
Subject: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Cybie1111](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 00:56:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/16/patriot.act/index.htm> l

Its about time. Our privacy has been saved!

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 01:26:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Insert wanton liberal hate

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 01:39:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

When the next towers burn, you can thank the Senate.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 02:07:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Heh. Terrorists are the least of your worries.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [bandie63](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 03:06:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

YSLMuffins wrote on Fri, 16 December 2005 22:07Heh. Terrorists are the least of your worries.

<xp99> We all know that it is a sin for an Islamic male to see any woman other than his wife naked, and that he must commit suicide if he does.

<xp99> So next Sunday at 4:00 PM Eastern time, all American women are asked to walk out of their house completely naked to help weed out any neighborhood terrorists.

<xp99> Circling your block for one hour is recommended for this antiterrorist effort. All men are to position themselves in lawn chairs in front of their house to prove they are not terrorists, and to demonstrate that they think it's okay to see nude women other than their wife and to show support for all American women.

<xp99> And since the Koran also does not approve of alcohol, a cold six-pack at your side is

further proof of your antiterrorist sentiment.

<xp99> The American Government appreciates your efforts to root out terrorists and applauds your participation in this anti terrorist activity.

<xp99> God bless America and GOD BLESS AMERICAN WOMEN! IT IS YOUR PATRIOTIC DUTY TO PASS THIS ON

/bash.org

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Cybie1111](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 04:05:00 GMT

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

At first i think the act was necessary. But we all know that news broadcasters dont give ya enough so I had to read some of the specifics. After that ive been against this act 100%. Yet this act does the job but it violates our right to privacy and our civil rights (and many other rights if you people can read laws/bills) and i know for sure that you guys dont like to be spied on.

Quote by: YSLMuffins
Heh. Terrorists are the least of your worries.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 05:55:06 GMT

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

Thats what they thought on 9/10/01....

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 11:25:21 GMT

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

"Any society that would give up a little liberty to gain a little security will deserve neither and lose both."

-Benjamin Franklin

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 13:56:41 GMT

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

Does anyone have a link to the reformed bill? I can't seem to find one.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 16:21:15 GMT

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

Bush said that after 9/11, when there are no more attacks, we will slip back into the idea that we are invincible. This is the first step.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 20:11:17 GMT

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

I'm glad it failed. Though, I don't have anything to hide. I mean, I don't want the government to know what I do, but if it means I have more security, I don't know, maybe it's worth it. Do I think that the Patriot Act is exactly what we need? No, but I think something similar could be beneficial. I think the Patriot Act came about a little too hastily.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 17 Dec 2005 21:33:00 GMT

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

heh, I'm sure there are many happy young adults that are glad that the Military is no longer allowed (by statute) to harrass them with "Join the Military" phone calls.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 02:42:07 GMT

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

All I had to do was tell them no....

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 03:45:45 GMT

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

heh, only reason I bring it up was that it was on the news a while ago that a number of people were being phoned numerous times after saying no the first time, to the point of harassment.

It could be an isolated incident I guess...

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 04:01:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don't worry, President Bush is illegally authorizing spying anyways.

<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2005/12/17/113212/10>

EDIT: Oh, and gbull, why'd you say no if you're in support of the War in Iraq? (You still are, right?)

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 04:09:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Military wasn't the career path I chose. If I was drafted I would go, if that's what you mean. I wouldn't flee to Canada. You're in favor of evolution, are you going to become an ecologist?

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 04:38:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 06:08:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's a shame we can use phone and wire taps on suspected drug lords but not suspected terrorists, now.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 06:26:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lol, you can say that again

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 06:32:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's called a warrant.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 07:23:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Uh-huh, and they were necessary for wiretaps and the like even under the Patriot Act.

Your point?

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 14:00:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Careful SFE, your maturity is showing.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 14:49:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well put it this way, under the Pat Act I felt safe getting on a train or a bus. Now i don't know, the guy yelling "I have a bomb" might be a terrorist and not a mentally challenged person.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 19 Dec 2005 22:53:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If the Patriot Act made you feel safe using public transportation, then I'm sorry to say you've been riding on a false sense of security. You might try actually reading the Act itself, to see what it really did...

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Mon, 19 Dec 2005 23:47:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

False sense is still better then mass fear.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Mon, 19 Dec 2005 23:58:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hydra wrote on Sun, 18 December 2005 02:23Uh-huh, and they were necessary for wiretaps and the like even under the Patriot Act.

Your point?

