Site comments/questions:
Mike Alissi

Media Inquiries and Reprint Permissions:
Chris Mitchell
(310) 367-6109

Editorial & Production Offices:
3415 S. Sepulveda Blvd.
Suite 400
Los Angeles, CA 90034
(310) 391-2245

Does the Constitution Need a Parental Advisory Sticker?

Damon W. Root | May 6, 2010

Walter Olson highlights a remarkable reader advisory attached to a $4.95 paperback version of the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and Articles of Confederation:

> This book is a product of its time and does not reflect the same values as it would if it were written today. Parents might wish to discuss with their children how views on race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and interpersonal relations have changed since this book was written before allowing them to read this classic work.

Of course, several of the actual amendments to the Constitution reflect a few of those changes, but I suppose you can never be too safe when it comes to the children.

← Used Car Prices Rise as Administration... | Main | Mr. President Please Think of Spain... →

See all 227 comments | Leave a comment

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 5:00PM | #
OMG! It's history!!!

I bet if you had a book of speaches by the racist Woodrow Wilson or FDR who threw Japanese Americans in internment camps they would not have put that warning on there. According to progressives those are good guys you see.

reply to this

John | 5.6.10 @ 5:17PM | #
Hey PIRS and other Hit & Run posters

Instead of sitting around on the internet all day, posting pointless messages about "liberty" and "free markets" and abusing yourselves to pictures of loose women (like Lobstergirl), why not do something productive and surrender your lives to Allah?

Western society has become decadent, weak, and lazy, and is soon to collapse. The upcoming generation, people such as yourselves, want nothing more from life than to grow fat sitting around on computers all day, masturbating, drinking, and taking drugs. You are encouraged in this behaviour by corrupt politicians and absent new age parents while your societies and economies collapse around you. Meanwhile the Muslim Ummah, or brotherhood, grows rich on oil wealth and trains its upcoming generation to serve Allah, and to fight, willing to give their lives if necessary for the cause. The 19 hijackers of 9/11 have surely earned their place in paradise as do the suicide bombers who strike daily into the heart of the devil state of Israel. We are living among you, in Europe and America, and we are outbreeding you day by day,

slowly taking over.

Allah has a plan for each of us. He means us all to be good Muslims and live by his rules, as set out to the Prophet Muhammed (pbuh). Your sinful lives and wicked ways go against His plans, and you will be tortured for eternity in hell for your iniquities. Repent now and revert back to the one true faith.

Where your joke of a faith, which no one in your society believes in anyway, tells you to love, be tolerant, and turn the other cheek, the Quran teaches us to "Kill the unbelievers wherever you find them, capture and besiege them and prepare for them every kind of ambush."

It also says "Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies, of Allah and your enemies".

How can you hope to win your futile so called 'war on terror' against us? You have become weak, and no longer willing or able to fight. You even elected a pacifist president with Muslim sympathies to try and placate us. It's only a matter of time until we win. Even now your soldiers contine to die on the battlefields of Afghanistan, and for what? The moment you leave, it will be back to traditional Sharia law. Your technological advances count for nothing if all you do with them is watch porn and play video games. We will continue our jihad on the west, to maim and kill those who oppose or insult us. See the truth for what it is and revert to Islam immediately. It is your only hope of survival.

reply to this

Jordan Elliot | 5.6.10 @ 5:28PM | #
This "new" John is great!

reply to this

Sudden | 5.6.10 @ 5:29PM | #
How dare you insult Lobstergirl?

This is an act of war!

reply to this

MikeL | 5.6.10 @ 5:53PM | #
How can we be sure if he's right or not? I'm going to need empirical evidence, does anyone have lobstergirl's number?

reply to this

Timon19 | 5.6.10 @ 5:31PM | #
Forget your meds today, John?

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 5:35PM | #
It's not John, dude.

reply to this

Timon19 | 5.6.10 @ 5:37PM | #
Yeah, after I saw the post about the roommate, I figured it out.

I suspect NutraSweet.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 5:40PM | #
Could be, but I think it may be someone else.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 6:04PM | #
I have my own theory.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 6:11PM | #
Who do you suspect?

reply to this

Tony | 5.6.10 @ 7:33PM | #
John's itchy copy/paste finger?

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 5:37PM | #
I have studied Islam and found it to be just as mistaken as the other religions of Abrahamic origin. I do enjoy Halal foods however (I also like Kosher foods). The candy that is called "Halvah" is DEELISH. I have found that in both Halal food stores and Kosher delies. The next Middle East peace conferance should have Halvah as an apetizer.

reply to this

Enough About Palin | 5.6.10 @ 5:45PM | #
I go here for halal foods, Fan-fucking-tastic!

http://www.holylandbrand.com/

reply to this

heller | 5.7.10 @ 1:54AM | #
Halva is a traditional Arabic candy made from sesame seed paste and sugar. It is very popular in Middle Eastern countries, including Israel.

reply to this

Jeff P. | 5.6.10 @ 5:52PM | #
Can you keep it down, please? I'm trying to somomize my inflatable Muhammed...

reply to this

Does he have... | 5.6.10 @ 7:20PM | #
....two love orifices?

reply to this

Islamic Jihadist | 5.6.10 @ 8:18PM | #
Infidel!

(slashes love doll)

Allah Akbar!

reply to this

Zen Muslim | 5.6.10 @ 9:52PM | #
If you see the Muhammad
Kill the Muhammad.

reply to this

seguin | 5.6.10 @ 7:39PM | #
I would, but you know...bacon. Sorry.

reply to this

Citizen Nothing | 5.6.10 @ 5:02PM | #
They need to get Whoopi Goldberg to record an intro saying it's OK.

reply to this

Episiarch | 5.6.10 @ 5:06PM | #
Just put Oprah's book club sticker on it. It'll sell like hotcakes.

Oprah: Was it that you thought embellishing the story was okay if it helped people?

Towelie: Yeah. Yeah, that's it!

Oprah: Well you know what I think, Towelie? I think you're a LYING SACK OF SHIT!

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 5:09PM | #
This ties into a strategy suggested in another thread that Libertarians simply lie about their goals. Like the GOP and Dems do. Then start slashing spending and cutting taxes all while continuing to lie about it.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 5:09PM | #
Once in office, that is.

reply to this

Jordan Elliot | 5.6.10 @ 5:14PM | #
That's the tricky part.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 5:27PM | #
No, that's what the lies are for.

reply to this

JW | 5.6.10 @ 5:31PM | #
We're getting into office? When did this happen? [looks around for emergency procedures manual] Ah. Here it. *Chapter 1: Abandoning Your Core Principles.*

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 5:35PM | #
No, no, we abandon nothing. We just deceive America into letting us into office, then we take away their candy.

reply to this

Barack Obama | 5.6.10 @ 5:45PM | #
That'll never work.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 5:55PM | #
Plans withing plans within plans, Pro'L Dib?

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 5:56PM | #
You know me so well.

reply to this

JW | 5.6.10 @ 6:00PM | #
All those plans better be cunning, or I'm out now.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:05PM | #
As cunning as a fox who's just been appointed Professor of Cunning at Oxford University.

reply to this

JW | 5.6.10 @ 5:59PM | #
Sorry, that was the Republican manual.

