
Subject: Surveillance

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 16:49:02 GMT

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

So yeah, surveillance. Read on.

Quote:March 25, 2007

N.Y. Police Spied Broadly Before G.O.P. Convention

By JIM DWYER

For at least a year before the 2004 Republican National Convention, teams of undercover New York City police officers traveled to cities across the country, Canada and Europe to conduct covert observations of people who planned to protest at the convention, according to police records and interviews.

From Albuquerque to Montreal, San Francisco to Miami, undercover New York police officers attended meetings of political groups, posing as sympathizers or fellow activists, the records show.

They made friends, shared meals, swapped e-mail messages and then filed daily reports with the department's Intelligence Division. Other investigators mined Internet sites and chat rooms.

From these operations, run by the department's "R.N.C. Intelligence Squad," the police identified a handful of groups and individuals who expressed interest in creating havoc during the convention, as well as some who used Web sites to urge or predict violence.

But potential troublemakers were hardly the only ones to end up in the files. In hundreds of reports stamped "N.Y.P.D. Secret," the Intelligence Division chronicled the views and plans of people who had no apparent intention of breaking the law, the records show.

These included members of street theater companies, church groups and antiwar organizations, as well as environmentalists and people opposed to the death penalty, globalization and other government policies. Three New York City elected officials were cited in the reports.

In at least some cases, intelligence on what appeared to be lawful activity was shared with police departments in other cities. A police report on an organization of artists called Bands Against Bush noted that the group was planning concerts on Oct. 11, 2003, in New York, Washington, Seattle, San Francisco and Boston. Between musical sets, the report said, there would be political speeches and videos.

"Activists are showing a well-organized network made up of anti-Bush sentiment; the mixing of music and political rhetoric indicates sophisticated organizing skills with a specific agenda," said the report, dated Oct. 9, 2003. "Police departments in above listed areas have been contacted regarding this event."

Police records indicate that in addition to sharing information with other police departments, New York undercover officers were active themselves in at least 15 places outside New York —

including California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montreal, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas and Washington, D.C. — and in Europe.

The operation was mounted in 2003 after the Police Department, invoking the fresh horrors of the World Trade Center attack and the prospect of future terrorism, won greater authority from a federal judge to investigate political organizations for criminal activity.

To date, as the boundaries of the department's expanded powers continue to be debated, police officials have provided only glimpses of its intelligence-gathering.

Now, the broad outlines of the pre-convention operations are emerging from records in federal lawsuits that were brought over mass arrests made during the convention, and in greater detail from still-secret reports reviewed by The New York Times. These include a sample of raw intelligence documents and of summary digests of observations from both the field and the department's cyberintelligence unit.

Paul J. Browne, the chief spokesman for the Police Department, confirmed that the operation had been wide-ranging, and said it had been an essential part of the preparations for the huge crowds that came to the city during the convention.

"Detectives collected information both in-state and out-of-state to learn in advance what was coming our way," Mr. Browne said. When the detectives went out of town, he said, the department usually alerted the local authorities by telephone or in person.

Under a United States Supreme Court ruling, undercover surveillance of political groups is generally legal, but the police in New York — like those in many other big cities — have operated under special limits as a result of class-action lawsuits filed over police monitoring of civil rights and antiwar groups during the 1960s. The limits in New York are known as the Handschu guidelines, after the lead plaintiff, Barbara Handschu.

"All our activities were legal and were subject in advance to Handschu review," Mr. Browne said.

Before monitoring political activity, the police must have "some indication of unlawful activity on the part of the individual or organization to be investigated," United States District Court Judge Charles S. Haight Jr. said in a ruling last month.

Christopher Dunn, the associate legal director of the New York Civil Liberties Union, which represents seven of the 1,806 people arrested during the convention, said the Police Department stepped beyond the law in its covert surveillance program.

