

---

Subject: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Tue, 05 Aug 2008 23:22:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obama is an idiot that has no idea what he's going to do to fix the country.

McCain is too liberal and the Drive-By media chose him, not the Republicans.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 06 Aug 2008 01:25:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Not to be a total asshole, but before calling someone an idiot, make sure your spelling is correct first.

I don't think Obama is an idiot at all. In fact, he's very clever, as he has can change positions constantly, and get away with it, whereas any other candidate would be lambasted, and therein lies my problem.

However, Obama's sheen is wearing it seems, and people are starting to take a harder look at the guy.

My problem with McCain is that he could end up veering too far to the right, meaning he'll have to embrace the people that support the current administration... and I know McCain cringes at the thought of that, but he may have to go through with it, and keep grinning. Heading to the right will then alienate independent voters, and send them to Obama.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 06 Aug 2008 02:01:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obama wants to give people \$1000 rebates for the cost of fuel... including those that DON'T drive. How does he expect to pay for that? By taxing the oil companies. OF COURSE! BRILLIANT IDEA! THAT WON'T FORCE THE OIL COMPANIES TO RAISE THEIR PRICES, NEGATING THE REBATE.

Then Obama is FOR RFID chips. Not to mention his flip-flopping and ignoring the questions. He's also the CITIZEN OF THE WORLD. What a fucking blowhard. It's nothing but pandering to the idiots.

McCain, he supports the REAL ID Act, as well. He doesn't seem to want to shrink the government any, either.

Bob Barr is too conservative for my liking. He doesn't seem to be too moderate to be a libertarian. He doesn't go balls to the wall with getting rid of the IRS and welfare programs.

---

Quite frankly, I don't LOVE any of those three candidates. In fact, I HATE McCain and Obama. I don't hate Barr, but I wish he had a little bit more libertarian leanings... seeing as he's the Libertarian Party candidate, but he's the closest besides Ron Paul.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Wed, 06 Aug 2008 07:28:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Canadacdn for moderator '08 has no flaws at all and would make a valuable addition to the Renforums global moderation team.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 07 Aug 2008 22:29:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

How long will it take for both these Democrats and Republicans to take the sideline and let someone from the middle become the norm....?

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 07 Aug 2008 22:41:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

pawkyfox wrote on Thu, 07 August 2008 17:29How long will it take for both these Democrats and Republicans to take the sideline and let someone from the middle become the norm....?

On the contrary, both parties have been treading the middle for ages; that's why so many people complain about both parties being the same wine, just a different bottle.

If the Republicans were truly to the right, they would have likely not put the Patriot Act through, nor would they have sent \$600 cheques to American citizens. If the Democrats were truly to the 'left', Bill Clinton would have likely never signed NAFTA.

Both McCain and Obama are in the middle; aside from a few ideological differences, both candidates are courting the center because that's where the votes are.

Edit: What is interesting is how commentators are comparing Obama to Teddy Roosevelt, at least if you know your history on America's political parties.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Fri, 08 Aug 2008 01:46:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I bet if McCain wins he'll have a heart attack

Then Obama is the leader.. in which some white supremacist will assassinate him..

Then Hillary, the red neck hick will come into power and basically America will probably lose all interest.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 08 Aug 2008 05:11:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It'd be McCain's VP that would take over... not Obama.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Fri, 08 Aug 2008 07:57:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ryu wrote on Thu, 07 August 2008 20:46I bet if McCain wins he'll have a heart attack

Then Obama is the leader.. in which some white supremacist will assassinate him..

Then Hillary, the red neck hick will come into power and basically America will probably lose all interest.

Then we can all meet back here at half-past impossible.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Fri, 08 Aug 2008 11:56:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Doitle wrote on Fri, 08 August 2008 08:57Ryu wrote on Thu, 07 August 2008 20:46I bet if McCain wins he'll have a heart attack

Then Obama is the leader.. in which some white supremacist will assassinate him..

Then Hillary, the red neck hick will come into power and basically America will probably lose all interest.

Then we can all meet back here at half-past impossible.

Make that a quarter past and it's a date.

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [Ludichris1](#) on Fri, 08 Aug 2008 13:17:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Tue, 05 August 2008 21:25Not to be a total asshole, but before calling someone an idiot, make sure your spelling is correct first. His spelling IS correct...

