
Bail-out blunder

Posted by dailyherald - 2007/12/14 00:05

What the heck are President Bush and Secretary Paulsen doing getting involved in bailing people out of bad mortgages anyway?! That's not the proper role of government! Freezing rates so folks can stay in the home they can't afford only delays the day of reckoning, and punishes the ones who loaned the money. Neither situation is right. Why can't the feds learn to leave well enough alone? Our country became great in spite of government intervention, not because of it.

• Captain James C. Green,

Cedar Hills

Read more...

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by american_patriot - 2007/12/14 06:45

dailyherald wrote:

What the heck are President Bush and Secretary Paulsen doing getting involved in bailing people out of bad mortgages anyway?! That's not the proper role of government! Freezing rates so folks can stay in the home they can't afford only delays the day of reckoning, and punishes the ones who loaned the money. Neither situation is right. Why can't the feds learn to leave well enough alone? Our country became great in spite of government intervention, not because of it.

Captain James C. Green,

Cedar Hills

Read more...

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unConstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by The Keeper - 2007/12/14 07:02

Because President Bush and Secretary Paulsen work for Wall Street, not you. The book War Is a Racket, 1932, by Major General Butler, USMC Ret., should be required reading by all military personnel.

Once Hillary "Stalin" Clinton gets elected (vote fraud), you'll be fighting under a new flag called the North American Union. Orin "scrap the Constitution" Hatch will probably be there to holding a match to our US Constitution to make it

official.

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2007/12/14 10:08

The Keeper wrote:

Because President Bush and Secretary Paulsen work for Wall Street, not you. The book War Is a Racket, 1932, by Major General Butler, USMC Ret., should be required reading by all military personnel.

Once Hillary "Stalin" Clinton gets elected (vote fraud), you'll be fighting under a new flag called the North American Union. Orin "scrap the Constitution" Hatch will probably be there to holding a match to our US Constitution to make it official.

Last November, I almost made some waves when I walked in to vote and asked for a paper ballot. I was standing in line and one of the female officials in charge of directing people where to go and all was talking to a man in front of me about the electronic voting machines and how they are fraud-proof and perfectly legitimate because when you are done voting, you can print out your selections to make sure the candidate(s) you voted for is what was recorded. I remarked to her that a Diebold computer programmer testified under oath that it was easy to go in and alter the code after voting so that any result you want will indeed spit out. I then asserted the need to go back to paper balloting, but could see that she was beginning to get irked, as were the people standing around me and so I backed down and voted on the Diebold machine. But at least I came away from it knowing that I had at least informed some people about the ease of vote fraud with these Diebold machines. With so much political deceit and corruption nowadays, how can anyone trust the outcome of an election, especially given the ease with which these electronic machines can be rigged to give any result you want???

Our government is nothing but a gang of crooks and criminals operating under a facade of checks and balances. These guys receive a King's ransom for creating legislation and passing laws that benefit the corporations or special interests that are providing them with kickbacks, while the average joe is nothing but an after-thought. How many people know that a few weeks ago, Bush signed legislation that effectively passes along the national debt to our children and grandchildren? What a guy! As for the bail out of Wall Street and the banks... these guys know our economy is a big fraud built on a mountain of debt, fiat currency and speculation and that the day of reckoning is fast approaching. All they're doing is trying to save their own fannies and interests by artificially stimulating the markets and preventing collapse so that we dumbed-down sheep keep spending to their delight, while they bail out the very banks who are responsible for so much plunder and legalized thievery with OUR tax dollars. Simply incredible.

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2007/12/14 10:26

Airwolf84 wrote:

The Keeper wrote:

Because President Bush and Secretary Paulsen work for Wall Street, not you. The book War Is a Racket, 1932, by Major General Butler, USMC Ret., should be required reading by all military personnel.

Once Hillary "Stalin" Clinton gets elected (vote fraud), you'll be fighting under a new flag called the North American Union. Orin "scrap the Constitution" Hatch will probably be there to holding a match to our US Constitution to make it official.

Last November, I almost made some waves when I walked in to vote and asked for a paper ballot. I was standing in line and one of the female officials in charge of directing people where to go and all was talking to a man in front of me about the electronic voting machines and how they are fraud-proof and perfectly legitimate because when you are done voting, you can print out your selections to make sure the candidate(s) you voted for is what was recorded. I remarked to her that a Diebold computer programmer testified under oath that it was easy to go in and alter the code after voting so that any result you want will indeed spit out. I then asserted the need to go back to paper balloting, but could see that she

was beginning to get irked, as were the people standing around me and so I backed down and voted on the Diebold machine. But at least I came away from it knowing that I had at least informed some people about the ease of vote fraud with these Diebold machines. With so much political deceit and corruption nowadays, how can anyone trust the outcome of an election, especially given the ease with which these electronic machines can be rigged to give any result you want???