"The police have no authority to spy on lawful political activity, and this wide-ranging N.Y.P.D. program was wrong and illegal," Mr. Dunn said. "In the coming weeks, the city will be required to disclose to us many more details about its pre-convention surveillance of groups and activists, and many will be shocked by the breadth of the Police Department's political surveillance operation."

The Police Department said those complaints were overblown.

On Wednesday, lawyers for the plaintiffs in the convention lawsuits are scheduled to begin depositions of David Cohen, the deputy police commissioner for intelligence. Mr. Cohen, a former senior official at the Central Intelligence Agency, was “central to the N.Y.P.D.’s efforts to collect intelligence information prior to the R.N.C.,” Gerald C. Smith, an assistant corporation counsel with the city Law Department, said in a federal court filing.

Balancing Safety and Surveillance

For nearly four decades, the city, civil liberties lawyers and the Police Department have fought in federal court over how to balance public safety, free speech and the penetrating but potentially disruptive force of police surveillance.

After the Sept. 11 attacks, Raymond W. Kelly, who became police commissioner in January 2002, “took the position that the N.Y.P.D. could no longer rely on the federal government alone, and that the department had to build an intelligence capacity worthy of the name,” Mr. Browne said.

Mr. Cohen contended that surveillance of domestic political activities was essential to fighting terrorism. “Given the range of activities that may be engaged in by the members of a sleeper cell in the long period of preparation for an act of terror, the entire resources of the N.Y.P.D. must be available to conduct investigations into political activity and intelligence-related issues,” Mr. Cohen wrote in an affidavit dated Sept. 12, 2002.

In February 2003, the Police Department, with Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg’s support, was given broad new authority by Judge Haight to conduct such monitoring. However, a senior police official must still determine that there is some indication of illegal activity before an inquiry is begun.

An investigation by the Intelligence Division led to the arrest — coincidentally, three days before the convention — of a man who spoke about bombing the Herald Square subway station. In another initiative, detectives were stationed in Europe and the Middle East to quickly funnel information back to New York.

When the city was designated in February 2003 as the site of the 2004 Republican National Convention, the department had security worries — in particular about the possibility of a truck bomb attack near Madison Square Garden, where events would be held — and logistical concerns about managing huge crowds, Mr. Browne said.

“We also prepared to contend with a relatively small group of self-described anarchists who vowed to prevent delegates from participating in the convention or otherwise disrupt the convention by various means, including vandalism,” Mr. Browne said. “Our goal was to safeguard delegates, demonstrators and the general public alike.”

In its preparations, the department applied the intelligence resources that had just been strengthened for fighting terrorism to an entirely different task: collecting information on people participating in political protests.

In the records reviewed by The Times, some of the police intelligence concerned people and groups bent on causing trouble, but the bulk of the reports covered the plans and views of people with no obvious intention of breaking the law.

By searching the Internet, investigators identified groups that were making plans for demonstrations. Files were created on their political causes, the criminal records, if any, of the people involved and any plans for civil disobedience or disruptive tactics.

From the field, undercover officers filed daily accounts of their observations on forms known as DD5s that called for descriptions of the gatherings, the leaders and participants, and the groups' plans.

Inside the police Intelligence Division, daily reports from both the field and the Web were summarized in bullet format. These digests — marked “Secret” — were circulated weekly under the heading “Key Findings.”

Perceived Threats

On Jan. 6, 2004, the intelligence digest noted that an antigentrification group in Montreal claimed responsibility for hoax bombs that had been planted at construction sites of luxury condominiums, stating that the purpose was to draw attention to the homeless. The group was linked to a band of anarchist-communists whose leader had visited New York, according to the report.

Other digests noted a planned campaign of “electronic civil disobedience” to jam fax machines and hack into Web sites. Participants at a conference were said to have discussed getting inside delegates' hotels by making hair salon appointments or dinner reservations. At the same conference, people were reported to have discussed disabling charter buses and trying to confuse delegates by switching subway directional signs, or by sealing off stations with crime-scene tape.