Ah, here's the Libertarian manual: *The Audacity of Hopelessness*. We have to make sure that we tell the public that, when elected Dog Catcher, we'll repatriate the Mexican dogs across the border.

reply to this

Sudden | 5.6.10 @ 6:15PM | #
I fucking hate Chihuahuas. You have my vote.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:27PM | #
Soon, libertarians will bestride the animal control world like a colossus.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 6:52PM | #
We are libertarians. You can't draw neat lines around planet-wide problems. Governance is a cut-and-fit science.

reply to this

heller | 5.7.10 @ 1:57AM | #
The jihad will be fought in the name of Pro'L Dib!

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.7.10 @ 9:38AM | #
A jihad of sex and violence.

reply to this

Jordan Elliot | 5.6.10 @ 5:06PM | #
I go the whole day without reading Reason and come here to see what I've missed and the first thing I read is about some idiotic warning for children and their parents about reading the Constitution?!

.....

Though, perhaps this will serve as the "Explicit Lyrics" sticker did and make kids want to read it more.

reply to this

Madbiker | 5.6.10 @ 5:13PM | #
Would that it could!

I teach American Lit and the Constitution, DoI, Crevecoeur, Patrick Henry, and Thomas Paine are standards I teach (for now). Kids don't give a crap about reading any of these documents.

My pissy mood is due to being let go over teaching Crevecoeur's "Letters from an American Farmer" and daring to bring up his ideas/ideals in light of the current Arizona Immigration Law issue. Apparently some kids could not handle some frank talk about race, immigration, and the foundations of our society. They got mad and ran to their guidance counsellors and principals claiming I was a racist who insulted them.

I am starting to think we are lost as a society, at least as that society was envisioned by Jefferson and his peers.

reply to this

AJs | 5.6.10 @ 5:15PM | #
You just got fired? Damn man, that sucks.

reply to this

JW | 5.6.10 @ 5:26PM | #
Sorry to hear about your untimely demise, job-wise, but there is no upside to talking about race in public. *None*. Especially if you're a white guy.

When it comes up, I just smile and nod my head in the appropriate spots.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 5:28PM | #
Stop oppressing Neanderthal-Americans!

reply to this

Madbiker | 5.6.10 @ 5:36PM | #
But what bugs me is that we can't have honest conversations about race, immigration, racial tensions real or imagined, or the foundations of our government without pissing on somebody's delicate sensibilities.

I get irritated when things like our Constitution have to be prefaced with warnings about its archaic (and therefore invalid?) nature. This sets up a generation and beyond to disregard what is, IMO, one of the finest (flawed in some ways, but better than any I've read yet) documents outlining the liberties citizens of a free society are supposed to enjoy.

reply to this

JW | 5.6.10 @ 5:52PM | #
But what bugs me is that we can't have honest conversations about race, immigration, racial tensions real or imagined, or the foundations of our government without pissing on somebody's delicate sensibilities.

I've gone out of my way to make sure that my kids don't view race as a necessary evil. *Everything* we have presented to them is race neutral and we try and play down anything that overtly has racial overtones. And white kids are the minority in this school! 6%!

But, they're not idiots. Even when they were 6 or 7, they noticed cultural differences with the other kids they go to school with and asked about them. I don't recall what we said at the time, other than to make sure they didn't have any preconceived notions about "how the black kids act" or the like.

When they get old enough, they can make up their own minds about race and ethnicity. (What they do know now is that the Asian family at the end of the block can buy and sell us many times over.)

reply to this

Jordan Elliot | 5.6.10 @ 5:29PM | #
Sorry to hear about the job loss.

reply to this

West Texas Boy | 5.6.10 @ 5:31PM | #
I am starting to think we are lost as a society, at least as that society was envisioned by Jefferson and his peers.

Starting to think?!??! I think Jefferson would probably spend about 20 minutes here and then probably tell you it's OK to just give up.

Sorry to hear about your job.

reply to this

Geotpf | 5.6.10 @ 6:01PM | #
Methinks there is more to the story than you let on and/or you just made it up on the spot.

For one thing, you used the present tense "teach"-twice. If you were fired, the past tense "taught" would be more accurate.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 6:15PM | #
Logic FAIL. Just because one may no longer be formally employed as a teacher in a particular institution, does not invalidate the expertise in the subject.

There is the phenomenon of the grieving process, where intellectually one is all too aware of the loss, yet the psyche is still processing the loss.

Insensitive pedantic shitbag.

reply to this

Rabbit Scribe | 5.6.10 @ 6:57PM | #
Uh, guys?

They got mad and ran to their guidance counsellors and principals claiming I was a racist who insulted them.

Doesn't necessarily mean he got fired. He might get off with a stint in the reeducation camp

reply to this

Madbiker | 5.6.10 @ 7:05PM | #
I'll clarify. I was "non-renewed" which means I'll teach until the end of this school year and then not be invited back next year. And along with my notice of non-renewal, I was told to keep a low-profile, give the kids their assignments, keep them engaged in group work, and try not to do any conversing, and stick to the curriculum.

So, the euphemism of non-renewal means fired to me. I can't believe I'm saying this, but I am looking forward to a summer of receiving unemployment checks versus no paycheck. I've paid into unemployment insurance for 20 years, since I was 15 years old. I guess I might as well get something back for the support I've given the system for so long.

We'll see what next September brings. I think I'm going to be in school finishing my second degree to get dual certified and increase my job prospects. 36 credits and I can add Bio to my credentials. Woo hoo.

reply to this

Barack Obama | 5.6.10 @ 7:16PM | #
This is how all teachers will do their jobs under My Rule.

reply to this

Juice | 5.7.10 @ 2:18AM | #
I just went and read some of the "Letters." Man, anyone who thought that people were free back then is utterly fooling themselves. Read Letter IX.

" The three principal classes of inhabitants are, lawyers, planters, and merchants; this is the province which has afforded to the first the richest spoils, for nothing can exceed their wealth, their power, and their influence. They have reached the ne plus ultra of worldly felicity; no plantation is secured, no title is good, no will is valid, but what they dictate, regulate, and approve. The whole mass of provincial property is become tributary to this society; which, far above priests and bishops, disdain to be satisfied with the poor Mosaical portion of the tenth. I appeal to the many inhabitants, who, while contending perhaps for their right to a few hundred acres, have lost by the mazes of the law their whole patrimony. These men are more properly law givers than interpreters of the law; and have united here, as well as in most other provinces, the skill and dexterity of the scribe with the power and ambition of the prince: who can tell where this may lead in a future day? The nature of our laws, and the spirit of freedom, which often tends to make us litigious, must necessarily throw the greatest part of the property of the colonies into the hands of these gentlemen. In another century, the law will possess in the north, what now the church possesses in Peru and Mexico.