So why would the Senate's unwillingness to renew the Patriot Act affect spying on terrorists, then? A major part of the act was to allow roving wiretaps without a warrant.

Hydra wrote on Sun, 18 December 2005 00:08It's a shame we can use phone and wire taps on suspected drug lords but not suspected terrorists, now.

The laws passed during the "war on drugs" were, I think, much scarier than the Patriot Act.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Tue, 20 Dec 2005 00:41:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hay, maybe they will get rid of those and pass the "Hug drug lords and terrorists act".

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 20 Dec 2005 21:58:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:False sense is still better then mass fear.

Sadly, that is exactly the attitude which is going to allow the next terrorist attack. So the government enacted some new legislation- well, most folks haven't the foggiest idea about what it does, but it sounds like something that'll make them safer. Knowing that the government is ever-vigilant, we can all sleep soundly at night, right? Wrong! Complacency kills- quite a few people seem to have forgotten that confidence that terrorists were not a threat was precisely the reason why the 9/11 attacks were such a huge, tragic surprise.

Mass fear is bad, too, but either extreme ought to be avoided. Both are dangerous. Mass panic leads to mob rule, where innocent people are victimized for being percieved as similar to the source of a threat (this happened a number of times immediately post-9/11). Complacency, on the other hand, leads us to place too much faith in those who need to be under constant scrutiny (the government, that is).

Moderation is a skill which the majority of the human race just doesn't seem to have mastered... people are far more comfortable when they can claim to be right (to the exclusion of all possibility of doubt), no matter what. That is, to paraphrase a certain man whose name is familiar to most of the world: we can't (or won't) see past our own noses, yet are ever-ready to laugh at the blindness of others. Extremism isn't limited to fanatics wearing dynamite belts.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Tue, 20 Dec 2005 23:30:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It doesn't matter if the people are Complacent, as long as the gov has what it needs they can fight it. When they don't have what they need then we get screwed. We forget that we need these sacrifices in order to be safe. People wont know that again till there is another attack. When those people die I will have no pity because WE did it to them.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 21 Dec 2005 03:19:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:It doesn't matter if the people are Complacent, as long as the gov has what it needs they can fight it. When they don't have what they need then we get screwed. We forget that we need these sacrifices in order to be safe. People wont know that again till there is another attack. When those people die I will have no pity because WE did it to them.

See, here's the problem... the more power you give to the bureaucracy, the more power they'll claim they need. It just isn't as easy as saying "here, you can do whatever you need to" because they'll take it one step further and do whatever they want to. In government, that's a very, very bad thing. Basically, if you give the government the power to spy on any citizen they want to, the dominant party will be likely to use that newfound power to spy on political opponents.

Don't think that's likely? I turn your attention to Watergate. No matter how good and decent you may think your government is, most of the people who run it (and this goes for ALL branches and levels) are in those positions because they wanted the power and/or publicity. There are higher paying jobs out there; they intend to further an agenda. Now, they might do so keeping in mind what they think is in the best interests of the country, but the concerns of Joe Average American hardly figure in the daily goings-on of the government.

Which is precisely why the government needs to be watched, and watched carefully. Our founding fathers worded the Constitution the way they did specifically to put as much power in the hands of the PEOPLE as they possibly could. No matter how frequently governemnt officials are rotated out and replaced, there is always a danger that a large governing body could overstep its authority. A good many people believe that this has already happened, and that we (the people) have just looked past it as if nothing was wrong. Any breach of the public trust should not be tolerated.

I'm wondering...are you of voting age? Do you read into what your government does (that is, are you aware of the kind of legislation that gets passed/rejected, significant court rulings, executive actions, etc)? Often, a perfectly acceptable piece of legislation is used to pass a seperate, completely unrelated item as a footnote (in the hopes that nobody will read the whole thing). That little provision often pertains to expanded government powers, funneling additional funding to X, Y, or Z official's pet project (that would be pork-barrel spending), another piece of legislation which was previously rejected, etc. That happens all the time- with almost every bill. And it happens right under the noses of everybody; it is stuff which any citizen could look up and examine. The real question is this: if the government already gets away with so much in plain view of the public, then

what's going on behind the scenes that we don't know about?

Never, ever, ever take anything for granted. This country was founded on the basis of lack of trust in authority. It would be a mistake to forget that...whether you agree or disagree with what the government does, you really should keep an eye on what, exactly, it is doing.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 21 Dec 2005 03:48:24 GMT

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

Tell me what freedoms the patriot act took from you dumbasses. Do you even know what it covers?