A Syracuse peace group intended to block intersections, a report stated. Other reports mentioned past demonstrations where various groups used nails and ball bearings as weapons and threw balloons filled with urine or other foul liquids.

The police also kept track of Richard Picariello, a man who had been convicted in 1978 of politically motivated bombings in Massachusetts, Mr. Browne said.

At the other end of the threat spectrum was Joshua Kinberg, a graduate student at Parsons School of Design and the subject of four pages of intelligence reports, including two pictures. For his master's thesis project, Mr. Kinberg devised a “wireless bicycle” equipped with cellphone, laptop and spray tubes that could squirt messages received over the Internet onto the sidewalk or street.

The messages were printed in water-soluble chalk, a tactic meant to avoid a criminal mischief charge for using paint, an intelligence report noted. Mr. Kinberg's bicycle was “capable of transferring activist-based messages on streets and sidewalks,” according to a report on July 22, 2004.

“This bicycle, having been built for the sole purpose of protesting during the R.N.C., is capable of spraying anti-R.N.C.-type messages on surrounding streets and sidewalks, also supplying the rider with a quick vehicle of escape,” the report said. Mr. Kinberg, then 25, was arrested during a television interview with Ron Reagan for MSNBC’s “Hardball” program during the convention. He was released a day later, but his equipment was held for more than a year.

Mr. Kinberg said Friday that after his arrest, detectives with the terrorism task force asked if he knew of any plans for violence. “I’m an artist,” he said. “I know other artists, who make T-shirts and signs.”

He added: “There’s no reason I should have been placed on any kind of surveillance status. It affected me, my ability to exercise free speech, and the ability of thousands of people who were sending in messages for the bike, to exercise their free speech.”

New Faces in Their Midst

A vast majority of several hundred reports reviewed by The Times, including field reports and the digests, described groups that gave no obvious sign of wrongdoing. The intelligence noted that one group, the “Man- and Woman-in-Black Bloc,” planned to protest outside a party at Sotheby’s for Tennessee’s Republican delegates with Johnny Cash’s career as its theme.

The satirical performance troupe Billionaires for Bush, which specializes in lampooning the Bush administration by dressing in tuxedos and flapper gowns, was described in an intelligence digest on Jan. 23, 2004.

“Billionaires for Bush is an activist group forged as a mockery of the current president and political policies,” the report said. “Preliminary intelligence indicates that this group is raising funds for expansion and support of anti-R.N.C. activist organizations.”

Marco Ceglie, who performs as Monet Oliver dePlace in Billionaires for Bush, said he had suspected that the group was under surveillance by federal agents — not necessarily police officers — during weekly meetings in a downtown loft and at events around the country in the summer of 2004.

“It was a running joke that some of the new faces were 25- to 32-year-old males asking, ‘First name, last name?’ ” Mr. Ceglie said. “Some people didn’t care; it bothered me and a couple of other leaders, but we didn’t want to make a big stink because we didn’t want to look paranoid. We applied to the F.B.I. under the Freedom of Information Act to see if there’s a file, but the answer came back that ‘we cannot confirm or deny.’ ”

The Billionaires try to avoid provoking arrests, Mr. Ceglie said.

Others — who openly planned civil disobedience, with the expectation of being arrested — said they assumed they were under surveillance, but had nothing to hide. “Some of the groups were very concerned about infiltration,” said Ed Hedemann of the War Resisters League, a pacifist organization founded in 1923. “We weren’t. We had open meetings.”

The war resisters publicly announced plans for a “die-in” at Madison Square Garden. They were arrested two minutes after they began a silent march from the World Trade Center site. The charges were dismissed.

The sponsors of an event planned for Jan. 15, 2004, in honor of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday were listed in one of the reports, which noted that it was a protest against “the R.N.C., the war in Iraq and the Bush administration.” It mentioned that three members of the City Council at the time, Charles Barron, Bill Perkins and Larry B. Seabrook, “have endorsed this event.”