> While all is joy, festivity, and happiness in Charles-Town, would you imagine that scenes of misery overspread in the country? Their ears by habit are become deaf, their hearts are hardened; they neither see, hear, nor feel for the woes of their poor slaves, from whose painful labours all their wealth proceeds. Here the horrors of slavery, the hardship of incessant toils, are unseen; and no one thinks with compassion of those showers of sweat and of tears which from the bodies of Africans, daily drop, and moisten the ground they till."

reply to this

Seer | 5.6.10 @ 5:10PM | #

Yes it's true that the document provided several protections for slavery. But you have to use notes from the convention or historical context to figure this out since the Southern slave holders were at least ashamed enough to avoid using the term "slaves."

reply to this

> **Seamus** | 5.7.10 @ 9:56AM | #
>
> They weren't so ashamed when they got together without any Yankees in the room and wrote a constitution for the C.S.A.
>
> reply to this

Ska | 5.6.10 @ 5:11PM | #

This is the type of shit that leads to self-inflicted blunt trauma.

reply to this

Slut Bunwalla | 5.6.10 @ 5:12PM | #

They're afraid that notions like freedom, equality, justice, etc. might undermine the work of the education establishment to warp everyone into good little statists.

reply to this

Hockey Guy | 5.6.10 @ 5:12PM | #

It's a racist document written by slaveholders and deserves a speedy death /sarc/

reply to this

Barbara Boxer | 5.6.10 @ 5:13PM | #

This book is a product of its time and does not reflect the same values as it would if it were written today...

This sounds like a foreword by future justice Liu.

reply to this

John | 5.6.10 @ 5:14PM | #

Does anyone have a thing for seeing girls eat your cum?

I live with a beautiful girl. Blonde, model material, with legs, breasts and ass to die for and the face of an angel. She looks so innocent, I fell for her the moment I saw her. She looks so virginal and is so prudish even talking about sex, that I don't even know if she's had any guys in the past. We're both young professionals in our early 20s and met through a mutual friend who I knew through university and she knew through school. Recently she moved to the city, and needed a place to stay. I needed a housemate, so our friend set us up.

I tried asking her out when she first moved in but unfortunately she made it pretty clear that she wasn't interested in anything but friendship. I figured that if she wasn't going to taste my baby batter voluntarily, and I'm pretty sure she hasn't tasted anyone else's before, I could feed it to her without her knowledge.

When she was out, I went around the house jacking off into her personal items - shampoo, conditioner, toothbrush, moisturiser, panties from her panty drawer, etc. I also started taking cookery lessons and offered to cook for her in order to practice my skills. What she doesn't know is that every meal I've cooked for her so far has had a healthy dose of my secret special sauce.

Before moral fags start whining, she seems to love it. She's commented on how her hair's been really soft recently and remarked on how her skin has been firmer, with a healthy glow to it. She even wondered if maybe the shampoo/conditioner manufacturers had changed the formulation. She used to get quite moody and hormonal over the month as her cycle progressed. Since I started feeding her my spooge, she's chilled out a lot and been really flirtatious with me. She's been more receptive to joking around with me, and finding ways to lightly touch my arms and chest, or accidentally brush up against me. Pheromones maybe? I've been sniffing her soiled panties while she's been out, and I know that personal scents can have a powerful effect – I've often ended up spontaneously ejaculating merely from the scent of her personal secretions.

She's told me she loves my cooking. It may just be a coincidence, but our bedrooms share a wall, and on the evenings I cook for her, I'm fairly sure I can hear her rubbing herself off. On the mornings when she leaves for work early and I'm in the flat alone, I sneak into her room and sniff and lick her still warm used panties from her laundry basket. The aroma is exquisite. On the mornings after I've cooked for her the previous night, they're definitely muskier and damper, and often have a heavy dried sugar crystal like crust on the gusset, which I love to chew on.

In addition, I get the added bonus of sitting opposite her while she's eating and see her swallow my jizz, savouring every mouthful before it slides smoothly down her throat. Knowing that I'm corrupting her beautiful innocent face with my unique glaze and coating those gorgeous lips and tongue; the thought that at this very moment she might be wearing a pair of the panties from her drawer that I jerked off into, and that flakes of my dried man milk might at this very moment be nestled against her hot gooey moist cunt; mingling with her own juices and being rehydrated by them, is an amazing turn on for me.

I also see it as a way of marking my territory. While the scent of my cream hangs on her, it might drive other guys away. I'm not sure if that has any scientific basis, but it seems to work. I understand there is some scientific research that shows cum to contain chemicals that aid in partner bonding and fight depression in women, as well as changing their hormonal balance and significantly reducing their risk of breast cancer.

All I know, from my unscientific little experiment is that feeding cock custard to girls definitely has its advantages, for both sexes. I'd go so far as to say doctors ought to be prescribing it. Guys, what are you waiting for? Give the women in your life the greatest gift a man has to offer, and improve your relationships with them. Ladies, why not ask the men in your life for a regular dose of liquid silk? It has many nutritional benefits, and if you're feeling hesitant, just remember that you've probably already unknowingly swallowed several cupfuls of spunk, donated by guys like me. A few more on a regular basis can't hurt.

reply to this

Jordan Elliot | 5.6.10 @ 5:16PM | #
This may be the best post I have ever read on this site.

reply to this

Enough About Palin | 5.6.10 @ 5:33PM | #
Are you the regular john who posts here or a spoof? I'm guessing the later, so I think you should get the banhammer.

reply to this

Episiarch | 5.6.10 @ 5:41PM | #
This is some good shit.

reply to this

B.P. | 5.6.10 @ 5:44PM | #
Needs more misspellings.

reply to this

The Gobbler | 5.6.10 @ 5:49PM | #
+ one hundrud.

reply to this

Sudden | 5.6.10 @ 6:21PM | #
I agree with that to (sic)

reply to this

JW | 5.6.10 @ 5:53PM | #
It's a copy and paste from another web forum.

reply to this

The Art-P.O.G. | 5.6.10 @ 6:04PM | #
I'll admit that I don't get this John spoofer. But even though I love clever satire (i.e. 24DollarsForHeadDon'tCum) I think actually appropriating someone else's handle is a banworthy offense.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:08PM | #
Yeah, I've never been much for spoofery. Better to subtly give away the spoof by misspelling the handle or using an obvious e-mail address.

Of course, this comes from someone who used to run extra-trollish comments through Babel Fish 50 times then re-post them, albeit following the aforementioned rules.

reply to this

The Art-P.O.G. | 5.6.10 @ 6:10PM | #
Yeah, I also think you have to tip your hand in the handle or the e-mail address for a spoof to be in good form.

reply to this

Jeff P. | 5.6.10 @ 5:55PM | #
Somebody please perform a dramatic reading of this. Pretty please. We'll loop it over the video from the old High Flight sign-off. Maybe add some kazoo and armpit farts. Youtube gold.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 5:57PM | #
Either in the voice of Sean Connery or Christopher Walken. I think the latter, but I'm willing to hear both.

Or maybe the Shat.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 6:02PM | #
Morgan Freeman.

Also, I am never eating Alfredo sauce if invited to John's house.

reply to this

The Art-P.O.G. | 5.6.10 @ 6:05PM | #
Morgan Freeman can make any narration awesome.

reply to this

JW | 5.6.10 @ 6:08PM | #
I'm going with Oprah.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:08PM | #
No, no, no. James Earl Jones.