"OMFGQWTFJBBQ DEY DUN TOOKDED HOUR FREEDUMS
WTFWTFWTFWTFWTFWTFWTF I H8 BUSH CUZ HE IS LIEK SUCK AND STUFF GRRR
DUMN TEXAS!!!11111142222 NOW CUZ OF PATREEOHT ACT THE FBI DUN INSTALLD
CAMRAS IN MY HOUSE! WERE ARE MY FIRST AM..M... WRITES!?"

Also upon re-reading YSL knows what it was about. Wiretaps.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 21 Dec 2005 04:05:19 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sat, 17 December 2005 23:01 Don't worry, President Bush is illegally authorizing spying anyways.

<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2005/12/17/113212/10>

EDIT: Oh, and gbull, why'd you say no if you're in support of the War in Iraq? (You still are, right?)

You need to learn what the president can and can't do first.

The ability of the 1978 FISC act to limit the ability of the executive branch depends on how the 1972 United States v. United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan et al, (407 U.S. 297) is interpreted by the courts. The court stated

<http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&am p;vol=407&invol=297>

Quote:We begin the inquiry by noting that the President of the United States has the fundamental duty, under Art. II, 1, of the Constitution, to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." Implicit in that duty is the power to protect our Government against those who would subvert or overthrow it by unlawful means. In the discharge of this duty, the President - through the Attorney General - may find it necessary to employ electronic surveillance to obtain

intelligence information on the plans of those who plot unlawful acts against the Government.

Quote:Further, the instant case requires no judgment on the scope of the President's surveillance power with respect to the activities of foreign powers, within or without this country.

Based on this ruling, the President may have the authority to use warrantless wiretaps on Foreign National even if it involves US citizens, regardless of the FISC act. Additionally the FISC may be unconstitutional, because it may be an attempt by congress to impose restrictions on the executive Branch of the government outside of the constitutional amendment process.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Cybie1111](#) on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 03:59:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Heh. I guess the senate wants the act back. (luckly temporary)

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-patriot22dec22,0,314184.story?coll=la-home-headlines>

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 04:19:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 20 December 2005 21:19Quote:It doesn't matter if the people are Complacent, as long as the gov has what it needs they can fight it. When they don't have what they need then we get screwed. We forget that we need these sacrifices in order to be safe. People wont know that again till there is another attack. When those people die I will have no pity because WE did it to them.

See, here's the problem... the more power you give to the bureaucracy, the more power they'll claim they need. It just isn't as easy as saying "here, you can do whatever you need to" because they'll take it one step further and do whatever they want to. In government, that's a very, very bad thing. Basically, if you give the government the power to spy on any citizen they want to, the dominant party will be likely to use that newfound power to spy on political opponents.

Don't think that's likely? I turn your attention to Watergate. No matter how good and decent you may think your government is, most of the people who run it (and this goes for ALL branches and levels) are in those positions because they wanted the power and/or publicity. There are higher paying jobs out there; they intend to further an agenda. Now, they might do so keeping in mind what they think is in the best interests of the country, but the concerns of Joe Average American hardly figure in the daily goings-on of the government.

Which is precisely why the government needs to be watched, and watched carefully. Our founding fathers worded the Constitution the way they did specifically to put as much power in the hands of the PEOPLE as they possibly could. No matter how frequently governemnt officials are rotated out and replaced, there is always a danger that a large governing body could overstep its authority. A good many people believe that this has already happened, and that we (the people) have just looked past it as if nothing was wrong. Any breach of the public trust should not be tolerated.

I'm wondering...are you of voting age? Do you read into what your government does (that is, are you aware of the kind of legislation that gets passed/rejected, significant court rulings, executive actions, etc)? Often, a perfectly acceptable piece of legislation is used to pass a seperate, completely unrelated item as a footnote (in the hopes that nobody will read the whole thing). That little provision often pertains to expanded government powers, funneling additional funding to X, Y, or Z official's pet project (that would be pork-barrel spending), another piece of legislation which was previously rejected, etc. That happens all the time- with almost every bill. And it happens right under the noses of everybody; it is stuff which any citizen could look up and examine. The real question is this: if the government already gets away with so much in plain view of the public, then what's going on behind the scenes that we don't know about?

Never, ever, ever take anything for granted. This country was founded on the basis of lack of trust in authority. It would be a mistake to forget that...whether you agree or disagree with what the government does, you really should keep an eye on what, exactly, it is doing.

No I can't vote but im counting off the days. When I turn 18 thats all I care about. Im going to major in polotical science.