Our government is nothing but a gang of crooks and criminals operating under a facade of checks and balances. These guys receive a King's ransom for creating legislation and passing laws that benefit the corporations or special interests that are providing them with kickbacks, while the average joe is nothing but an after-thought. How many people know that a few weeks ago, Bush signed legislation that effectively passes along the national debt to our children and grandchildren? What a guy! As for the bail out of Wall Street and the banks... these guys know our economy is a big fraud built on a mountain of debt, fiat currency and speculation and that the day of reckoning is fast approaching. All they're doing is trying to save their own fannies and interests by artificially stimulating the markets and preventing collapse so that we dumbed-down sheep keep spending to their delight, while they bail out the very banks who are responsible for so much plunder and legalized thievery with OUR tax dollars. Simply incredible.

Sadly, you are correct about the voting machines. They are extremely vulnerable to fraud:
<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2007/07/28/VOTING.TMP&tsp=1>

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by rolandkayser - 2007/12/14 10:53

dailyherald wrote:

What the heck are President Bush and Secretary Paulsen doing getting involved in bailing people out of bad mortgages anyway?! That's not the proper role of government! Freezing rates so folks can stay in the home they can't afford only delays the day of reckoning, and punishes the ones who loaned the money. Neither situation is right. Why can't the feds learn to leave well enough alone? Our country became great in spite of government intervention, not because of it.

Captain James C. Green,

Cedar Hills

Read more...

Don't worry, they'll bail out precious few homeowners. The plan mostly aids banks, hedge funds, and wealthy investors.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by Death_and_Taxes - 2007/12/14 11:04

american_patriot wrote:

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unconstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

Which unconstitutional powers are you referring to?

The presidential power to wage war? The powers voted to him by congress (Dems included) I bet you can't find one Power he uses that is unconstitutional.

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2007/12/14 15:47

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unconstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

Which unconstitutional powers are you referring to?

The presidential power to wage war? The powers voted to him by congress (Dems included) I bet you can't find one Power he uses that is unconstitutional.

Probably this one is a big one:

<http://www.epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.html>

Here is another:

<http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/17/bush.nsa/>

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by american_patriot - 2007/12/14 20:13

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unconstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

Which unconstitutional powers are you referring to?

The presidential power to wage war? The powers voted to him by congress (Dems included) I bet you can't find one Power he uses that is unconstitutional.

The President has no Constitutional authority to wage war. Congress has no Constitutional authority to give it to him, unless they passed an amendment to the Constitution.

Then there are the Unconstitutional executive orders, which in effect is creating law. Only congress is granted the power by the Constitution to create laws. Then there is his signing statements, that basically say, he is signing a bill into law, but he doesn't have to abide by it if he doesn't want to. There, I hope that satisfies you, I listed more than one.

Next time, go read the Constitution before you spout off your nonsense.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by Death_and_Taxes - 2007/12/15 12:46

unaffiliated_person wrote:

Probably this one is a big one:

<http://www.epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.html>

Here is another:

<http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/17/bush.nsa/>

Ahh, pure ignorance, where you have sited liberal bush hating media sources (discredited CNN) I will cut straight to the constitution and site the actual events and what has taken place in court.

Read section 2 and 3 of article 2 and section 8 of article 1 in the constitution.
then read this article from wikipedia-

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

About a week after the 9/11 attacks, Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Terrorists (AUMF) which authorized the President to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

Now tell me again what has the president done that is illegal. because none of your sources can prove or tell me anything that he has done that is against the law and powers authorized to him.

Also the only way that he can found to be out of order is if congress is able to pass a law saying so (good luck with that they can barely stand up to a stiff breeze) or if their is a court case that is brought successfully against him (as you can see from the article there haven't been any).

All your bush hating is only going to get you mad. I suggest you take a chill pill and realize that you have been played by the media and the entire left side of America.

Last of all I want to tell you what I read this morning. I came across an article that talked about the exoneration of Paul Wolfwitz of any wrong doing at the world bank. you should remember, that the campaign against him was a smear campaign spearheaded by your cronies in the media. I also came across an article that talked about how Ronnie Earle (democrat prosecutor from Texas) is retiring before the case against Tom delay will be brought to court. I think he is afraid of being Nifonged for that fact that he lacks any evidence to convict him and will later be sued for his actions of misconduct.

It seems that most of the accusations that you make against conservatives in power are based on hate and rage and prejudice against another man's beliefs. Isn't acceptance of differences one of the tenants of liberalism.