I have spoken.

reply to this

Ragin Cajun | 5.6.10 @ 6:23PM | #
Charlton Heston.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:29PM | #
If only he weren't dead.

reply to this

Ragin Cajun | 5.6.10 @ 9:42PM | #
Yeah, it's too bad.

reply to this

Sudden | 5.6.10 @ 6:23PM | #
I am convinced that Morgan Freeman is the voice of every man's good internal monologue. Al Pacino is the voice of every man's evil internal monologue.

reply to this

The Art-P.O.G. | 5.6.10 @ 6:36PM | #
I believe you're right, Sudden. I wonder who provides the analogue in women's internal monologues.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 6:43PM | #
Meryl Streep.

reply to this

Maverick | 5.6.10 @ 6:49PM | #
Women aren't equipped with internal monologues.

reply to this

Maverick | 5.6.10 @ 6:53PM | #
My special lady friend only comes with the external version.

reply to this

The Expatriate | 5.6.10 @ 8:18PM | #
No, just vaginal ones.

reply to this

Dagny T. | 5.6.10 @ 7:00PM | #
Post- Sex and the City, SJP provides the "crazy" portion of an already overcrowded internal gabfest.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 7:08PM | #
If crazy is the pre-req Dagny, then Sally Field.

She is/played Sybil.

reply to this

Dagny T. | 5.6.10 @ 7:14PM | #
Sally Field is all Boniva-fied now. Disqualified.

reply to this

Mr. FIFY | 5.6.10 @ 7:18PM | #
John, I love your drapes! They're so soft... and absorbent...

reply to this

Almanian | 5.7.10 @ 4:04AM | #
Has anyone notice how you never see John v2.0 and SugarFree together? Like Clark Kent and Superman? Curious.

"I'm just asking the question...."

reply to this

Ken Shultz | 5.6.10 @ 5:14PM | #
Does the Constitution Need a Parental Advisory Sticker?

Well if you're gonna treat it like a death pact, why not go all the way?

reply to this

Colin | 5.6.10 @ 5:19PM | #
At one time the laity was not allowed to read the Bible. I wonder if that day will one day come for the Constitution.

reply to this

Jason | 5.6.10 @ 5:32PM | #
California already tried.

reply to this

Kent | 5.6.10 @ 6:58PM | #
California might want to check out the Fifth Circuit's decision in Veeck v. SBCCI. The decision is not binding on CA, but SBCCI had a much stronger case than the state of California and lost.

reply to this

CJ | 5.6.10 @ 7:33PM | #
I was going to say "Prior to the printing press it wasn't particularly easy to create thousand-page manuscripts, so even if anyone was allowed to read the Bible there likely wouldn't be many of them available to read--and having multiple people read simultaneously wouldn't be very feasible. It'll be difficult to prevent the wide availability of a document in an era of the printing press mark 2, namely the Internet."

But then I remembered that politicians are attempting to control the Internet. So yeah, we're doomed eventually.

reply to this

Enough About Palin | 5.6.10 @ 5:27PM | #
Speaking of the Constitution (and the 4th Ammendment, a few weeks ago I wrote about the Gas company getting a court order to enter my house and look at the lines. This was the result of my ignoring their notices. Some commenters said I should sue saying they had no right to enter the premisis as I had commited no crime.

But one commentator said something to the effect that I had signed a contract with the gas company so I was bound by that agreement to let them in.

I never signed an agreement with the gas company. No such document exists. My name was added to the account 25 years ago whe I moved in with my mom when she got cancer. Her name was removed when she died.

But even if I had signed a contract, the coming into my house wasn't due to any contract, it was do to some STATE LAW MAKER getting a bill passed that says the inside lines must be inspected and homeowner's gas companies and they can get a court order to do it.

So my point is by statue, the GOVERNMENT decided to enter my home. So how is this not a violation of the 4th Ammendment? I was not secure in my home from a government search.

Now I am not a man of great means, (solidly middle class, thankfully), so I really lack the resources

to pursue this. But then I remembered the court order and there were scores of home addresses that they entered just on that day. Given that, it would seem likely there were other court orders for other days with scores of addresses as well. Given this, could this not be a candidate for a class-action suit, given that it affected so many homeowners? And if so, would a reliable attorney be willing to take a case like this on a contingency bases? I really don't want any money, I just want this bullshit law struck down.

Thanks for your input.

reply to this

Jordan Elliot | 5.6.10 @ 5:33PM | #
Have you thought about getting in contact with some of the attorney groups mentioned here on H&R by some of the Reason staff?

I can't recall the names but they're in the archives. Institute of Justice is perhaps one of them. Sorry I'm of such little help.

reply to this

Enough About Palin | 5.6.10 @ 5:52PM | #
Thanks! Their Minnesota office is just a block away from mine.

reply to this

Sudden | 5.6.10 @ 7:24PM | #
Check the title report on your property. Frequently, the title report confers easements to public utilities for such inspections.

reply to this

BakedPenguin | 5.6.10 @ 8:26PM | #
EAP, sorry to hear about your situation. I hope you find a way to fight back.

This is one reason why I'd consider paying out the ass for wind or solar power.

reply to this

Scooby | 5.7.10 @ 10:43AM | #
I was that commenter, and I'm pretty sure that in obtaining gas service, the builder of your home granted an easement to the gas company to access their piping and equipment up to the demarcation point between utility owned equipment and customer owned piping (usually at the meter). This sort of easement is typically granted by the builder or owner and and typically perpetually binds the grantor and his heirs and assigns to it- even if you as a buyer or heir to the property don't explicitly agree to it.

Even if there isn't a recorded easement, I'll bet there is an access clause in your customer agreement (request this from the utility if you aren't familiar with it). Even if you haven't read it, you ratify your agreement to it by having the ongoing utility service.

You can look for a lawyer, but you probably won't find one that will take this case because it sounds like the sheriff was enforcing a valid court order and doesn't sound like there were any damages (other than to your feelings). Lawyers don't like working on their own dime, especially for a losing cause.

Next time don't ignore notices- you might have been able to fight the court order if you had responded.

Don't like it? Have the gas cut off from your house- have the meter removed by a plumber of your choice and the piping capped at the property line. Do the same for all of your other public utilities, especially those with demarc points within your walls.

Disclaimer: I am not a lawyer, and this is not legal advice.

reply to this

Rich | 5.6.10 @ 5:19PM | #
This ~~book~~ reader advisory *is a product of its time*

reply to this

P Brooks | 5.6.10 @ 5:28PM | #
bangs head on desk

reply to this

Ska | 5.6.10 @ 5:31PM | #
So my above post was right....

reply to this

Ragin Cajun | 5.6.10 @ 5:35PM | #
I wonder if the British are allowed to read the Magna Carta...

reply to this

West Texas Boy | 5.6.10 @ 5:36PM | #
I think I'm just going to give up now and start drinking during the day. There is absolutely no hope any more.

"They" have won.

reply to this

Madbiker | 5.6.10 @ 5:41PM | #
Even Guy Montag found a way. You can too. Never give in.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 5:44PM | #
Are you suggesting that our only hope is a nuclear war?

reply to this

Madbiker | 5.6.10 @ 5:51PM | #
The phoenix will always rise.

Not that I condone nuclear war. But sometimes a thing must be destroyed before it can be rebuilt in a better image.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 5:58PM | #
I agree. Time for the Stone Burners.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:03PM | #
Will you knock it off?

It's time to introduce the sandtrout/sandworm cycle.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 6:08PM | #
No, I'm kinda serious on that one. But then, it's been a REALLY remarkably unusually shitty day. So take my comment with a grain of spice.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:11PM | #
Speaking of shitty days and *Dune*, it occurs to me that Brian Herbert--if he simply had to eff up his father's universe--should've written a couple of books about the lives of ordinary people living in the times of the first book. Because I think life must've sucked for such people.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 6:18PM | #
Indeed. I believe I can relate. Brian Herbert is the product of Frank's unusual parenting style.