Yes, they do tack shit onto bills. The defense bill has Kitrena relief, defnese spending and ANWAR drilling on it.

Id rather the gov know what books i read then get on a bus and be blow to bits because that terrorist was protected from the CIA.

If the gov goes too far we have the locol millitias. Thats why we have the 2nd ammendment. The people DO have the power. The power to abolish the government. The power to petition the government for grivences. So don't feed out crap about a powerless, helpless american people.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [DreamWraith](#) on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 11:10:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

runewood wrote on Thu, 22 December 2005 22:19Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 20 December 2005 21:19Quote:It doesn't matter if the people are Complacent, as long as the gov has what it needs they can fight it. When they don't have what they need then we get screwed. We forget that we need these sacrifices in order to be safe. People wont know that again till there is another attack. When those people die I will have no pity because WE did it to them.

See, here's the problem... the more power you give to the bureaucracy, the more power they'll

claim they need. It just isn't as easy as saying "here, you can do whatever you need to" because they'll take it one step further and do whatever they want to. In government, that's a very, very bad thing. Basically, if you give the government the power to spy on any citizen they want to, the dominant party will be likely to use that newfound power to spy on political opponents.

Don't think that's likely? I turn your attention to Watergate. No matter how good and decent you may think your government is, most of the people who run it (and this goes for ALL branches and levels) are in those positions because they wanted the power and/or publicity. There are higher paying jobs out there; they intend to further an agenda. Now, they might do so keeping in mind what they think is in the best interests of the country, but the concerns of Joe Average American hardly figure in the daily goings-on of the government.

Which is precisely why the government needs to be watched, and watched carefully. Our founding fathers worded the Constitution the way they did specifically to put as much power in the hands of the PEOPLE as they possibly could. No matter how frequently government officials are rotated out and replaced, there is always a danger that a large governing body could overstep its authority. A good many people believe that this has already happened, and that we (the people) have just looked past it as if nothing was wrong. Any breach of the public trust should not be tolerated.

I'm wondering...are you of voting age? Do you read into what your government does (that is, are you aware of the kind of legislation that gets passed/rejected, significant court rulings, executive actions, etc)? Often, a perfectly acceptable piece of legislation is used to pass a separate, completely unrelated item as a footnote (in the hopes that nobody will read the whole thing). That little provision often pertains to expanded government powers, funneling additional funding to X, Y, or Z official's pet project (that would be pork-barrel spending), another piece of legislation which was previously rejected, etc. That happens all the time- with almost every bill. And it happens right under the noses of everybody; it is stuff which any citizen could look up and examine. The real question is this: if the government already gets away with so much in plain view of the public, then what's going on behind the scenes that we don't know about?

Never, ever, ever take anything for granted. This country was founded on the basis of lack of trust in authority. It would be a mistake to forget that...whether you agree or disagree with what the government does, you really should keep an eye on what, exactly, it is doing.

No I can't vote but im counting off the days. When I turn 18 thats all I care about. Im going to major in polotical science.

Yes, they do tack shit onto bills. The defense bill has Kitrena relief, defnese spending and ANWAR drilling on it.

Id rather the gov know what books i read then get on a bus and be blow to bits because that terrorist was protected from the CIA.

If the gov goes too far we have the locol millitias. Thats why we have the 2nd ammdement. The people DO have the power. The power to abolish the government. The power to petition the government for grivences. So don't feed out crap about a powerless, helpless american people.

i used to think like you. then i grew up.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 16:51:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good for you. Just because you are older doesnt mean my opnions are crap. I will still mostly think this way when I get older.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 17:09:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Can I borrow your time machine?

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 19:03:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No, its mine, get your own.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [DreamWraith](#) on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 22:57:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

runewood wrote on Fri, 23 December 2005 11:51 I will still mostly think this way when I get older.

famous last words.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 00:54:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You gotta love the ad hominem flying about the place.

Just remember that BOTH parties spew a bunch of bullshit our way, and BOTH parties use our tax dollars (well, those of us who aren't moochers anyway) to bribe people for their own interests. The Democrats give it out in social programs to keep the lower class voting for them, and the

Republicans give it to their buddies in big business.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 01:31:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I could just see these provisions being renewed constantly until eternity.

And I could have sworn the Democrats grew a backbone, just for a little while.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 02:28:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You shouldn't play politics with life and death.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [DreamWraith](#) on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 03:46:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Fri, 23 December 2005 19:54 You gotta love the ad hominem flying about the place.