Others supporting it, the report said, were the New York City AIDS Housing Network, the Arab Muslim American Foundation, Activists for the Liberation of Palestine, Queers for Peace and Justice and the 1199 Bread and Roses Cultural Project.

Many of the 1,806 people arrested during the convention were held for up to two days on minor offenses normally handled with a summons; the city Law Department said the pre-convention intelligence justified detaining them all for fingerprinting.

Mr. Browne said that 18 months of preparation by the police had allowed hundreds of thousands of people to demonstrate while also ensuring that the Republican delegates were able to hold their convention with relatively few disruptions.

“We attributed the successful policing of the convention to a host of N.Y.P.D. activities leading up to the R.N.C., including 18 months of intensive planning,” he said. “It was a great success, and despite provocations, such as demonstrators throwing faux feces in the faces of police officers, the N.Y.P.D. showed professionalism and restraint.”...

Rest of article below:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/25/nyregion/25infiltrate.html>

Any thoughts?

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 18:22:22 GMT

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

Yeah it takes too long to scroll to the bottom

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [Crusader](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 18:58:42 GMT

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

puddle_splasher wrote on Mon, 26 March 2007 14:22 Yeah it takes too long to scroll to the bottom

haha!

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [ron paul](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 19:13:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Way to go shitting up the thread guys. I'm surprised there hasn't been 200 image macros posted with witty phrases like "Sir Catting hates your post."

Back on topic now?

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [Crusader](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 20:39:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LMFAO!~~~~

Mr. Tzarmind, you got OWNED!

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [ron paul](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 20:47:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronBalls wrote on Mon, 26 March 2007 14:39LMFAO!~~~~

Mr. Tzarmind, you got OWNED!

It was actually pretty funny and in a way, appropriate. But then you come along and brainlessly threadshit again

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [Crusader](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 20:50:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

tzarmind wrote on Mon, 26 March 2007 16:47IronBalls wrote on Mon, 26 March 2007 14:39LMFAO!~~~~

Mr. Tzarmind, you got OWNED!

It was actually pretty funny and in a way, appropriate. But then you come along and brainlessly threadshit again

Some topics just don't take off here. Mine got "threadshitted" too.

Here: <http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=23557&start=0&rid=2> 2347

Which is why I had it locked.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 21:07:27 GMT

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

IronBalls wrote on Mon, 26 March 2007 14:50tzarmind wrote on Mon, 26 March 2007 16:47IronBalls wrote on Mon, 26 March 2007 14:39LMFAO!^^^

Mr. Tzarmind, you got OWNED!

It was actually pretty funny and in a way, appropriate. But then you come along and brainlessly threadshit again

Some topics just don't take off here. Mine got "threadshitted" too.

Here: <http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=23557&start=0&rid=2> 2347

Which is why I had it locked.

Doesn't mean you have to threadshit other peoples threads. Seriously. Just skim what I posted and reveal to us your opinion.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 22:50:57 GMT

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

I guess it was "spying" in the literal sense, but it wasn't illegal spying. The police went to publically held meetings and made friends with the activists to figure out what they were up to. A sneaky thing to do yeah, but its not illegal. They didn't tap their phones or intercept their private emails etc.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 22:53:41 GMT

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

P.S. Please don't spam the threads with clever pictures and whatnot. Most people posting in this area are looking to have a discussion. Flame posts are fine, but posting huge pictures is outright

spamming.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 27 Mar 2007 00:47:17 GMT

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

Sending undercover cops and also keeping records of law-abiding citizens crosses the line. If you want to monitor rallies and such, do it yourself. It may be a bit shady, but the people you're spying on aren't being forced to give out private information.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 27 Mar 2007 05:46:21 GMT