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [u6795](#) on Fri, 08 Aug 2008 14:03:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ludichris1 wrote on Fri, 08 August 2008 09:17nikki6ixx wrote on Tue, 05 August 2008 21:25Not to be a total asshole, but before calling someone an idiot, make sure your spelling is correct first. His spelling IS correct...

"Critize the Candidates"

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 08 Aug 2008 20:01:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

lol Obama is the Antichrist but the minimum qualification for a an Antichrist is the requirement of a spine...which Obama does not have lol.

<http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1830590,00.html>

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Fri, 08 Aug 2008 20:12:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:One chain e-mail claims that the Antichrist was prophesied to be "A man in his 40s of MUSLIM descent," which would indeed sound ominous if not for the fact that the Book of Revelation was written at least 400 years before the birth of Islam.

Hahahaha.

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 08 Aug 2008 20:14:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

hahaha

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [Kingdud](#) on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 19:06:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obama: Hasn't read the Constitution and is not willing to read it and enforce it. Believes that the office of the president has the power to "do" things.

(bullshit? Read the Constitution; the president ENFORCES the laws, he does not create them. Congress creates the laws, and the powers congress has {which it oversteps greatly, daily} are enumerated in Articles I through VII)

Obama talks about "change" because it's this years buzzword, but he just wants to give dollars to people, dollars that the Federal Reserve prints from thin air. So the \$1000 he gives you will be more like \$800 today, or worse. He doesn't want to fix the MASSIVE corruption in our government. No, Obama is not for change. He just wants to give off the illusion of change.

And if you're an Obama supporter, please, read my McCain rant as well before assuming I am off my rocker.

McCain: This man is insane. Simply insane. I cite all the things I said about Obama as equally true about McCain, but on top of that, McCain wants to police the world (if Obama doesn't, I am still not sure where he lies on that). I am sorry, but until you, as a country, are NOT corrupt, and NOT interested in anything but justice, you cannot police the world, and even then, it simply isn't something that should be done.

Liberty and national sovereignty are important ideas. Policing the world removes both. Without those, we are no better than the people we are "bringing justice to". It's complete lunacy.

So who do you vote for? IMO, you must vote on principle, not based on "majority choice". Choosing between the lesser of two evils is what fools do. Write in your own name. Vote for Sitting Bull. Vote for whomever you believe will actually fix the country.

And not the problems FOX and CNN tell you about, but the real problems, like unsound currency, a horrible foreign policy, and the complete loss and violation of civil liberties and constitutional powers here at home. IMO, if you don't vote for these things, you are voting to continue the path we are on, and you, sir or madam, are a fool; a fool that will make everyone suffer for your choice.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 20:33:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I respect your post and your attempt to rail on BOTH candidates, as opposed to one, lol...

However, I gotta point out that, since Obama taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago Law School for twelve years, I'm pretty sure he has a thorough grasp of the document.

EDIT: Look guys, no matter who the fuck wins, Bush isn't going to be President, anymore. I'm just thrilled enough with that prospect.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [Kingdud](#) on Mon, 18 Aug 2008 21:43:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yes. He did teach it. Look at his voting record. Does it follow what the constitution allows? No. Clearly he doesn't understand what he taught. I'm sure he could recite the words of the document to you in a song, but he doesn't put into action what he believes.

A politician can talk sunshine up my ass all day long. But when he actually backs up his mouth-blown sunshine in my ass with actions, that's the day I will start taking him as anything more than a fake and a fraud.

Peace out,

-Kingdud

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 15:40:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh, so you're the supreme authority on the constitution? You know exactly what it does and does not allow, cut and dry?

The constitution is a document that must be interpreted, seeing as how we can't resurrect the founding fathers from their graves and ask them directly. Just because one person's interpretation of the document doesn't match yours doesn't make him or her wrong.

By the way, it would be nice to see an example of his voting record not "following what the constitution allows," instead of just reading an unreferenced accusation.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 15:50:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm not seeing how the Constitution ISN'T cut and dry.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [Kingdud](#) on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 17:16:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You know, in hindsight, it was actually hard to compile a list showing Obama and McCain's lack of understanding of the constitution. Why? Because so many of the bills they simply did not vote on. I don't mean they voted for/against. I mean they didn't vote at all.

McCain missed 63.8% of senate votes in the current congressional session {source: <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/m000303/>}

-Obama missed 45.5% of senate votes in the current congressional session. {source: <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/o000167/>}

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00168](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00168) (FISA "improvements", outlawed by: Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. )

FISA allows for the possibility of warrant-less searches, among many, many other things. That 1, single provision, is enough to declare the document unconstitutional.