Your a Hypocrite!!!!!!!!!!

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by The Keeper - 2007/12/15 13:03

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

unaffiliated_person wrote:

Probably this one is a big one:

<http://www.epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.html>

Here is another:

<http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/17/bush.nsa/>

Ahh, pure ignorance, where you have sited liberal bush hating media sources (discredited CNN) I will cut straight to the constitution and site the actual events and what has taken place in court.

Read section 2 and 3 of article 2 and section 8 of article 1 in the constitution.
then read this article from wikipedia-

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

About a week after the 9/11 attacks, Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Terrorists (AUMF) which authorized the President to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

Now tell me again what has the president done that is illegal. because none of your sources can prove or tell me anything that he has done that is against the law and powers authorized to him.

Also the only way that he can found to be out of order is if congress is able to pass a law saying so (good luck with that they can barely stand up to a stiff breeze) or if their is a court case that is brought successfully against him (as you can see from the article there haven't been any).

All your bush hating is only going to get you mad. I suggest you take a chill pill and realize that you have been played by the media and the entire left side of America.

Last of all I want to tell you what I read this morning. I came across an article that talked about the exoneration of Paul Wolfowitz of any wrong doing at the world bank. you should remember, that the campaign against him was a smear campaign spearheaded by your cronies in the media. I also came across an article that talked about how Ronnie Earle (democrat prosecutor from Texas) is retiring before the case against Tom delay will be brought to court. I think he is afraid of being Nifonged for that fact that he lacks any evidence to convict him and will later be sued for his actions of misconduct.

It seems that most of the accusations that you make against conservatives in power are based on hate and rage and prejudice against another man's beliefs. Isn't acceptance of differences one of the tenants of liberalism.

Your a Hypocrite!!!!!!!!!!

It's really too bad CIA narco pilot Barry Seal was offed by Colombians claiming to be directed to kill by a US Lt Col. that sounded remarkably like Oliver North. Seal was about to testify in court about George H.W. Bush's involved in narco trafficking, his bagman, Noriega, and the Contras, when Seal was murdered

I was really looking forward to watching Seal's video of little Georgie and Jeb unloading an illegal cocaine shipment from a narco drug running aircraft.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by Death_and_Taxes - 2007/12/15 13:13

american_patriot wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unconstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

Which unconstitutional powers are you referring to?

The presidential power to wage war? The powers voted to him by congress (Dems included) I bet you can't find one Power he uses that is unconstitutional.

The President has no Constitutional authority to wage war. Congress has no Constitutional authority to give it to him, unless they passed an amendment to the Constitution. Then there are the Unconstitutional executive orders, which in effect is creating law. Only congress is granted the power

by the Constitution to create laws. Then there is his signing statements, that basically say, he is signing a bill into law, but he doesn't have to abide by it if he doesn't want to. There, I hope that satisfies you, I listed more than one. Next time, go read the Constitution before you spout off your nonsense.

I mean seriously everyone out there that reads your post and knows anything about the administration of the government and the constitution is laughing at you. read what you wrote, "Congress has no Constitutional authority to give it to him, unless they passed an amendment to the Constitution." How stupid are you. do you know an amendment is?

Here read section 2 and 3 of Article 2 and section 8 of Article 1 in the constitution. I will even quote them on here because you are probably too lazy to go to the source.

Article. II. - The Executive Branch
Section 2 - Civilian Power over Military, Cabinet, Pardon Power, Appointments

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States

Article. I. - The Legislative Branch
Section 8 - Powers of Congress,

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

and read this article-
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_Powers_Clause

Since World War II, Congress has formally authorized all the major military engagements that the US has undertaken. (Vietnam, Lebanon, Panama, Persian Gulf War, Afghanistan, and Iraq.)

And to the matter of Executive Orders, they are orders given by the president to carry out powers already granted to him under the constitution you dimwit.

You know what you lack so much knowledge about who things are carried out that you probably should go read about our government a little more before you post again.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by Death_and_Taxes - 2007/12/15 13:14

The Keeper wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

unaffiliated_person wrote:

Probably this one is a big one:
<http://www.epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.html>
Here is another:
<http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/17/bush.nsa/>

Ahh, pure ignorance, where you have sited liberal bush hating media sources (discredited CNN) I will cut straight to the constitution and site the actual events and what has taken place in court.

Read section 2 and 3 of article 2 and section 8 of article 1 in the constitution.
then read this article from wikipedia-

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

About a week after the 9/11 attacks, Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Terrorists (AUMF) which authorized the President to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the

United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

Now tell me again what has the president done that is illegal. because none of your sources can prove or tell me anything that he has done that is against the law and powers authorized to him.

