

'crap.'

GLENN BECK TO SARAH PALIN,
WHO ANSWERED "ALL OF THEM"
WHEN ASKED, "WHO'S YOUR DADDY?"

False-doctrine

~~THE LAW~~ OF UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES
rears its head in Juneau, again.

Almost daily, some lawmakers offer compelling arguments for a 90-day (or shorter) legislative session, even though they didn't mean to do so.

Rep. Carl Gatto's offering, House Bill 88, is an example. It doesn't contain the word "Shariah," or Islamic law, but that's what it is aimed at, according to Gatto.

Officially, HB88 prohibits courts, agencies, and the like "from applying a law, rule, or provision of an agreement that violates an individual's right under the Constitution of the State of Alaska or the United States Constitution."

Our constitutions, state and federal, already trump any law, rule or provision. Why write a law that says so? - WTF? Good point, actually

Peninsula Clarion

First of all, I've never heard of so-called unintended consequences, so how did it become a Law. Secondly; they don't explain what they mean by "again" - that's a vaguery; real journalists aren't supposed to be vague.

Lastly; I looked up the word "consequence" and Webster's defines it as; the natural result of a previous action or condition. So there's really no such thing as certainly no such Law of U.C. (This is just one of many thousands of instances of this false-doctrine being spread)