
Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 01 Jan 2006 17:06:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nodbugger wrote on Sat
Grasping at straws now?

I don't even think you live in the US and it is quite obvious you have never taken a class or read a book about the US government.

Well, not any books written by Rush Limbaugh or Anne Coulter.

NodbuggerThis is a court case that says the president can do this. It isn't very hard to understand.

But it does not say this.

Amendment IVThe 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.

The Constitution itself expressly says that warrants based on probable cause are required for all cases of domestic searches. (This extends to electronic surveillance as well.) (So you know, they didn't have wiretaps back when this was written.)

NodbuggerAnd no, Congress cannot impose restrictions on the executive Branch, ever hear of Separation of powers? The War Powers act doesn't limit what the president can do, it isn't a presidential power to wage war. The war powers act gives them that ability.

...

The War Powers Act was created in response to troops being sent into Vietnam by a President without the approval of Congress. So Congress declared that the President may only deploy troops if he reports to Congress within a certain amount of time after deployment. Thus, Congress is saying "The President must do this."

NodbuggerThe NSA, lets break that Acronym down. National Security Agency. Not international, but national. While they are specializing in foreign activity, they can spy domestically when it involves foreign citizens.

These are AMERICAN citizens. AMERICAN NOT FOREIGN.

I think you might also like to take a look at this.

<http://www.cia.gov/cia/information/eo12333.html>

Quote:2.5 Attorney General Approval. The Attorney General hereby is delegated the power to approve the use for intelligence purposes, within the United States or against a United States person abroad, of any technique for which a warrant would be required if undertaken for law enforcement purposes, provided that such techniques shall not be undertaken unless the Attorney General has determined in each case that there is probable cause to believe that the technique is directed against a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power. Electronic surveillance, as defined in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, shall be conducted in accordance with that Act, as well as this Order.

Shall be conducted in accordance with that act [FISA]. The end.

RunewoodOk listen carefully. Who here likes old Honest Abe? I do. Under the precedents he set up, the President can remove your rights if you commit treason. If you are a terrorist then you have committed treason. Thus if they think you are a terrorist, you HAVE NO RIGHTS. These people are involved in questionable things dealing with treason so they CAN be searched, checked, spy-ed upon.

These people haven't been convicted of ANYTHING. So they cannot legally be viewed as being guilty of treason. Of course, legality never stopped President Bush, but that doesn't mean you should follow his bad example. I highly suggest you give up political science in favor of being a waiter or something.