Also the only way that he can found to be out of order is if congress is able to pass a law saying so (good luck with that they can barely stand up to a stiff breeze) or if their is a court case that is brought successfully against him (as you can see from the article there haven't been any).

All your bush hating is only going to get you mad. I suggest you take a chill pill and realize that you have been played by the media and the entire left side of America.

Last of all I want to tell you what I read this morning. I came across an article that talked about the exoneration of Paul Wolfwitz of any wrong doing at the world bank. you should remember, that the campaign against him was a smear campaign spearheaded by your cronies in the media. I also came across an article that talked about how Ronnie Earle (democrat prosecutor from Texas) is retiring before the case against Tom delay will be brought to court. I think he is afraid of being Nifonged for that fact that he lacks any evidence to convict him and will later be sued for his actions of misconduct.

It seems that most of the accusations that you make against conservatives in power are based on hate and rage and prejudice against another man's beliefs. Isn't acceptance of differences one of the tenants of liberalism.

Your a Hypocrite!!!!!!!!!!

It's really too bad CIA narco pilot Barry Seal was offed by Colombians claiming to be directed to kill by a US Lt Col. that sounded remarkably like Oliver North. Seal was about to testify in court about George H.W. Bush's involved in narco trafficking, his bagman, Noriega, and the Contras, when Seal was murdered

I was really looking forward to watching Seal's video of little Georgie and Jeb unloading an illegal cocaine shipment from a narco drug running aircraft.

wow

accusations and speculations

no evidence!!!!!!!!!!

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by american_patriot - 2007/12/15 14:48

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unconstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

Which unconstitutional powers are you referring to?

The presidential power to wage war? The powers voted to him by congress (Dems included) I bet you can't find one Power he uses that is unconstitutional.

The President has no Constitutional authority to wage war. Congress has no Constitutional authority to give it to him, unless they passed an amendment to the Constitution.
Then there are the Unconstitutional executive orders, which in effect is creating law. Only congress is granted the power by the Constitution to create laws. Then there is his signing statements, that basically say, he is signing a bill into law, but he doesn't have to abide by it if he doesn't want to. There, I hope that satifies you, I listed more than one.
Next time, go read the Constitution before you spout off your nonsense.

I mean seriously everyone out there that reads your post and knows anything about the administration of the government and the constitution is laughing at you. read what you wrote, "Congress has no Constitutional authority to give it to him, unless they passed an amendment to the Constitution." How stupid are you. do you know an amendment is?

Here read section 2 and 3 of Article 2 and section 8 of Article 1 in the constitution. I will even quote them on here because you are probably to lazy to go to the source.

Article. II. - The Executive Branch
Section 2 - Civilian Power over Military, Cabinet, Pardon Power, Appointments

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States

Article. I. - The Legislative Branch
Section 8 - Powers of Congress,

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

and read this article-
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_Powers_Clause

Since World War II, Congress has formally authorized all the major military engagements that the US has undertaken. (Vietnam, Lebanon, Panama, Persian Gulf War, Afghanistan, and Iraq.)

And to the matter of Executive Orders, they are orders given by the president to carry out powers already granted to him under the constitution you dimwit.

You know what you lack so much knowledge about who things are carried out that you probably should go read about our government a little more before you post again.

Yes I am awars of the fact that Congress has the power to declare war. the problem is that they haven't issued a declaration of war against any country since WWII. Go look it up if you don't believe me. Every so-called "war" sone WWII has eithe been dones by a non-binding resolution from Congress, or the President has by-passed Congress and gone to to United Nation for authority.

As for excutive orders, you go read these executive orders, then read the Constitution, and tell me where in the Constitution it grants any President to do the things he is doing, let alone issue these orders.
Article 2 sections 2 and three list the specific powers granted to a President. If a power is not listed there, he has no authority to do it.

Also, take a look at article 2 section 8. It is an oath of office the President makes before taking office.
Well, George Bush and a great many presidents before him have been in violation of that oath, since they seem to have a total disregard for the Constitution. The same can be said about Congress as well.
It is obvious to me that you are completely loyal to George and his buddies, so pretty much anything you say, can not be trusted.

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2007/12/17 08:49

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

unaffiliated_person wrote:

Probably this one is a big one:
<http://www.epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.html>
Here is another:
<http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/17/bush.nsa/>

Ahh, pure ignorance, where you have sited liberal bush hating media sources (discredited CNN) I will cut straight to the constitution and site the actual events and what has taken place in court.