Obama: Yea

McCain: Not voting

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00125](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00125) (Flood insurance reform, outlawed by: Article I, Section 8 {source: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/constitution.articlei.html#section8>})

\*Note: For those unaware, the list of powers given to the House and Senate in Article I, section 8 is exhaustive. The elastic clause that appears as the last entry in section 8 was placed there in the event that a power struggle broke out, and it was, somehow, made illegal for any of the powers listed in section 8 to be carried out, through that elastic clause it would be possible to justify the enactment of a law to fix that error. That is ALL the elastic clause is for; to help enforce the

powers congress had already been given. Not to expand them!

Now, maybe I'm blind, but nowhere in Article 1, section 8 do I see a power allowing the government to enact any form of insurance, give money to an established form of insurance, or anything to do with "federal aid". The flood insurance program is illegal, and by extension, so is it's reform. You do not vote to continue (even if it is a reformation) of something that is illegal. You DON'T DO IT!

Obama: Yea

McCain: Not Voting

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00068](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00068) (To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for a 3-year extension of the pilot program for national and State background checks on direct patient access employees of long-term care facilities or providers. Outlawed by: Article I, section

Where is the authorization to launch pilot programs? Much less for background checks? Hm? There isn't. Illegal.

Obama: Yea

McCain: Not voting (big surprise --)

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00020](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00020) (FISA again, but a different date than the first one posted, outlawed by: Amendment IV)

Again, a bill for warrant-less search and seizure. Completely illegal.

Obama: Not voting

McCain: Yea

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00166](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00166) (Telecom immunity for passing information along to the government, outlawed by: Article I, section 9 "No ex-post facto laws")

Ex-post facto, for those who don't know, means "after the fact" effectively. It means you can NOT make a law that says "Yea...this was illegal back then, but this law makes it legal now, and makes appear as if it was legal back then too. So if you have a civil suit pending, which relies on a given



item being illegal at a point in history, an ex-post facto law makes your case invalid, by making the action legal at that point in history.

Obama: Yea  
McCain: Not Voting

I can go on...but do you really want me to? I admit, it was REALLY hard finding anything McCain voted for, then again, he only voted on about 30% of the items listed on:  
[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/vote\\_menu\\_110\\_2.htm](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/vote_menu_110_2.htm) ...so it's hard in general.

I was not making "reference-less accusations", I was simply saving you, and everyone else, the large volume of reading proving such points involves. But, since you asked, here's my proof. All you had to do was ask

Peace out,

-Kingdud

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 19 Aug 2008 23:54:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You got told, Ryan. Damn, son.

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 05:50:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kingdud wrote on Tue, 19 August 2008 12:16 You know, in hindsight, it was actually hard to compile a list showing Obama and McCain's lack of understanding of the constitution. Why? Because so many of the bills they simply did not vote on. I don't mean they voted for/against. I mean they didn't vote at all.

McCain missed 63.8% of senate votes in the current congressional session {source: <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/m000303/>}

-Obama missed 45.5% of senate votes in the current congressional session. {source: <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/o000167/>}

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00168](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00168) (FISA "improvements", outlawed by: Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. )

FISA allows for the possibility of warrant-less searches, among many, many other things. That 1, single provision, is enough to declare the document unconstitutional.

Obama: Yea  
McCain: Not voting

Keyword: unreasonable search and seizure. An opposing argument (i.e. national security reasons) can be made, so it cannot be definitively called "unconstitutional."

Quote:

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00125](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00125) (Flood insurance reform, outlawed by: Article I, Section 8 {source: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/constitution.articlei.html#section8>})

\*Note: For those unaware, the list of powers given to the House and Senate in Article I, section 8 is exhaustive. The elastic clause that appears as the last entry in section 8 was placed there in the event that a power struggle broke out, and it was, somehow, made illegal for any of the powers listed in section 8 to be carried out, through that elastic clause it would be possible to justify the enactment of a law to fix that error. That is ALL the elastic clause is for; to help enforce the powers congress had already been given. Not to expand them!  
Completely unreferenced claims detected.

Now, maybe I'm blind, but nowhere in Article 1, section 8 do I see a power allowing the government to enact any form of insurance, give money to an established form of insurance, or anything to do with "federal aid". The flood insurance program is illegal, and by extension, so is it's reform. You do not vote to continue (even if it is a reformation) of something that is illegal. You DON'T DO IT!