Just remember that BOTH parties spew a bunch of bullshit our way, and BOTH parties use our tax dollars (well, those of us who aren't moochers anyway) to bribe people for their own interests. The Democrats give it out in social programs to keep the lower class voting for them, and the Republicans give it to their buddies in big business.

I've been saying this for years. They are all evil. The very nature of politics has become, not what can I do for my country, but rather, how can I manipulate my country for my own gain and/or interests.

The only sane politicians are the ones who don't serve in the government.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Chronojam](#) on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 08:23:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DreamWraith is referring to mod leaders?

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [DreamWraith](#) on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 08:28:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chronojam wrote on Sat, 24 December 2005 03:23 DreamWraith is referring to mod leaders?
har har funny

no i was referring to politicians.

but your comment is humorous given recent events...

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 09:33:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It isn't all about what an average citizen has to hide. It's about what the governments have to hide. Every single form of government on this planet has corruption. There are people who would wiretap the average Joe Citizen and then ABUSE the knowledge in God knows what ways. Sell it ahead or perhaps use it against the citizen for whatever reasons, maybe in courts. Sell it to terrorists so they know your religious beliefs, maybe, since the t-word is so feared nowadays...use your imagination, what can be done with valuable information that can be converted to money?

The patriot act would work very well if some divine force came and vaporized every EVIL(Asshat) person in the lead of a country.

Yes, I'm talking globally, similiar laws are processed in many other countries too, and the problem persists.

One view.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 23:05:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IF your worried about abuse then get stuff to over see the people who work in this crap. That fact is, the PATRIOT Act did something where no one else acted. The wrong action is better then no action. Gunning down a mugger is better then doing nothing.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 25 Dec 2005 01:55:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:The wrong action is better then no action.

Thank you. I needed a good laugh today.

No offense, but you really don't pay much attention to politics, do you?

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Mon, 26 Dec 2005 03:25:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, I do. Look at UK, Spain and soon to be France. They have weak terror laws.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Wed, 28 Dec 2005 06:00:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OH NO! THE TERRORISTS! AIEE!

Look, for all you people that hugged this act, I've got a message for you:

TERRORISTS ARE IN YOUR BACKYARD, PLANT LANDMINDS THERE BEFORE THEY GET INTO YOUR GODDAMN BACKDOOR.

For anyone who are sane (opposed it, or disagreed with parts of it) let's all go for a cup of tea.

How about instead of supporting this tragically faulty bill, you go and support making a NEW bill that works for the CITIZENS and for getting rid of TERRORISTS.

With everyone running around going "omg terrorists on the bus omgomgomg the US is the new middle east save us plz goverment plz take my privacy omgomgomg i dunt care about ma layfe i want teh terrorists gone!" then, uhh...

You need a deep breath, a glass of water, and a 2*4 over the head.

For all of us who know that terrorists aren't big huge boogy men that live around every single corner, let's just uphold the fact that the goverment should pass laws that help THE PEOPLE while GETTING THE JOB DONE.

Saying "BIBI PRIVACY PWNT!" isn't GETTING THE JOB DONE because it's not HELPING THE PEOPLE. Innocent people can be suddenly investigated out of nowhere! YAY!

Anyways kids, remember to check your closet for Osama.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [DreamWraith](#) on Wed, 28 Dec 2005 23:08:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

whats a landmind?

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 29 Dec 2005 00:11:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

glyde51 wrote on Wed, 28 December 2005 01:00OH NO! THE TERRORISTS! AIEE!

Look, for all you people that hugged this act, I've got a message for you:

TERRORISTS ARE IN YOUR BACKYARD, PLANT LANDMINDS THERE BEFORE THEY GET INTO YOUR GODDAMN BACKDOOR.

For anyone who are sane (opposed it, or disagreed with parts of it) let's all go for a cup of tea.

How about instead of supporting this tragically faulty bill, you go and support making a NEW bill that works for the CITIZENS and for getting rid of TERRORISTS.

With everyone running around going "omg terrorists on the bus omgomgomg the US is the new middle east save us plz goverment plz take my privacy omgomgomg i dunt care about ma layfe i want teh terrorists gone!" then, uhh...

You need a deep breath, a glass of water, and a 2*4 over the head.

For all of us who know that terrorists aren't big huge boogy men that live around every single corner, let's just uphold the fact that the government should pass laws that help THE PEOPLE while GETTING THE JOB DONE.

Saying "BIBI PRIVACY PWNT!" isn't GETTING THE JOB DONE because it's not HELPING THE PEOPLE. Innocent people can be suddenly investigated out of nowhere! YAY!