Read section 2 and 3 of article 2 and section 8 of article 1 in the constitution.
then read this article from wikipedia-

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

About a week after the 9/11 attacks, Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Terrorists (AUMF) which authorized the President to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

Now tell me again what has the president done that is illegal. because none of your sources can prove or tell me anything that he has done that is against the law and powers authorized to him.

Also the only way that he can found to be out of order is if congress is able to pass a law saying so (good luck with that they can barely stand up to a stiff breeze) or if their is a court case that is brought successfully against him (as you can see from the article there haven't been any).

All your bush hating is only going to get you mad. I suggest you take a chill pill and realize that you have been played by the media and the entire left side of America.

Last of all I want to tell you what I read this morning. I came across an article that talked about the exoneration of Paul Wolfwitz of any wrong doing at the world bank. you should remember, that the campaign against him was a smear campaign spearheaded by your cronies in the media. I also came across an article that talked about how Ronnie Earle (democrat prosecutor from Texas) is retiring before the case against Tom delay will be brought to court. I think he is afraid of being Nifonged for that fact that he lacks any evidence to convict him and will later be sued for his actions of misconduct.

It seems that most of the accusations that you make against conservatives in power are based on hate and rage and prejudice against another man's beliefs. Isn't acceptance of differences one of the tenants of liberalism.

Your a Hypocrite!!!!!!!!!!

Wikipedia is freely editable by anyone, so let's stick to third party sources:

bout a week after the 9/11 attacks, Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Terrorists (AUMF) which authorized the President to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

Does this trump the constitution? The Partiot Act allows for warrantless search and seizure. That is specifically prohibited in the Constitution. In order for Congress to enact something that changes the Constitution, they must obtain a 2/3 majority and have it ratified by the states. That did not happen.
Wiretaps without judicial oversight are also unconstitutional and would require a change to the constitution.
By your own admission, it states "necessary and appropriate measures". Do you consider actions by a president that are unconstitutional to be "appropriate"?

Your insults reflect your biased views.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2007/12/17 10:11

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unconstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

Which unconstitutional powers are you referring to?

The presidential power to wage war? The powers voted to him by congress (Dems included) I bet you can't find one Power he uses that is unconstitutional.

You can't be that naive? I read a report a few weeks ago outlining and detailing approximately 30 abuses of power by Pres. Bush that are unconstitutional. The man is deceitful, arrogant and obsessed with power and his executive orders that give him dictatorial powers in the event of a national emergency were not created by accident or with good intentions.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2007/12/17 14:12

I found this elsewhere that is an accurate summary of abuses:

They violate the 1st Amendment by opening mail, caging demonstrators and banning books like "America Deceived" from Amazon.

They violate the 2nd Amendment by confiscating guns during Katrina.

They violate the 4th Amendment by conducting warrant-less wiretaps.

They violate the 5th and 6th Amendment by suspending habeas corpus.

They violate the 8th Amendment by torturing.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by The Keeper - 2007/12/17 16:32

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

The Keeper wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

unaffiliated_person wrote:

Probably this one is a big one:

<http://www.epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.html>

Here is another:

<http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/17/bush.nsa/>

Ahh, pure ignorance, where you have sited liberal bush hating media sources (discredited CNN) I will cut straight to the constitution and site the actual events and what has taken place in court.

Read section 2 and 3 of article 2 and section 8 of article 1 in the constitution.
then read this article from wikipedia-

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

About a week after the 9/11 attacks, Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Terrorists (AUMF) which authorized the President to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

Now tell me again what has the president done that is illegal. because none of your sources can prove or tell me anything that he has done that is against the law and powers authorized to him.

Also the only way that he can found to be out of order is if congress is able to pass a law saying so (good luck with that they can barely stand up to a stiff breeze) or if their is a court case that is brought successfully against him (as you can see from the article there haven't been any).

All your bush hating is only going to get you mad. I suggest you take a chill pill and realize that you have been played by the media and the entire left side of America.

Last of all I want to tell you what I read this morning. I came across an article that talked about the exoneration of Paul Wolfowitz of any wrong doing at the world bank. you should remember, that the campaign against him was a smear campaign spearheaded by your cronies in the media. I also came across an article that talked about how Ronnie Earle (democrat prosecutor from Texas) is retiring before the case against Tom delay will be brought to court. I think he is afraid of being Nifonged for that fact that he lacks any evidence to convict him and will later be sued for his actions of misconduct.

It seems that most of the accusations that you make against conservatives in power are based on hate and rage and prejudice against another man's beliefs. Isn't acceptance of differences one of the tenants of liberalism.

Your a Hypocrite!!!!!!!!!!