Obama: Yea  
McCain: Not Voting

That list of powers is not exhaustive, because the Constitution does not say so.

More to the point: You're saying federal disaster relief is unconstitutional? Read Section 8 again:

Section8The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States...

Federal disaster relief falls under "general welfare." Can you possibly argue otherwise?

Quote:

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00068](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00068) (To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for a 3-year extension of the pilot program for national and State background checks on direct patient access employees of long-term care facilities or providers. Outlawed by: Article I, section

Where is the authorization to launch pilot programs? Much less for background checks? Hm? There isn't. Illegal.

Obama: Yea

McCain: Not voting (big surprise --)

Not necessarily unconstitutional, for the same reason I stated before. Let me remind you that the Constitution was adopted in 1787, before they had to deal with issues like "pilot programs" or "background checks" that would make sure that the new nurse at your grandmother's nursing home isn't a convicted felon who's going to kick the shit out of her, for example?

Did you even understand what the description of that bill was saying?

Like I said, general welfare.

Quote:

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00020](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00020) (FISA again, but a different date than the first one posted, outlawed by: Amendment IV)

Again, a bill for warrant-less search and seizure. Completely illegal.

Obama: Not voting

McCain: Yea

Only if the search and seizure were unreasonable. Instead, they are conducted under a necessary and proper blanket of "national security reasons." I don't necessarily agree with it, but it's not necessarily unconstitutional, either.

Quote:

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00166](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00166) (Telecom immunity for passing information along to the government, outlawed by: Article I, section 9 "No ex-post facto laws")

Ex-post facto, for those who don't know, means "after the fact" effectively. It means you can NOT make a law that says "Yea...this was illegal back then, but this law makes it legal now, and makes

appear as if it was legal back then too. So if you have a civil suit pending, which relies on a given item being illegal at a point in history, an ex-post facto law makes your case invalid, by making the action legal at that point in history.

Obama: Yea  
McCain: Not Voting

As you hopefully know, the Supreme Court interprets the law. In 1798, when the Founding Fathers were still alive, the SC found that not all ex-post facto laws are unconstitutional. Please read up on your case studies (particularly *Calder v. Bull*). They are important to understanding the application of the Constitution.

~~~~~

In short, just because the Constitution does not explicitly enumerate a power, doesn't necessarily make said power unconstitutional.

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 06:15:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The intention of the Constitution was to LIMIT the power of Congress, so anything not permitted is, get this, unconstitutional.

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 14:27:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Then why did they even bother adding a Bill of Rights? You're saying that anything not explicitly permitted is unconstitutional, so why did they bother adding amendments that restrict the power of government when the government wasn't even given said powers by the constitution in the first place?

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 16:17:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because they know how corrupt government can be, and how eager they are to take away our rights.

As for the "general welfare" clause, I consider that to exist when it benefits EVERYBODY.. at least, tax payers. Government funding where only a small portion of the nation benefits from what I pay for isn't the "general welfare", especially if certain government initiatives (ie. minimum wage

and fiat money) only helps to create inflation and other economic problems which we can all agree only serve as a detriment to society rather than a helping hand.

A government that serves best, serves least.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 19:03:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh, I agree with that. I'm more or less playing the Devil's Advocate here because I just think it's unfair to say CANDIDATES X, Y, AND Z DON'T UNDERSTAND THE CONSTITUTION when it's clear that its a document that has different avenues of interpretation. Some take a literal approach, others see it as a "living" document, so to speak.

---

---

Subject: Re: Critize the Candidates

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 20 Aug 2008 19:11:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I hate the "living Constitution" approach. It's just like Christians deciding what they want to believe out of the Bible. "I think homosexuality is wrong, but so is stoning disobedient children." As Ron Paul wrote, once the Constitution becomes a living document, it might as well be nothing more than a blank sheet of paper.

As for the whole FISA thing, I have absolutely no problem with the government gathering information about suspects and tracking them... as long as they obtain a warrant for it. FISA is clearly a violation of our 4th amendment rights.

As far as saying that they don't know the Constitution, you're probably right. I'm sure they do. It's just that they're pandering to idiots who DON'T know the Constitution. Throw that in with their inability to accept responsibility for themselves, and we have a big, totalitarian government.

---