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

If they hold PUBLIC meetings, they can't complain about anyone showing up, including cops who are trying to find out what they are up to. Yeah its sneaky of the cops to go to the meetings and pretend to be one of them just to find out what they are doing, but its not illegal in any way.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 27 Mar 2007 13:15:49 GMT

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

These are undercover POLICE. I don't care if it's "legal" or not. It shouldn't be. If they did it under their own desires, then I don't see an issue with it. If they did it as a job, then I see a problem.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 28 Mar 2007 10:57:02 GMT

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

Even if their JOB is to do undercover work? I just don't see how it can be considered illegal or wrong for the police to go to PUBLIC meetings. That's like drug dealers, dealing in the public library, and then complaining because people are watching them.

If they want to have secret meetings then they should close them to the public.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [Crusader](#) on Wed, 28 Mar 2007 14:44:33 GMT

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

IMO, no wrong thing was done. Even if "innocent" people were spied on, it is always better to be vigilant and watchful.

Here, the police did what we normally don't think should be done by cops. But in this day and age it is an absolute must. As inferred from the article, 9/11 proved that every legal law enforcement branch should be vigilant...not just agencies like the FBI, CIA, and NSA. So the NYPD is setting the standard in becoming more efficient and enforcing homeland security.

The NYPD took the time and money to BLEND in with ordinary folks and get on the inside. It is necessary to investigate each and every one of the so-called "perceived" threats. You may never know...

This is slightly off topic but what is absolutely illegal is what the CIA did with it's secret prisons and illegal flights in Europe. With no background information and on MERE suspicion, they arrested quite a few innocent men and flew them to Syria/Egypt to be tortured.

Now that is illegal and scumwork...but this is not. So people who are complaining about this should realize that we are living in dangerous times and sacrifices are necessary.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 28 Mar 2007 19:04:37 GMT

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

Just more proof that the Republicans want to grow the government just as much as Demorats. Demorats want to give up our liberties for "equality" an Republicans want to give up our liberties in the name of "safety".

As Benjamin Franklin once said, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety".

The fact of the matter is the POLICE spied on people with no probable cause. I'm sorry, but that's not how it works. You need probable cause for the government to spy on you. There's no argument on that "well, this prevents terrorists from doing harm". You're wrong. The government is going to have enough red flags thrown up on some shady activity from would-be terrorists that they'd have plenty of probable cause to spy on them. Only then should they be allowed to tail someone.

If you're a group and think that your opposition might be planning something, that's not probable cause. There is much more needed for something to be considered probable cause. Spying on public gatherings doesn't take a police officer to do, so why bring them in?

As much as I hate Demorats, they had no right to be spied on.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 28 Mar 2007 23:54:24 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Wed, 28 March 2007 12:04

The fact of the matter is the POLICE spied on people with no probable cause. I'm sorry, but that's not how it works. You need probable cause for the government to spy on you.

I should have thought of that the times I got pulled over and my car searched for simply "being out too late"

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 29 Mar 2007 00:35:13 GMT

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

Yeah... you don't have to allow them to search your car. At least, not here in Michigan. I don't know to what extent you can deny their search, but I know that you can. They have to have probable cause.

Plus, even if you couldn't stop them doesn't mean that they should be allowed to. Just because it's "legal" doesn't mean it's right.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 29 Mar 2007 01:33:13 GMT

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

Heh this was in the south, where they can and will stop you for whatever they please. If you try to talk back then they will throw you in jail. If you complain it won't do any good because the judge is somewhere in their family tree

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sat, 31 Mar 2007 05:56:47 GMT

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

You notice that it doesn't say NYPD Busts All Liberals that Turn Out at Protest. Does it? Or does it say a bunch of times that they were trying to figure out who was going to incite violence? I'm sure you've seen the protest warrior videos J_ball. Those guys were physically attacked, and that's where it's a problem for the NYPD. People setting fires, technically a problem for the NYFD but problems for police too. Their probable cause was preventing mayhem. The very reason government exists in the FIRST place. If this hadn't happened and a bunch of shops had been burned and people had been hurt or killed, you can be DAMN sure the NYPD would be all over the media. Ineffective Cops Can't Keep Handle on Vandals or 3 Die in Protest Fire: Why Wasn't NYPD Prepared?. There were people planting hoax bombs. Who the Fucks brilliant idea was that? Could you be asking to be arrested more? Or shot?

