New
Constitution.

The least
punishment
for such a
felony is
three years
in prison. It
shall be
treason, to
flagrantly
organize a
resistance to
having a
one-day,
democratic
vote on the
New
Constitution.

The
punishment
for such
treason
includes
banishment
from the
USA; life in
prison; or
death.

<<<<<

So, as the media continues on its merry course to RAPE democracy in America, each person so employed, including the likes of: Tim Russert, Jack Kafferty, Rush Limbaugh, Larry King, Wolf Blitzer, David Gurgen, Jeffrey Toobin, Gloria Borger, Jamal Simmons, Roland Martin, Bill O'Reilly, Donna Brazile ad infinitum should be most careful about putting themselves in jeopardy by handicapping the continuing race for President.

And those don t-make-too-many-waves commentators like Lu Dobbs should

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

consider whether pulling his punches to protect his job shows high enough motives. Bright lights like Campbell Brown should consider whether her stock ownership in recreational battery companies should justify her smiling while CNN continues to rape democracy. Time-Warner itself could be in danger of being shut down, when it is shown that its business activities aren't in the best interest of the country, and of the world.

Folks, the primary reason for having& punishments for wrongs is to get people to STOP doing wrong things! In past eras, going to war was the process by which new governments replaced old ones. My New Constitution has used as its standard: Doing what is best for the vast majority of Americans. What is best will necessitate stopping group-against-group, party-against-party, and class-against-class fights. By replacing such divisiveness with FAIR PLAY, the mechanisms of our American way of life will get the fresh oiling that they sorely need!

Ron Paul has impressed me as someone who sticks to his principles. A man like that quickly cuts any strings that try to pull him one way or another. One of my many complaints about Barack Obama, is that he has enough soundly-attached strings on him to circle the globe a zillion times. Obama could never be objective regarding the ratification processes for my New Constitution. Corrupt business influences desire to continue business as usual.

The advantage of having a one-day, POPULAR VOTE, only, ratification process is that our corrupt Congress will get to have just one vote per member like every other duly registered voter in America! The seated members of the HOUSE will get a two year grace period to remain in office. After that, my ten year, total term limit will cut in. No one needs to fear that this country will be leaderless during the transition to a New Form of government. The improved efficiency brought about because the House will no longer have to come to agreement with the corrupt Senate, should make those last two years productive ones for our most tenured representatives.

Other than to modify how our President is elected, nothing about the duties and functions of the Executive Branch has been changed. And very importantly, nothing about the organization nor function of our armed services has changed. Additionally, the Second Amendment Right to keep and bear arms has been expanded for law abiding citizens! At every turn, individual rights are increased. Heretofore, those have been known as our civil liberties. Never again will your or my civil liberties be placed at the whim of those making or enforcing our laws. So, as I explain more things about the New Constitution, please know that you and yours are going to be EMPOWERED to get fair treatment from your government!

Because RON PAUL is the best choice to be our President, I'm recommending that Americans everywhere write in RON PAUL this November. Ron himself likes Rep. Dennis Kucinich for his running

Re: Campaigning is a 'Science', too.

mate. So, if both of those men are in agreement to work together, patriotic Americans like you and me can speed ...

[read more »](#)