It's really too bad CIA narco pilot Barry Seal was offed by Colombians claiming to be directed to kill by a US Lt Col. that sounded remarkably like Oliver North. Seal was about to testify in court about George H.W. Bush's involved in narco trafficking, his bagman, Noriega, and the Contras, when Seal was murdered

I was really looking forward to watching Seal's video of little Georgie and Jeb unloading an illegal cocaine shipment from a narco drug running aircraft.

wow

accusations and speculations

no evidence!!!!!!!!!!!!

<http://www.libertystickers.com/sites/38289/images/peace-on-earth-from-the-war.jpg>

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by Death_and_Taxes - 2007/12/19 20:46

Airwolf84 wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unconstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

Which unconstitutional powers are you referring to?

The presidential power to wage war? The powers voted to him by congress (Dems included) I bet you can't find one Power he uses that is unconstitutional.

You can't be that naive? I read a report a few weeks ago outlining and detailing approximately 30 abuses of power by Pres. Bush that are unconstitutional. The man is deceitful, arrogant and obsessed with power and his executive orders that give him dictatorial powers in the event of a national emergency were not created by accident or with good intentions.

Naive???

LOL.

If he was a dictator obsessed with power you would not be able to right what you just wrote. If he was anything like a dictator like fidel castro or putin or saddam or the president dude from china you would have been thrown in jail along time ago and beaten for the rest of your life.

don't talk about me being naive when you don't even know the meaning of the word dictator.

what a retard!

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by Death_and_Taxes - 2007/12/19 21:12

unaffiliated_person wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

unaffiliated_person wrote:

Probably this one is a big one:

<http://www.epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.html>

Here is another:

<http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/17/bush.nsa/>

Ahh, pure ignorance, where you have sited liberal bush hating media sources (discredited CNN) I will cut straight to the constitution and site the actual events and what has taken place in court.

Read section 2 and 3 of article 2 and section 8 of article 1 in the constitution.
then read this article from wikipedia-

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

About a week after the 9/11 attacks, Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Terrorists (AUMF) which authorized the President to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

Now tell me again what has the president done that is illegal. because none of your sources can prove or tell me anything that he has done that is against the law and powers authorized to him.

Also the only way that he can found to be out of order is if congress is able to pass a law saying so (good luck with that they can barely stand up to a stiff breeze) or if their is a court case that is brought successfully against him (as you can see from the article there haven't been any).

All your bush hating is only going to get you mad. I suggest you take a chill pill and realize that you have been played by the media and the entire left side of America.

Last of all I want to tell you what I read this morning. I came across an article that talked about the exoneration of Paul Wolfowitz of any wrong doing at the world bank. you should remember, that the campaign against him was a smear campaign spearheaded by your cronies in the media. I also came across an article that talked about how Ronnie Earle (democrat prosecutor from Texas) is retiring before the case against Tom delay will be brought to court. I think he is afraid of being Nifonged for that fact that he lacks any evidence to convict him and will later be sued for his actions of misconduct.

It seems that most of the accusations that you make against conservatives in power are based on hate and rage and prejudice against another man's beliefs. Isn't acceptance of differences one of the tenants of liberalism.

Your a Hypocrite!!!!!!!!!!

Wikipedia is freely editable by anyone, so let's stick to third party sources:

bout a week after the 9/11 attacks, Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Terrorists (AUMF) which authorized the President to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

Does this trump the constitution? The Partiot Act allows for warrantless search and seizure. That is specifically prohibited in the Constitution. In order for Congress to enact something that changes the Constitution, they must obtain a 2/3 majority and have it ratified by the states. That did not happen.

Wiretaps without judicial oversight are also unconstitutional and would require a change to the constitution.

By your own admission, it states "necessary and appropriate measures". Do you consider actions by a president that are unconstitutional to be "appropriate"?

Your insults reflect your biased views.

so your saying that Wikipedia is wrong? show me evidence that they are wrong?

also, which 3rd party are you referring to?

You sound as if there is an unbiased view point out there, apparently you are an ignorant liberal who still believes that Dan Rather is non partisan!

now on to the meat!

Does Al Qaeda have rights under the constitution? does another government who aided Al Qaeda have rights under our constitution? Do non Citizens who aided AL Qaeda have rights under our constitution? Is he going against precedent when he targets US citizens who we have evidence that aided Al Qaeda?(by the way any US citizen who has been involved with Al Qaeda has been given do process and when they haven't the courts have insured that they were).

In regards to Warrentless wiretaps, they are only placed on individuals who are not protected by the constitution and live outside the US. In addition, there is no recorded case in the which United States government agencies have illegally searched and seized anyone covered by the constitution under the patriot act, so your two-thirds argument is crap it doesn't even apply.

You must be a brainwashed moveon.org type.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by Death_and_Taxes - 2007/12/19 21:22

american_patriot wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unconstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

Which unconstitutional powers are you referring to?