Anyways kids, remember to check your closet for Osama.
Stay out of American politics. Thanks.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Thu, 29 Dec 2005 03:22:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So your law would be something like this.

"We, the people of the us, the ones who give a damn and have my view point, do establish this paper as law. We think that the mean people with bombs, guns and other things should plz stop. If

they don't then action will be taken. First we will ask them to stop. Then leave a message on their machine. Then call their parents. Then finally, if we must, we will revoke their drivers licenses. We are sorry we would even think of going that far but desperate times call for desperate measures. Thank you for your time."

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 29 Dec 2005 17:57:07 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Wed, 28 December 2005 19:11glyde51 wrote on Wed, 28 December 2005 01:00OH NO! THE TERRORISTS! AIEE!

Look, for all you people that hugged this act, I've got a message for you:

TERRORISTS ARE IN YOUR BACKYARD, PLANT LANDMINDS THERE BEFORE THEY GET INTO YOUR GODDAMN BACKDOOR.

For anyone who are sane (opposed it, or disagreed with parts of it) let's all go for a cup of tea.

How about instead of supporting this tragically faulty bill, you go and support making a NEW bill that works for the CITIZENS and for getting rid of TERRORISTS.

With everyone running around going "omg terrorists on the bus omgomgomg the US is the new middle east save us plz goverment plz take my privacy omgomgomg i dunt care about ma layfe i want teh terrorists gone!" then, uhh...

You need a deep breath, a glass of water, and a 2*4 over the head.

For all of us who know that terrorists aren't big huge boogy men that live around every single corner, let's just uphold the fact that the goverment should pass laws that help THE PEOPLE while GETTING THE JOB DONE.

Saying "BIBI PRIVACY PWNT!" isn't GETTING THE JOB DONE because it's not HELPING THE PEOPLE. Innocent people can be suddenly investigated out of nowhere! YAY!

Anyways kids, remember to check your closet for Osama.
Stay out of American politics. Thanks.

Noes, your country controls too much of the current world for me to stay out of your pants. Uhh... politics. Pants too, if you'd rather me stay out of there...

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 29 Dec 2005 18:03:24 GMT

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

I think that if the President takes away enough of our freedoms, then the terrorists will stop hating us for them. It's probably his secret plan.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 29 Dec 2005 18:43:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Thu, 29 December 2005 13:03I think that if the President takes away enough of our freedoms, then the terrorists will stop hating us for them. It's probably his secret plan.

What freedoms have been taken away?

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 30 Dec 2005 05:19:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Thu, 29 December 2005 12:03I think that if the President takes away enough of our freedoms, then the terrorists will stop hating us for them. It's probably his secret plan.

He hasn't taken away any freedoms yet.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Dec 2005 16:14:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, for one, there is the freedom to the right of privacy that the President has taken away with secret, illegal warrantless wiretap authorizations.

<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2005/12/17/113212/10>

In true Nodbugger fashion, the argument he obviously copied and pasted from some other website in response to this actually proves him wrong.

<http://www.democrats.com/node/7192>

That's how you copy from a website, Nodbugger, not by pretending it's your own thought.

One last thing: Who knows how many terrorists have been successfully prosecuted and brought to justice by President Bush?

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 31 Dec 2005 16:20:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sat, 31 December 2005 10:14: One last thing: Who knows how many terrorists have been successfully prosecuted and brought to justice by President Bush? Who cares?

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 31 Dec 2005 17:41:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

runewood wrote on Sat, 24 December 2005 18:05: The wrong action is better than no action. Gunning down a mugger is better than doing nothing.

Is it?

Then maybe it was better for Al Qaeda to launch that attack against America. Perhaps, according to your logic, it was better to kill people than not do anything. After all, context is everything here. What is right and wrong to you is relative to the people you're trying to kill. That's why they call themselves freedom fighters when you call them terrorists.

I suggest you revamp this atrocious illogic before you actually go and apply it to actual situations.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 31 Dec 2005 19:51:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sat, 31 December 2005 11:14: Well, for one, there is the freedom to the right of privacy that the President has taken away with secret, illegal warrantless wiretap authorizations.

<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2005/12/17/113212/10>

In true Nodbugger fashion, the argument he obviously copied and pasted from some other website in response to this actually proves him wrong.

<http://www.democrats.com/node/7192>

That's how you copy from a website, Nodbugger, not by pretending it's your own thought.

One last thing: Who knows how many terrorists have been successfully prosecuted and brought to justice by President Bush?