I submit that Frank probably should not have had children.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:26PM | #
Agreed. He should've had a ghola of himself made.

reply to this

The Art-P.O.G. | 5.6.10 @ 6:34PM | #
You people are such nerds. Which is why I love you and why I belong.

reply to this

The Art-P.O.G. | 5.6.10 @ 6:32PM | #
"Grain of spice". Nice.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:35PM | #
I looked at you link. Soldier-artist is an awesome label.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:35PM | #
Your link, that is.

reply to this

The Art-P.O.G. | 5.6.10 @ 6:42PM | #
I haven't updated my Myspace page in ages, but thanks. I actually recently left active duty and now I'm in the reserves for :::sigh::: less than four years.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:55PM | #
Soldier-artist still works.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 7:07PM | #
Good ole fashioned Renaissance Man works better IMO.

And don't argue with me Pro'L Dib. I am not Imperially Conditioned.

reply to this

The Art-P.O.G. | 5.6.10 @ 7:20PM | #
I really have to read the books and, y'know, stop referencing the Lynch adaptation (although that cast was full of win).

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 8:27PM | #
I agree about the cast. I mean, Jürgen as the Duke Leto? Awesome. Too bad the film sucked.

reply to this

Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 8:39PM | #
The film was terrible; so much potential, yet the poorest of executions. However, I had a schoolboy crush on Francesca Annis for quite a while.

That is the danger of an all-star cast, IMO: each individual performance is great in it's own right, but not guaranteed to translate into a great movie upon amalgamation.

reply to this

Chris | 5.6.10 @ 5:44PM | #
http://money.cnn.com/2010/05/0.....amp;hpt=C2

"If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it."

reply to this

Chris | 5.6.10 @ 5:48PM | #
"No sooner did the Democrats on the Energy Committee read them than they abruptly cancelled the hearings."

And:

"Nowhere in the five-page report did the majority staff mention that not one, but all four companies, were weighing the costs and benefits of dropping their coverage."

reply to this

Chris | 5.6.10 @ 5:52PM | #
"So policies for a family making $66,000 would cost them just $5,300 a year with the government picking up the difference: more than $10,000 by most estimates."

reply to this

Chris | 5.6.10 @ 5:54PM | #
"So if 50% of people covered by company plans get dumped, federal health care costs will rise by $160 billion a year in 2016, in addition to the $93 billion in subsidies already forecast by the CBO. Of course, as we've seen throughout the health care reform process, it's impossible to know for certain what the unintended consequences of these actions will be."

reply to this

Nancy Pelosi | 5.6.10 @ 6:03PM | #
Remember when I told you we need to pass this so you can find out what's in it?

Turns out we didn't know what was in it either, but that's ok. We're gonna pass a VAT tax to fix everything.

FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE THAT I AM COMMITTED TO SERVING.

reply to this

¢ | 5.6.10 @ 5:51PM | #
This thread is a product of its time and does not reflect the same values as it would if it were written when Virginia Postrel was editor. Parents might wish to discuss with their children how views on Islam, nuclear war, and cock custard have changed since *Reason* got all shitty before allowing them to read this not classic thread.

reply to this

The Art-P.O.G. | 5.6.10 @ 6:09PM | #
Heh heh. Awesome.

DISCLAIMER: I'm almost certain I never actually read Reason when Postrel was EIC.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:34PM | #
I've mentioned this before, but I met her at a conference in San Jose back in the 90s. Awesome event, with Milton Friedman (sat about six feet away from him when he spoke), his son, David, VP and some other *Reason* people, bunches of Cato folk, David Brin, Larry "Evil" Ellison, Harry Browne, and others.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 6:44PM | #
Okay, this was the conference.

Looks like Vernor Vinge was there, too (I just read *Rainbows End*, incidentally). Pretty sure I never saw him.

I think I spoke to Eric Drexler, as well. I know I bought one of his books on nanotech.

reply to this

Dagny T. | 5.6.10 @ 7:04PM | #
I went to a Vernor Vinge book reading at the Sci Fi Museum in Seattle. Even though I hadn't read any of his stuff at the time (tagged along with my geeky uncle), it was a fun event- he's super smart & put up with the geeks with a lot of humor and grace.

reply to this

The Art-P.O.G. | 5.6.10 @ 7:18PM | #
That looks like a badass conference. I would have been happy to have been there, but now that I think about it, I was a H.S. sophomore back in those days.

reply to this

robc | 5.6.10 @ 7:45PM | #
What did you think of Rainbows End? I think it is the weakest of his novels that Ive read.

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 8:28PM | #
I rather liked it. Next up is *A Fire Upon the Deep*.

reply to this

Marc | 5.6.10 @ 9:23PM | #
Fuuuuuck that's a good one.

A Deepness in the Sky is even better IMO.

reply to this

Marc | 5.6.10 @ 9:24PM | #
GAH THREADS.

That was in response to ProL.

Rainbows End is just fine, but I agree, not his best.

reply to this

robc | 5.6.10 @ 11:07PM | #
I prefer Fire over Deepness, but it depends on my mood. Probably because I read Fire first too.

reply to this

Almanian | 5.6.10 @ 6:36PM | #
Hah! What Art said, and
DRINK!

reply to this

MikeL | 5.6.10 @ 6:02PM | #
Does the Constitution Need a Parental Advisory Sticker?

Things would be much simpler for the government if we would all just follow Al's example.

reply to this

MikeL | 5.6.10 @ 6:34PM | #
Sorry, Al's example.

reply to this

Eminem | 5.6.10 @ 6:40PM | #
White America:

America!! Hahaha! We love you!
How many people are proud to be citizens of this beautiful country of ours?
The stripes and the stars for the rights that men have died for to protect
The women and men who have broke their necks for the freedom of speech
the United States government has sworn to uphold..
(Yo, I want everybody to listen to the words of this song) .. or so we're told

I never woulda dreamed in a million years I'd see
so many motherfuckin people, who feel like me
Who share the same views and the same exact beliefs
It's like a fuckin ARMY marchin in back of me
So many lives I touched, so much anger aimed
in no particular direction, just sprays and sprays
And straight through your radio waves, it plays and plays
'til it stays stuck in your head, for days and days
Who woulda thought; standin in this mirror bleachin my hair
with some peroxide, reachin for a t-shirt to wear
that I would catapult to the forefront of rap like this?
How could I predict my words would have an impact like this?
I must've struck a chord with somebody up in the office
Cause Congress keep tellin me, I ain't causin nuthin but problems
And now they're sayin I'm in trouble with the government - I'm lovin it!
I shoveled shit all my life, and now I'm dumpin it on

[Chorus 2X: Eminem]
White America! I could be one of your kids
White America! Little Eric looks just like this
White America! Erica loves my shit
I go to TRL; look how many hugs I get!