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 31 Mar 2007 14:11:57 GMT

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

If they weren't trying to gather information about people trying to incite violence, then why were they there?

You don't keep records of people at the gatherings if you aren't surveying them.

If the cops wanted to do this by themselves, then fine, but this was orchestrated by the government.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sat, 31 Mar 2007 17:30:48 GMT

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

They were trying to gather information about people trying to incite violence. Where did I say they weren't? You can't say if the cops did it it is fine but the government doing it is bad. The NYPD is an extension of the US Government. That's like saying of the post office reads our mail that's ok but if the government does it, NOT OK.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 31 Mar 2007 22:00:18 GMT

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

The question made it sound like you were dismissing the idea that they were trying to spy on those trying to incite violence.

Also, I know that the police force is the government. I meant the police doing it on their own time, as civilians.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 05:46:05 GMT

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

If by U.S. government you mean federal government, you're wrong. The NYPD and other such police departments are funded and organized by local government. The city would decide if the NYPD would "spy" on protestors, not the national government. They could pressure New York to do it, but they couldn't issue the order to the department.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 06:08:13 GMT

QUIT ACTING LIKE I DON'T KNOW THE FUCKING DIFFERENCE.

I'm not an ignorant fool. I've graduated from a private high school. I'm not some average-intelligence kid. Just because most morons may not be able to tell you the difference doesn't mean that I am one of them. >.<

Do I really need to specify "local", "state" or "federal" government when it's more than obvious what one I'm talking about?

Yes, this outburst was warranted. This is twice in the same thread that I was talked down to as if I don't have a decent understanding of my own government. Would I be discussing politics without making an ass of myself if I didn't have an idea?

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 13:53:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i guess i'm just some average intelligence person compaired to you o mighty "i graduated at a private school". you're a hipocrite, now you're looking down on me and alot of other people in the nation that go to goverment funded schools.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 14:39:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gamemodding wrote on Sun, 01 April 2007 09:53i guess i'm just some average intelligence person compaired to you o mighty "i graduated at a private school". you're a hipocrite, now you're looking down on me and alot of other people in the nation that go to goverment funded schools. Did you happen to notice that those were two separate sentences? They are two completely different thoughts.

My statement about me going to a private school is just to show that I DID get taught the difference. My statement about me not being just an average-intelligence kid was simply to say that I understand these concepts.

I don't know why I decided to explain this to you, but maybe you can learn to think before you reply. Also, you have no right to be pissy when you openly use this "I still have a few more years to mature" excuse. If you know you're being immature, that must mean you're mature enough to stop yourself from looking like a fool. Self-control and maturity aren't one in the same.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 15:50:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I was stating that you don't like to be looked down on. You make out that going to a private school makes you "higher" than everyone else. Therefore, you are looking down on everyone else.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 17:06:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gamemodding wrote on Sun, 01 April 2007 11:50I was stating that you don't like to be looked down on. You make out that going to a private school makes you "higher" than everyone else. Therefore, you are looking down on everyone else.
God, you're a fucking idiot.

PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN AMERICA (THE COUNTRY WHERE I SEEM TO BE LIVING AT PRESENT) ARE GENERALLY SUPERIOR TO PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

Can I make it any simpler for you?

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 18:36:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spyguy the local government is given sovereignty by the federal government. Without the US government there would be no local government.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 18:52:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

exactly, your stating you're more superior than everyone else because you went to a private school.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 22:53:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gamemodding wrote on Sun, 01 April 2007 14:52exactly, your stating you're more superior than everyone else because you went to a private school.
Obviously, I have to clear it up even further because you don't seem to grasp SIMPLE concepts.