The presidential power to wage war? The powers voted to him by congress (Dems included) I bet you can't find one Power he uses that is unconstitutional.

The President has no Constitutional authority to wage war. Congress has no Constitutional authority to give it to him, unless they passed an amendment to the Constitution.

Then there are the Unconstitutional executive orders, which in effect is creating law. Only congress is granted the power by the Constitution to create laws. Then there is his signing statements, that basically say, he is signing a bill into law, but he doesn't have to abide by it if he doesn't want to. There, I hope that satisfies you, I listed more than one. Next time, go read the Constitution before you spout off your nonsense.

I mean seriously everyone out there that reads your post and knows anything about the administration of the government and the constitution is laughing at you. read what you wrote, "Congress has no Constitutional authority to give it to him, unless they passed an amendment to the Constitution." How stupid are you. do you know an amendment is?

Here read section 2 and 3 of Article 2 and section 8 of Article 1 in the constitution. I will even quote them on here because you are probably too lazy to go to the source.

Article. II. - The Executive Branch
Section 2 - Civilian Power over Military, Cabinet, Pardon Power, Appointments

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States

Article. I. - The Legislative Branch
Section 8 - Powers of Congress,

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

and read this article-
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_Powers_Clause

Since World War II, Congress has formally authorized all the major military engagements that the US has undertaken. (Vietnam, Lebanon, Panama, Persian Gulf War, Afghanistan, and Iraq.)

And to the matter of Executive Orders, they are orders given by the president to carry out powers already granted to him under the constitution you dimwit.

You know what you lack so much knowledge about who things are carried out that you probably should go read about our government a little more before you post again.

Yes I am aware of the fact that Congress has the power to declare war. the problem is that they haven't issued a declaration of war against any country since WWII. Go look it up if you don't believe me. Every so-called "war" since WWII has either been done by a non-binding resolution from Congress, or the President has by-passed Congress and gone to the United Nation for authority.

As for executive orders, you go read these executive orders, then read the Constitution, and tell me where in the Constitution it grants any President to do the things he is doing, let alone issue these orders. Article 2 sections 2 and three list the specific powers granted to a President. If a power is not listed there, he has no authority to do it. Also, take a look at article 2 section 8. It is an oath of office the President makes before taking office.

Well, George Bush and a great many presidents before him have been in violation of that oath, since they seem to have a total disregard for the Constitution. The same can be said about Congress as well. It is obvious to me that you are completely loyal to George and his buddies, so pretty much anything you say, can not be trusted.

Obviously you are an amateur and a moron!

An Executive order is used to tell his administrative people how laws passed constitutionally by our congress will be carried out. The executive order is totally within the limits of a president and has been used by the presidents of the United States since the constitution was ratified (even George Washington).

Source(<http://usgovinfo.about.com/library/weekly/aa121897.htm>)

So because I show you facts backed up by evidence I am on the George Bush team. Basically it is because I know the constitution and the facts that I voted for George Bush and not a former communist sympathizer like John Kerry!

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2007/12/20 08:16

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

so your saying that Wikipedia is wrong? show me evidence that they are wrong?

also, which 3rd party are you referring to?

You sound as if there is an unbiased view point out there, apparently you are an ignorant liberal who still believes that Dan Rather is non partisan!

now on to the meat!

Does Al Qaeda have rights under the constitution? does another government who aided Al Qaeda have rights under our constitution? Do non Citizens who aided AL Qaeda have rights under our constitution? Is he going against precedent when he targets US citizens who we have evidence that aided Al Qaeda?(by the way any US citizen who has been involved with Al Qaeda has been given do process and when they haven't the courts have insured that they were).

In regards to Warrentless wiretaps, they are only placed on individuals who are not protected by the constitution and live outside the US. In addition, there is no recorded case in the which United States government agencies have illegally searched and seized anyone covered by the constitution under the patriot act, so your two-thirds argument is crap it doesn't even apply.

You must be a brainwashed moveon.org type.

Does Al-Qaeda have rights? Unfortunately, yes. The consitution states "nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." It says "person", not "citizen". This blog spells it out fairly well:

<http://blogspectrum.blogspot.com/2005/07/to-whom-does-constitution-apply.html>

US citizens cannot be wiretapped without the FISA court's approval. That is due process. Just because one member of the conversation is not a citizen does not negate the rights of the citizen. FISA was created to ensure that we could handle sensitive national security issues that are urgent, it needs to be used to protect us from the government.