[Eminem]
Look at these eyes, baby blue, baby just like yourself
If they were brown Shady lose, Shady sits on the shelf
But Shady's cute, Shady knew Shady's dimples would help
Make ladies swoon baby (ooh baby!) Look at my sales
Let's do the math - if I was black, I woulda sold half
I ain't have to graduate from Lincoln High School to know that
But I could rap, so fuck school, I'm too cool to go back
Gimme the mic, show me where the fuckin studio's at
When I was underground, no one gave a fuck I was white
No labels wanted to sign me, almost gave up I was like
Fuck it - until I met Dre, the only one to look past
Gave me a chance aand I lit a FIRE up under his ass
Helped him get back to the top, every fan black that I got
was probably his in exchange for every white fan that he's got
Like damn; we just swapped - sittin back lookin at shit, wow
I'm like my skin is it startin to work to my benefit now? It's..

[Chorus]

[Eminem]
See the problem is, I speak to suburban kids
who otherwise woulda never knew these words exist
Whose moms probably woulda never gave two squirts of piss

'til I created so much motherfuckin turbulence!
Straight out the tube, right into your living rooms I came
And kids flipped, when they knew I was produced by Dre
That's all it took, and they were instantly hooked right in
And they connected with me too because I looked like them
That's why they put my lyrics up under this microscope
Searchin with a fine tooth comb, it's like this rope
waitin to choke; tightenin around my throat
Watchin me while I write this, like I don't like this (Nope!)
All I hear is: lyrics, lyrics, constant controversy, sponsors working
round the clock to try to stop my concerts early, surely
Hip-Hop was never a problem in Harlem only in Boston
After it bothered the fathers of daughters startin to blossom
So now I'm catchin the flack from these activists when they raggin
Actin like I'm the first rapper to smack a bitch or say faggot, shit!
Just look at me like I'm your closest pal
The posterchild, the motherfuckin spokesman now for..

[Chorus]

[Eminem}
So to the parents of America
I am the derringer aimed at little Erica to attack her character
The ringleader of this circus of worthless pawns
Sent to lead the march right up to the steps of Congress
and piss on the lawns of the White House
To burn the {flag and replace it with a Parental Advisory sticker
To spit liquor in the faces of this democracy of hypocrisy
Fuck you Ms. Cheney! Fuck you Tipper Gore!
Fuck you with the free-est of speech
this Divided States of Embarassment will allow me to have
Fuck you!

I'm just kiddin America, you know I love you

reply to this

2002 | 5.6.10 @ 6:48PM | #
Ahh, the good old days, when some Americans thought the country was united.

reply to this

skr | 5.6.10 @ 7:03PM | #
are you fucking kidding me?

reply to this

Warty | 5.6.10 @ 7:04PM | #
What the fuck is happening on H&R today? And how come I don't get an insane spoofer?

reply to this

Warty Insane Spoofer | 5.6.10 @ 7:15PM | #
Would you like one?

reply to this

Pro Libertate | 5.6.10 @ 8:29PM | #
You've already been allocated one Episiarch. Don't be greedy.

reply to this

BakedPenguin | 5.6.10 @ 8:29PM | #
How could we tell the difference?

reply to this

cynical | 5.6.10 @ 8:46PM | #
Pretty much.

reply to this

Jeffersonian | 5.6.10 @ 7:23PM | #
Christ.

reply to this

Slim Charles | 5.6.10 @ 8:48PM | #
FUCK all postmodernists. Fuck 'em with burning hot, badly rusted, crooked, stout, broken screwdriver.

reply to this

Took a class on postmodernism | 5.6.10 @ 8:54PM | #
Some of them might actually enjoy that.

reply to this

Sir Groovus Maximus | 5.6.10 @ 9:59PM | #
Was is in Bolivia?

reply to this

---

no war there | 5.6.10 @ 11:58PM | #
just great times

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:21PM | #
I'm not sure how it's "postmodernist" to point out to kids that the Founder's racist and sexist beliefs enshrined in the document were wrong. Wrong now, wrong then, not excused by the time or "social construction" of the age.

That's the opposite of postmodernism goofball.

reply to this

The Libertarian Guy | 5.7.10 @ 9:53AM | #
That's how things were done back then, MNG. Don't like it? Build a time machine and fix it.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 9:31PM | #
The constitution was an amazing advancement at its time. But yes, it is really f*cked up in many ways (blacks as 3/5th person, no protection of womens suffrage or rights, etc.). I can see a kid reading it and seeing the 3/5ths provision and thinking WTF?!

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 9:40PM | #
MNG, in case you are unaware, that part was changed.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 9:50PM | #
Yes, but it was in the original and stood for a long time. It was f*cked up to consider blacks 3/5ths a person. Do you deny this? I didn't think so. And so you concede my point that the Constitution had some pretty f*cked up provisions.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 9:57PM | #
“Yes, but it was in the original and stood for a long time.”

As Jeffersonian points out below, allowing slaves to be counted fully would have been to the benefit of slaveholding states.

“And so you concede my point that the Constitution had some pretty f*cked up provisions.”

And this was not the point of Damon W. Root's post. Was it? I didn't think so. Children need to be taught history; they need to learn both the ugly and the beautiful in context. The Constitution is not the same as an album by Eminem. It is history. It should not be treated as something to be afraid of. That was Mr. Root's point and mine.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:06PM | #
Nothing in the advisory says urges parents to not teach them this ugly history. It says simply you might want to discuss to your kid the f*cked up views they had on race and gender at the time. This strikes me as helpful actually since the kid, if they have any sense, is going to read stuff like the 3/5ths clause and wonder WTF was going on when that was written. Thankfully such thinking will seem very crazy to a kid. It would help them understand it to have that discussed before reading it.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:15PM | #
The warning says "Parents might wish to discuss with their children how views on race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and interpersonal relations have changed since this book was written BEFORE {emphasis mine} allowing them to read this classic work."

It would make far more sense to me to talk to them about this AFTER reading the work if they have any questions. Let them read it without prejudicing them. If I were a lawyer in court defending the Consitution I might say "Council is leading the witness" or some such. Let them read it free and clear of our prejudices first.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:18PM | #
You don't want them "led" to find the sanctioning of human enslavement as wrong?

Oooook!

Again, I still argue it would be better to tell the kid aforehand "hey, you are going to see some stuff in there that is pretty f*cked up....Those people back then unfortunately had a pretty f*cked up set of views on this stuff. I know it's hard to believe, but you'll see what I mean in the text son."

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:30PM | #
You are twisting my words. The Constitution does not itself use the word race until the Amendments that recognize all races as having equal rights. Until those Amendments it is neutral on the topic. In fact, in 1845, Lysander Spooner argued that the Constitution ALREADY made slavery unconstitutional without any further amendments.
http://www.lysanderspooner.org.....ntents.htm

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:34PM | #
Being neutral on race during a time of race-based slavery is wrong and cowardly.

It would be like being neutral on religion during a time of religious based oppression.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:41PM | #
If I kidnap you and force you to do work this is an act of violence and coercion regardless of your race and regardless of what continent you were born on.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:47PM | #
And yet the Constitution was written by men at a time when that practice was common regarding black persons in their nation, and they wrote nothing in their Constitution to fight it...

They were concerned about, and specifically barred, the unreasonable searches and seizures, self-incrimination, etc., that was going on at the time. But not this. Shame on them forever for that lapse.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.7.10 @ 6:42AM | #
And what does this have to do with the original topic of the blog-post?

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:49PM | #
You yourself admit that in signing on to the compromise the founders were quite aware that they had created a document that failed to legally bar this kind of thing as it occurred to black Africans in their midst (you just think it was, like allowing Iran into the UN, a hard compromise).

