
Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2006 16:35:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

runewood wrote on Sun, 01 January 2006 15:45SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sun, 01 January 2006 11:06Nodbugger wrote on Sat

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.

Thats just it, if you commit treason you dont have the right to a trail. You dont need to be convicted. You have no rights as soon as you commit treason. Which means they can wire tap you, lock you in a box and throw away a key, ect. You are no longer protected by the constitution.

Only if they prove that you committed treason. When someone commits such an act, an alarm doesn't suddenly go off somewhere. There is that whole "innocent until proven guilty" thing, but, like I said, fortunately President Bush doesn't observe laws.

runewoodThere were people acused of treason and they never got a trial. They said, you are a spy, get in jail

Not legally.

runewoodBush is doing the same.

Not legally.

runewood, you are so deplorably unintelligent on the topic of what is and what is not illegal that I'm afraid to say I don't want to be bothered by you any more.

NodbuggerThese are in no way unreasonable.

That's not why these wiretaps are against the Constitution.

NodbuggerAnd what you don't realize is that that rule can be waived for something called probable cause.

That doesn't apply to electronic surveillance. Duh.

NodbuggerThe constitution is meant to be vague and this is one of those situations. If I can't have my machine gun you can't have your warrants.

Great comparison.

NodbuggerThe Wars powers act was created to stop trading with the enemy and was passed 50 years before Vietnam.

<http://www.cs.indiana.edu/statecraft/warpow.html>

Nodbugger

According to the constitution ONLY Congress has the power to declare war. Now the president got around this by not declaring war. This is what they did. The president never supposed to be able to wage war, before war was only fought with a formal declaration. It was just the thing to do. They made the Wars Powers resolution to make this even more so, even though no president has ever been denied, it was a nice try.

Not really.

Nodbugger

And as I said, American citizens can be wiretapped when it involved foreign citizens. To say that they can't wire tap Bob smiths house in Connecticut , but we can wire tap Mohamed's phone in Bahrain , even though they constantly call each other is stupid.

Except that Bob has constitutionally-protected rights, and to say you can violate them because you really want to is just stupid.

NodbuggerIf Bob smith has relations with Mohamed the terrorist, chances are Bob is talking to other terrorists. It is called common sense.

Law works on facts, not common sense.

Nodbugger

Now this will probably get amended, they did receive information on American citizens, but they could always say they didn't know.

Which I suppose you would consider good?

EDIT: Errors with quotation system