Warrantless wiretaps occur on citizens. It takes two people to make a phone call. They are tapping international calls from the US, and not protecting the rights of the citizen. Roughly 500 a year actually.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/12/16/politics/16program.html>

<http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/17/bush.nsa/>

The patriot act has not been abused? The FBI has done so on their own admission.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/23/AR2005102301352.html>

<http://arstechnica.com/news.ars/post/20070312-doj-report-finds-patriot-act-ripe-for-abuse.html>
<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/10/washington/10fbi.html>
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=7826450>

Am I brainwashed? No, in fact, I have never visited the moveon site. I am a veteran of operations enduring and iraqi freedom. I am disgusted with how this administration has deceived and treated my comrades and fellow veterans.

I find Al-Qaeda to be gutless and spineless. However, I believe the US to hold the high moral ground and should shine as a beacon of moral authority. When we stoop to the same tactics as those we have denounced in history, we lose the ability to say the US is the moral authority.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2007/12/21 14:05

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unconstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

Which unconstitutional powers are you referring to?

The presidential power to wage war? The powers voted to him by congress (Dems included) I bet you can't find one Power he uses that is unconstitutional.

You can't be that naive? I read a report a few weeks ago outlining and detailing approximately 30 abuses of power by Pres. Bush that are unconstitutional. The man is deceitful, arrogant and obsessed with power and his executive orders that give him dictatorial powers in the event of a national emergency were not created by accident or with good intentions.

Naive???

LOL.

If he was a dictator obsessed with power you would not be able to right what you just wrote. If he was anything like a dictator like fidel castro or putin or saddam or the president dude from china you would have been thrown in jail along time ago and beaten for the rest of your life.

don't talk about me being naive when you don't even know the meaning of the word dictator.

what a !

I'm sorry you're so closed-minded and naive on this subject. So tell me... ever hear this statement uttered directly from Bush's own mouth...

"A dictatorship would be a heckuva lot easier... just so long as I'm the dictator". " Washington, D.C., Dec. 19, 2000

?

Everything is being set-up by this man (err... jackass) and his administration for a totalitarian rule under martial law when there's a national emergency declared. Whether or not it will be Bush or someone else remains to be seen. The Bush

family are globalists and seek a one world government (this is far from being conspiracy)... good heck... Bush's Grandfather (Prescott Bush) financed Adolf Hitler's rise to power and his pursuit for regional domination. Look it up. Don't patronize other people who know what they're talking about pal... makes you look like a fool.

=====

Re: Bail-out blunder

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2007/12/21 14:38

Airwolf84 wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

Death_and_Taxes wrote:

american_patriot wrote:

George Bush and the rest of the government haven't cared about the Proper role of government for many years, why should they start now? If they did, they would have to give up all the unconstitutional powers they now use, and abuse. I just don't see that happening, unless we the people make it happen.

Which unconstitutional powers are you referring to?

The presidential power to wage war? The powers voted to him by congress (Dems included) I bet you can't find one Power he uses that is unconstitutional.

You can't be that naive? I read a report a few weeks ago outlining and detailing approximately 30 abuses of power by Pres. Bush that are unconstitutional. The man is deceitful, arrogant and obsessed with power and his executive orders that give him dictatorial powers in the event of a national emergency were not created by accident or with good intentions.

Naive???

LOL.

If he was a dictator obsessed with power you would not be able to right what you just wrote. If he was anything like a dictator like fidel castro or putin or saddam or the president dude from china you would have been thrown in jail along time ago and beaten for the rest of your life.

don't talk about me being naive when you don't even know the meaning of the word dictator.

what a !

I'm sorry you're so closed-minded and naive on this subject. So tell me... ever hear this statement uttered directly from Bush's own mouth...

"A dictatorship would be a heckuva lot easier... just so long as I'm the dictator". " Washington, D.C., Dec. 19, 2000

?

Everything is being set-up by this man (err... jackass) and his administration for a totalitarian rule under martial law when there's a national emergency declared. Whether or not it will be Bush or someone else remains to be seen. The Bush family are globalists and seek a one world government (this is far from being conspiracy)... good heck... Bush's Grandfather (Prescott Bush) financed Adolf Hitler's rise to power and his pursuit for regional domination. Look it up. Don't patronize other people who know what they're talking about pal... makes you look like a fool.

Dictator:

dictator

Main Entry:

dictator Listen to the pronunciation of dictator

Pronunciation:

?dik-?t?-t?r, dik-?

Function:

noun

Etymology:

Latin, from dictare

Date:

14th century

1 a: a person granted absolute emergency power; especially : one appointed by the senate of ancient Rome b: one holding complete autocratic control c: one ruling absolutely and often oppressively2: one that dictates

I believe Bush falls under 1a and 1c. Would you like examples?

=====