And you can't fault them for that? Why?

reply to this

PIRS | 5.7.10 @ 6:43AM | #
"And you can't fault them for that? Why?"

On what basis do you make the claim that I can't fault them for that?

reply to this

PIRS | 5.7.10 @ 6:43AM | #
"And you can't fault them for that? Why?"

On what basis do you make the claim that I can't fault them for that?

reply to this

Robert | 5.6.10 @ 11:30PM | #
What, something hard to explain about "other persons"?

Children love playing master & slave, it's a common children's game, and they understand it perfectly well.

reply to this

MJ | 5.7.10 @ 7:24AM | #
The Constitution did not say that blacks were 3/5ths of a person, but that individuals held as slaves (hidden behind a euphemism)were to be counted as 3/5ths for apportionment purposes. Being black in and of itslef had no role.

The evil of the time was that there was slavery at all, but what was revolutionary about the US founding was advancing the notion that human rights were universal, not simply enforcing the rights of Englishmen. One of the reasons the US had slavery was a cultural holdover that people who were of different ethnicity did not have the same claim to rights.

reply to this

cynical | 5.6.10 @ 9:41PM | #
Probably shouldn't teach kids history either. Might warp their fragile little minds. Plus, then they'll be doomed to repeat it, which Marx tells us will be farcical. And that means comedy gold.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 9:51PM | #
Good thing noone is talking about not teaching them history then. They are saying that when you talk to them about history you might want to mention the f*cked up views they had on race and gender at the time.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:05PM | #
The United States Constitution does not actually mention race except for the amendments that recognize equal rights for people of all races.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:07PM | #
You're right, it did nothing to protect the members of races that were being subjugated at the time. Pathetic that was, a cowardly compromise.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:23PM | #
It is easy for us, in 2010, to call it cowardly. We are living in a different world and paradigm right now. Please, do not misunderstand, I am not defending slaver. I mearly think that we should give a little bit of slack to people who were writing the Constitution in a period of great turmoil. Plus, the "federal government" was not viewed as a country in the same way it is now. A good example of what I mean is the United Nations. Should North Korea be given a voice in the United Nations? Is it cowardly to give Saudi Arabia the same voice as Canda? Why or why not? Should Iran be suspended from the United Nations because of its treatment of members of the Baha'i faith? Why or why not? How would you react if some neo-con said that Iran should be kicked out the United Nations?

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:29PM | #
So you absolve, say, President Woodrow Wilson's racist views as being a product of his region, time and age?

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:32PM | #
"So you absolve, say, President Woodrow Wilson's racist views as being a product of his region, time and age?"

No, because they were not. His actions were clearly a violation of his oath of office.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:36PM | #
How so? At the time the Constitution, as interpreted by the SCOTUS, was thought by most to allow his favored Jim Crow policies.

Just as at the time the US Constitution was written to ignore and implicitly sanction slavery in seemingly obvious contradistinction to the words of, say, the previously written Declaration of Independence.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:38PM | #

What matters is what the Constitution actually says - not what lawyers wearing black robes claim that it says:
http://www.lysanderspooner.org.....ntents.htm

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:43PM | #
And what matters is what the Declaration actually says, not the cowardly contradictory compromises some politicians writing the Constitution made.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:46PM | #
"And what matters is what the Declaration actually says, not the cowardly contradictory compromises some politicians writing the Constitution made."

And so we have come full circle. I agree and this does not at all contradict my other statments.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:51PM | #
So the failure of the Constitution drafters to live up to the Declaration's principles was wrong, right?

And children shouldn't be told about this, why?

reply to this

PIRS | 5.7.10 @ 6:39AM | #
"And children shouldn't be told about this, why?"

Did I say they should not be taught about this? No, I did not. What I said, and have been saying, is that they should be able to read the Constitution without prejudice first.

reply to this

MJ | 5.7.10 @ 7:25AM | #
...and Wlison's Progressive ideology?

reply to this

Jeffersonian | 5.6.10 @ 9:45PM | #
If blacks had been counted as full persons for the purposes of apportioning Congressional seats, we might still have slavery in the US, MNG. Abolitionists wanted them to not count at all, for obvious reasons.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 9:49PM | #
Jeffersonian has a good point.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 9:54PM | #
If you were writing the constitution right now would you have put in the 3/5ths provision? If not, why? Is it because you think it's preposterous to count human beings as 3/5ths of a person, or to compromise with actual enslavement of human beings in such a way?

If so you can admit the Founders foundered at the time. Or you can retreat into postmodernism and say "they's was just products of their time!

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:00PM | #
They were indeed products of their time. I do not see why anyone should deny this. So were the Ancient Greeks who also had slavery and yet contributed greatly to

modern society. Should we put a parental advisory sticker on a book by Aristotle or Plato or Homer?

reply to this

Seamus | 5.7.10 @ 9:59AM | #
If slavery were still legal in some states? Then yes, I'd have written the 3/5 clause, you know, to reduce the power of the slaveholders in the House of Representatives. And that's only if I couldn't write a provision in that said only free persons would be counted in apportionment. (Just in case you thought that the 3/5 clause had the evil effect of reducing the voting power of the *slaves*, here's a news flash for you: the slaves didn't have the right to vote, so counting them at 5/5 of a man would only have helped the slaveholders.)

reply to this

Seamus | 5.7.10 @ 10:04AM | #
Oh, and just in case MNG asks, "why don't you just write in a provision abolishing slavery," I should make it clear that I'm assuming such a provision wouldn't be adopted, so I have to fall back onto Plan B to minimize the Slave Power.

reply to this

Scarlett O'MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:25PM | #
Oh, mah delicate sensibilities are offended ever so, so I'm sure this Constitution is not safe for the children. Somebody get me mah smelling salts before I feint away.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:28PM | #
Except noone says this shouldn't be brought to children. So nice try dumbass.

reply to this

Scarlett O'MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:37PM | #
Except, that would mean you really don't have a point, and you are just flailing away like a pretty little belle that wants every one to notice her.

Bessy, how do you think those drapes would look sewed into a dress?

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:44PM | #
Since noone is advocating the position you are mocking, wouldn't that make YOU the person without a point?

reply to this

Scarlett O'MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:41PM | #
Oh, Captain Obvious, here is someone I would like you to meet, my sister. She is going to reiterate what should already be assumed to make her look much smarter than she really is. Please nod along even if you don't think she would make such a good catch. Do that for me, hun?

reply to this

Scarlett O'MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:51PM | #
Notice, Captain Obvious, how I answered her question before she asked it. Not bright and very predictable, but I got to get her married off and out of the house, so what do you say? Will you take her?

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:54PM | #
Did you just respond to simply yourself Captian Pathetic? It's too rich I tells ya.

reply to this

Scarlett O'MNG | 5.6.10 @ 11:02PM | #

Oh, please sister! Ah'm trying to catch you a man. I don't want him to know you are as vapid and mean spirited as you are flighty until the poor fool says 'I do.'

reply to this

MNG sucks | 5.6.10 @ 10:50PM | #

You seriously had to find a way to douche up this thread? Can you not just admit a PC warning sticker on a copy of the Constitution is absurd?

Oh, wait, you can't. You're too fucking big of a douche. Fuck you, you stupid asshole twit.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:53PM | #

Oh, because I should fall before the Constitution and genuflect and praise it as perfect!