They aren't illegal, I had already proven that.

And no, it isn't wrong. That idiot on that website isn't reading the right parts.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 31 Dec 2005 19:54:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.rasmussenreports.com/2005/NSA.htm>

Quote:December 28, 2005--Sixty-four percent (64%) of Americans believe the National Security Agency (NSA) should be allowed to intercept telephone conversations between terrorism suspects in other countries and people living in the United States. A Rasmussen Reports survey found that just 23% disagree.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Dec 2005 22:59:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Sat, 31 December 2005 11:20SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sat, 31 December 2005 10:14One last thing: Who knows how many terrorists have been succesfully prosecuted and brought to justice by President Bush?
Who cares?

Think reaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaal hard about this one, and the answer might come to you.

NodbuggerThey aren't illegal, I had already proven that.

What you proved is that you don't know very much about how the government works.

NodbuggerAdditionally the FISC may be unconstitutional, because it may be a attempt by congress to impose restrictions on the executive Branch of the governement outside of the constitutional admendment process.

This just makes no sense. Congress can impose restrictions on the Executive without amending the Constitution. Ever heard of the War Powers Act?

NodbuggerBased on this ruling, the President may have the authority to use warentless wiretaps on Foreign National even if it involves US citizens, regardless of the FISC act.

This, of course, is not what the ruling says at all. And isn't the issue at hand either, oddly enough.

President Bush is illegally authorizing the NSA to spy on American citizens inside America without warrants. Skipping warrants, the NSA isn't even supposed to spy inside the U.S.

Nodbugger

<http://www.rasmussenreports.com/2005/NSA.htm>

Quote:December 28, 2005--Sixty-four percent (64%) of Americans believe the National Security Agency (NSA) should be allowed to intercept telephone conversations between terrorism suspects in other countries and people living in the United States. A Rasmussen Reports survey found that just 23% disagree.

Oddly enough, that's not even the situation at hand. Nice try at using a meaningless statistic to bolster your argument, though.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Jan 2006 00:09:16 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sat, 31 December 2005 17:59j_ball430 wrote on Sat, 31 December 2005 11:20SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sat, 31 December 2005 10:14One last thing: Who knows how many terrorists have been succesfully prosecuted and brought to justice by President Bush? Who cares?

Think reaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaal hard about this one, and the answer might come to you.

NodbuggerThey aren't illegal, I had already proven that.

What you proved is that you don't know very much about how the government works.

NodbuggerAdditionally the FISC may be unconstitutional, because it may be a attempt by congress to impose restrictions on the executive Branch of the governement outside of the constitutional admendment process.

This just makes no sense. Congress can impose restrictions on the Executive without amending the Constitution. Ever heard of the War Powers Act?

NodbuggerBased on this ruling, the President may have the authority to use warentless wiretaps on Foreign National even if it involves US citizens, regardless of the FISC act.

This, of course, is not what the ruling says at all. And isn't the issue at hand either, oddly enough.

President Bush is illegally authorizing the NSA to spy on American citizens inside America without warrants. Skipping warrants, the NSA isn't even supposed to spy inside the U.S.

Nodbugger

<http://www.rasmussenreports.com/2005/NSA.htm>

Quote:December 28, 2005--Sixty-four percent (64%) of Americans believe the National Security Agency (NSA) should be allowed to intercept telephone conversations between terrorism suspects in other countries and people living in the United States. A Rasmussen Reports survey found that just 23% disagree.

Oddly enough, that's not even the situation at hand. Nice try at using a meaningless statistic to bolster your argument, though.

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.

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

And 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 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.

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.

Like I said, the attorney General can authorize a warrant less wiretap.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 01 Jan 2006 00:23:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sat, 31 December 2005 16:59 Think reaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaal hard about this one, and the answer might come to you.
Oh reaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaally?

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Sun, 01 Jan 2006 00:45:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ok 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.

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.

Nodbugger This 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 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.

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.)

Nodbugger And 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.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Jan 2006 18:53:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You realized you didn't prove anything?

The constitution says against unreasonable search and seizures.

These are in no way unreasonable.

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

If a cop has reason to suspect you are hiding something in your car, he can search it. If a cop hears gun shots from your house, he can run in. Warrants are bypassed all the time. Every time you ever told someone any personal information they couldn't find on public record you bypassed a warrant.

The 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.

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

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.

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.

