

Re: Vote for Bush! Re: Pres Bush Left

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2004-10/2609.html>

From: Eric Chomko (echomko_at__at_polaris.umuc.edu)

Date: 10/21/04

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 2004 20:44:05 +0000 (UTC)

Mark Cook (mcook@prodigy.net) wrote:

: "Eric Chomko" <echomko_at__at_polaris.umuc.edu> wrote in message

: [news:cl68rn\\$7n5\\$5@news.ums.edu...](mailto:news:cl68rn$7n5$5@news.ums.edu...)

: > Eric (notValid@comcast.net) wrote:

: > : >

: > : > A fair society would have simply thrown out all the votes in FLA from

: > : > election day except the absentee ballots and revoted the following

: > : > Tuesday.

: > : >

: > : Nonsense! Here, let me interpret for you:

: > : "A fair society would have simply thrown out all the votes in FLA from

: > : election day and re-voted till the Democrats got the results they

: > : wanted"

: >

: > No, The Republicans would not allow a revote and would argue until one

: > thing or another in their corrupt power structure got their man in power.

: >

: > And by golly THAT is exactly what happened!

: The FACTS show otherwise. Lawsuits were filed in Florida as to get a

: re-vote. A re-vote was denied by the DEMOCRATS on the Florida Supreme Court.

: The Court had 6 Democrats, and 1 Independant. They rules 7-0 that the US

: Constitution sets the time for elections, thus a revote would violate the US

: Constitution.

Amend the Constitution rather than throw it to the SC.

: <http://jurist.law.pitt.edu/election/revote.pdf>

: The case that upheld Judge Jorge Labarga's ruling by the Democrat majority

: of the Florida Supreme Court.

: <http://jurist.law.pitt.edu/election/sc00-2373.pdf>

: The re-vote was denied because it would violate both Federal Code and the US

: Constitution. I suggest that you take the time to educate yourself on the

: subject.

sci.space.policy: Re: Vote for Bush! Re: Pres Bush Left

: Art 2, Sec 1, Clause 4 of the US Constitution: The Congress may determine
: the Time of chusing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their
: Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

: <http://www.house.gov/Constitution/Constitution.html>

: Congress did so in the Federal Code.

: [http://assembler.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode03/usc_sec_03_00000001----
: -000-.html](http://assembler.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode03/usc_sec_03_00000001----000-.html)

: > : By what criteria would you "throw out all the vote"? How many times
: would

: > : you do it?

: >

: > No, too close to call, so revote one week later. No disputes and make sure
: > all manner of hanging chads,

: Before this election, the Florida Courts had ruled that hanging chads were
: not a reason to do recount. IF that is not enough for a recount, it is
: hardly a good reason to do an unconstitutional re-vote.

: "(f) Prior practice before this election, which was not to do a manual
: recount because of the claim that a county's machines were failing to count
: partially perforated or indented chads. See Transcript of Oral Arg. in Bush,
: at 39-40 (concession of Florida Attorney General that no county had
: previously done so). For example, in Broward County Canvassing Board v.
: Hogan, 607 So.2d 508, 509 (Fla. 4th DCA 1992), the board recognized that
: "voter error in piercing of computer ballot cards created loose or hanging
: paper chads." But the board declined to do a manual recount even though two
: machine counts indicated a margin of 3-5 votes. "Such voter errors, the
: board explained, are caused by hesitant piercing, no piercing, or
: intentional or unintentional multiple piercing of computer ballot cards,
: creating what are referred to as overvotes and undervotes. The board
: thereupon declined appellee's request for a recount". Id. (emphasis added).
: Thus, before this election, the fact that a request for a manual recount was
: based on incompletely perforated chads was considered not just insufficient,
: but an affirmative reason to reject a manual recount because the request was
: based on voter error rather than on machine or ballot defects."

: <http://jurist.law.pitt.edu/election/floridahouse.pdf>

: > butterfly ballots

: The FSC ruled that the butterfly ballot was a legal ballot. They relied on a
: Federal Court case that says a candidate does NOT have a constitutional
: right to a certain place on a ballot.

: <http://jurist.law.pitt.edu/election/sc00-2373.pdf>

: >and all precincts are counted.

Re: Vote for Bush! Re: Pres Bush Left

: "But no one claims that these ballots have not previously been tabulated;
: they were initially read by voting machines at the time of the election, and
: thereafter reread by virtue of Florida's automatic recount provision. No one
: claims there was any fraud in the election. The Supreme Court of Florida
: ordered this additional recount under the provision of the election code
: giving the circuit judge the authority to provide relief that is
: "appropriate under such circumstances." Fla. Stat. §102.168(8) (2000)."

: <http://supct.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/00-949.ZC.html>

: > : Absurd!

: >

: > The absurdity is your not wanting a fair outcome. The NFL has the
: > challenge system because of the beliefs of people like you.

: >

: > Eric (not the Comcast idiot)

: The absurdity is that you do not want to follow the law, and the US
: Constitution. The Electoral Count Act of 1887 was put into place as to allow
: for election disputes to be settled by the REPRESENTATIVES of the PEOPLE.

The Supreme Court by its very nature are NOT representatives of the people!
They are appointed and are the farthest thing in government from the
people. We vote for presidents/VP (executive branch). We vote for
congressmen (legislative branch). We DON'T vote for judges on the SC
(judicial branch). They are appointed. All your details above be they
accurate or not have lead you to a false conclusion. Reread your
capitalization above and explain how the SC fits in constitutionally. You
can't!

Eric