Except the Founders themselves were not such idiots. No, they saw the thing the way I have spoke of it here: marvelous and flawed.

You love it like a child loves their mom: "My mommy can do no wrong, don't ever say otherwise or I'll cry and stomp my feet!"

Get bent child-man.

reply to this

Johnny Cochrane | 5.7.10 @ 12:13AM | #

That's right, MNG. Every thing I taught you. That's the hurt paw defense.

Limp around a little, and whimper.

Except the Founders themselves were not such idiots. No, they saw the thing the way I have spoke of it here: marvelous and flawed.

Now, the sad puppy dog eyes.

You love it like a child loves their mom: "My mommy can do no wrong, don't ever say otherwise or I'll cry and stomp my feet!

Oh, yes! You nailed it.

Now, for the hardest part, snarl back the snarl of an innocent little whelp who has been mistreated.

Get bent child-man.

Oh, the jury ate it up, fo' sure!

reply to this

Scarlett O'MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:55PM | #

I can assure you mah little sister doesn't douche or it would be so much easier to get her a man.

reply to this

Scarlett O'MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:59PM | #

But she did indeed ruin this thread. We even sent her up North to the best schools, and she came back even worse. A thread ruiner, a party pooper, a bull in a china shop, where is mah hand fan these analogies to my sister's barbaric ignorance are wearing me thin!

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:09PM | #

It would surely help a kid in reading Aristotle to have some of the Greeks anti-freedom views explained to them before hand.

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:25PM | #
Why before-hand? This may be the crux of our disagreement. I think that these historic documents should be read without prejudice first.

reply to this

MNG | 5.6.10 @ 10:31PM | #
It doesn't say "you should tell them the different views on race and gender back then were bad" it says you should tell them they had some pretty different views on race and gender back then. So no, I don't think this necessarily prejudices the reader before they read the work (I understand and appreciate your concerns though, I would not want them to say "hey, this book is bad and wrong, now read it!"; I don't think that is necessarily implied here)

reply to this

PIRS | 5.6.10 @ 10:36PM | #
Knowing my own way of thinking as a child I know it might have very well prejudiced me. Kids are built to ask questions anyway. Any concerns they have they, themselves, will raise. They know what they are thinking better than the editor of a book.

reply to this

Jimmy Jomee | 5.6.10 @ 10:44PM | #
Sure sounds like it does WOw.

Lou
www.anonymous-web-surfing.cz.tc

reply to this

Comrade Zero | 5.6.10 @ 11:19PM | #
Since the term "man" can be used in a non-gender-specific way, it can be said that the Constitution is mostly race and gender neutral. The 3/5ths part can be taken only to apply to non-citizens held in service. But, still, questions will be raised about why these protections and privileges were selectively applied for so long - I raised them myself as a young person reading it - and maybe a notice isn't such a bad thing to have.

reply to this

heller | 5.7.10 @ 2:18AM | #
This is ridiculous...

No child would voluntarily read the Constitution.

reply to this

Neil Sedaka | 5.7.10 @ 3:17AM | #
MNG|5.6.10 @ 9:51PM|#

*Good thing noone is talking about not teaching them history then. They are saying that when you talk to them about history you might want to mention the f*cked up views they had on race and gender at the time.*

It could have been a throw away line but all too true
The contempt in us has only acrued
After all you put us through no reason this time
To listen to weak ridicule and your limpid pantomine

But it was in

Bad (ba-a-ad) Faith (Fai-ai-th)
The guy just can't tell us what he believes
Should the children be allowed to pry,

If so than why the cocked up outcry?

Because it is in

Bad (ba-a-ad) Faith (Fai-ai-th)
Brother, you're here to deceive
It's wont change a single mind
Just glad I'm not your kind.

From where I stand, it looks mighty strange
How you let those words arrange depending
On how you think you can slam us, rendering
The point mute and your modus unchanged.

Because it was in

Bad (ba-a-ad) Faith (Fai-ai-th)
The twitch is in his smile
The hate hidden for awhile
He's our bestest pal

Bad (ba-a-ad) Faith (Fai-ai-th)
You think you are taking us for a ride
But against us you make no progress, so
We just let it slide

Doo-ron, doo-ron, di di, dit, dit, ron-ron
Doo-ron, doo-ron, di di, dit, dit, ron-ron
Doo-ron, doo-ron, di di, dit, dit, ron-ron
Bad faith, talkin' 'bout bad faith

Doo-ron, doo-ron, di di, dit, dit, ron-ron
Doo-ron, doo-ron, di di, dit, dit, ron-ron
Doo-ron, doo-ron, di di, dit, dit, ron-ron
Bad faith

reply to this

Mad Max | 5.7.10 @ 8:14AM | #
Or they could use the following warning label:

CAUTION: Use sparingly. Excessive adherence to this document may be dangerous to the federal welfare/warfare state.

reply to this

> **Mad Max** | 5.7.10 @ 8:21AM | #
> Side effects include limited government, separation of powers, and federalism. Jury-trial guarantees may lead to fair trials, and possible acquittal, for people you 'know' to be guilty. If adherence to this Constitution persists, consult a demagogue or federal judge.
>
> reply to this
>
> > **Mad Max** | 5.7.10 @ 8:25AM | #
> > First Amendment guarantees may permit individuals and organizations outside the government-recognized media to express themselves freely without censorship.
> >
> > reply to this
> >
> > > **Mad Max** | 5.7.10 @ 8:31AM | #
> > > If freedom fails to subside within a year, consult your Congressman immediately.
> > >
> > > reply to this

SugarFree | 5.7.10 @ 8:25AM | #
I stand in awe of this thread.

reply to this

Isaac Bartram | 5.7.10 @ 11:52AM | #

> It was f*cked up to consider blacks 3/5ths a person.

The 3/5ths had to do with enumerating for the purposes of representation, not a value judgment on the worth of any human.

The demeaning of blacks was already occurring in the wider society through the legally sanctioned practice of chattel slavery. The Constitution simply recognized the fact.

Actually the fact that the Constitution is so close to neutral on the issue of slavery is quite a deal. Slaveowners wanted it enshrined in the document, abolitionists wanted it ended.

As in all things political sometimes compromise is the best you'll get and like almost all compromises this one sucked but not as badly as some of the alternatives.

reply to this

Isaac Bartram | 5.7.10 @ 11:56AM | #

To expand a little, slaveowners would have preferred to have slaves counted as *one* so as to get greater representation for their viewpoint. Does this mean that slaveowners were less bigoted than the abolitionists and abolitionist-leaners who were the ones that insisted on the lower number?

reply to this

Isaac Bartram | 5.7.10 @ 12:02PM | #

I should note the fact that other posters have said essentially the same things as I have.

But when you make a post as stupid as the one you made you deserve all the piling on you get.

reply to this

engineer | 5.7.10 @ 11:55AM | #

You should probably have a warning saying "This is not how the actual US government works. We do not take responsibility for anybody who violates one of the voluminous regulations imposed by the US government, gets jailed for illegal gun ownership, or gets in trouble for attempting secession, all of which may seem permissible if you take this original document at face value."

reply to this

Leave a Comment

* NAME:

EMAIL:

WEBSITE:

REMEMBER NAME, EMAIL, AND WEBSITE ON THIS COMPUTER FOR 30 DAYS?

* COMMENT:

preview submit