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

And according to FISA

Quote:The President may authorize, through the Attorney General, the surveillance without a court order for the period of one year provided it is only for foreign intelligence information and there is no substantial likelihood that the surveillance will acquire the contents of any communication to which a United States person is a party

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

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Sun, 01 Jan 2006 20:45:50 GMT

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

[quote title=SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sun, 01 January 2006 11:06]Nodbugger 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.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [DreamWraith](#) on Sun, 01 Jan 2006 21:19:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Right... maybe in the past. Last I checked this wasn't 16th century England.

Remember that FBI prick who sold documents to russia? Yea, he got a TRIAL and SET jail time.

But, according to you, that never happened right?

Wrong. This is literally the only country in the world where the citizens can commit outright treason and betray their country, and still be granted rights and priveledges.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2006 04:45:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not during the civil war u moron. There were people acused of treason and they never got a trial. They said, you are a spy, get in jail. When they asked for a trial they got none. Bush is doing the same.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [DreamWraith](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2006 11:01:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

if you say so, oh wise and great historian.

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

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2006 17:20:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You don't get it. If you commit treason you don't get a trial. Im not saying its right but IT IS legal. You don't have to be proven guilty. Plus these people get military tribunals. Look, put it this way.

I am a terrorist. I am also am an American citizen. If I fund Bob's terrorist attack, I have committed treason, am no longer a US citizen protected by the constitution and am an enemy soldier on US soil. When they want to search my stuff they can. At the moment they think im a terrorist, I have no rights.

Now you may be saying, they don't know your a terrorist till they tap you, thats bs and you know it. The government is smart enough to search people who have connections to terrorism. They don't search the little old lady but they do search the 23 year old Syrian Radical Cleric who teaches "kill America."

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2006 17:24:06 GMT

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

Actually, if you want to play the legal game: You cannot commit the legal definition of "treason" without it being established as such by a court. You can be CHARGED with treason, but it must be proven.

Military law, in context, is a bit different however.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2006 19:58:30 GMT

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

Quote:

That doesn't apply to electronic surveillance. Duh.

Yes they can. I showed you the damn law.

Quote:

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

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_Powers_Act

Fuck you.

Quote:Not really.

Yes really.

Quote:To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

No such power exists for the president.

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

Bob has no right to be a terrorist and the search is not unreasonable.

Quote:Law works on facts, not common sense.

What the hell does this mean? Common sense and facts are one in the same you idiot.

Quote:

Which I suppose you would consider good

Of course, just because someone is an American doesn't disqualify them from being a terrorist.

Now go away you fucking idiot, the laws says it can be done, fuck off.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2006 21:07:04 GMT

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

notices that very nearly everybody is gone except for the rabid, raving extremists, laughs, and walks away

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [runewood](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2006 22:08:13 GMT

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

Javafx wrote on Mon, 02 January 2006 11:24Actually, if you want to play the legal game: You cannot commit the legal definition of "treason" without it being established as such by a court. You can be CHARGED with treason, but it must be proven.

Military law, in context, is a bit different however.

Thats the damn point, YOU DONT NEED TO BE CONVICTED! Its like there has been an invasion of enemy troops, when you capture them you dont give them a trial.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [DreamWraith](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2006 22:52:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

runewood wrote on Mon, 02 January 2006 12:20
...I am a terrorist. I am also an American citizen...
I will be sure to let ol' Georgie know.

Subject: Re: Patriot Act Renewal rejected by the Senate
Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 04:42:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

runewood wrote on Mon, 02 January 2006 17:08Javafx wrote on Mon, 02 January 2006
11:24Actually, if you want to play the legal game: You cannot commit the legal definition of
"treason" without it being established as such by a court. You can be CHARGED with treason,
but it must be proven.

Military law, in context, is a bit different however.

Thats the damn point, YOU DONT NEED TO BE CONVICTED! Its like there has been an invasion
of enemy troops, when you capture them you dont give them a trial.

Let's not have trials for anything, because everyone accused of a crime must be guilty! Yeah, let's
go back to ninth century human rights!

Under our own law, there is a huge difference between being charged with a crime and having
been found guilty. Until you are found guilty, your rights are protected by the Constitution. The
government cannot (legally) abridge the rights of a citizen that has not been found guilty in a court
of law. This includes nasty crimes like treason.

Honestly, it scares me that there are people who think like you. The government is not infallible.
Our founding fathers realized this and tried to create a governmental system that protects itself
against corrupt individuals who want to seize power. If you buy into this whole "culture of fear"
nonsense-- that it's somehow okay to take away our rights because a bunch of bad men want to
kill us, then you are only asking for your fundamental rights to be removed.