I was stating that my EDUCATION was superior to most public education. I didn't say I was (though, for the most part, I am). It doesn't matter how "superior" I am if I'm not taught these concepts.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 23:17:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's funny how you talk about maturity then you turn caps lock on and call me an "idiot" even though you have no idea of how intellectual i am. I was stating the fact that you stated the fact that you went to a private school. You made it sound like you were hinting that you feel higher than everyone else because of this fact. You also, with your statement was calling me (and other people) an ignorant fool because i go to a government funded school.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 01 Apr 2007 23:37:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gamemodding wrote on Sun, 01 April 2007 19:17It's funny how you talk about maturity then you turn caps lock on and call me an "idiot" even though you have no idea of how intellectual i am. I was stating the fact that you stated the fact that you went to a private school. You made it sound like you were hinting that you feel higher than everyone else because of this fact. You also, with your statement was calling me (and other people) an ignorant fool because i go to a government funded school.

I called you an idiot because you are. I don't care how much of an "intellectual" you claim to be, you've proven otherwise more than once.

I used caps sparingly. I used them for one sentence to get my point across. How is that a sign of immaturity?

No, you accused me of trying to look down at you and others because you go to public school. That was an assumption, and I promptly proved you wrong. Quit your assbattering and move along. American politics isn't your concern.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [jnz](#) on Mon, 02 Apr 2007 00:05:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 02 April 2007 00:37I called you an idiot because you are.
Based on?

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 02 April 2007 00:37

I don't care how much of an "intellectual" you claim to be,

I didn't.

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 02 April 2007 00:37

I used caps sparingly. I used them for one sentence to get my point across. How is that a sign of immaturity?

It shows you need to resort to being aggressive to get your point across.

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 02 April 2007 00:37

No, you accused me of trying to look down at you and others because you go to public school. That was an assumption, and I promptly proved you wrong.

You didn't.

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 02 April 2007 00:37

Quit your asshattery and move along.

I was thinking the same, reversed sides.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 02 Apr 2007 00:10:08 GMT

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

1. I'll let tzarmind do this. He'll dig up plenty of dirt on you.
2. Maybe not in this thread, but elsewhere.
3. It's called emphasis.
4. Then you prove #1 right if you're too stupid to see what I'm talking about.
5. I'm not the one who posted off-topic to reply to me because you feel that you were attacked, and then continued to try and defend your off-base assumption.

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [jnz](#) on Mon, 02 Apr 2007 01:30:25 GMT

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

Oh, forget it. If you are too small to understand my point of view and why i posted then why should i even try?

Subject: Re: Surveillance

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 02 Apr 2007 02:14:02 GMT

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

gamemodding wrote on Sun, 01 April 2007 21:30Oh, forget it. If you are too small to understand my point of view and why i posted then why should i even try?
Because you're an arrogant fuck who seems to be self-involved to the point to assume that you're insulted when you weren't even included in this discussion. You're just like a Demorat, finding any little pissant way to call themselves a victim.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Mon, 02 Apr 2007 06:11:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Boy, you certainly discussed politics without making an ass of yourself. I sure was wrong.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 02 Apr 2007 13:07:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SpyGuy246 wrote on Mon, 02 April 2007 02:11Boy, you certainly discussed politics without making an ass of yourself. I sure was wrong.
This incessant arguing isn't politics.

Subject: Re: Surveillance
Posted by [ron paul](#) on Mon, 02 Apr 2007 14:54:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Jake, don't worry about 'gamemodding.' I do believe the more intelligent people just tend to ignore him. Considering explaining anything to him is like trying to walk through a brick wall. Just search for 'helplinux' for every over opinionated and blatantly retarded post he has made.

And to be honest, I don't really like the "surveillance society" we're all slowly becoming part of.
