
THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by spartan - 2008/06/20 06:52

This thread discusses the Content article: THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

The three other issues that will help McCain win in November is Judges, Judges, and Judges. I believe that the American people are tired of the Judicial tyranny that makes bad decisions in Boumediene and w/r/t gay marriage. These decisions overturned an act of Congress (which the SCOTUS said was needed in Hamdan) and the will of the people. These acts were reckless. On top of that, the Senate Judiciary under the leadership of Leahy has effectively halted the appointment of judges to various District and Appellate positions. Of course it was the ham-handed McCain who brought us the "gang of 14" when the GOP ran the Senate. McCain needs to tailor his position to reflect the abuses of the runaway judges as well as the need to appoint qualified (hopefully, conservatives like Roberts and Alito) judges.

This will appeal (no pun intended) to the conservatives who are looking for reasons to support McCain.

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by bogle - 2008/06/20 13:00

James Cagney once was called by the movie mogul Sam Goldwyn the "Professional Against-er" since anything Goldwyn was for Cagney (a union activist) was against. This is how McCain should behave towards the Democrat Left. If McCain wants a kinder and gentler approach he should emphasize that higher energy prices are a huge tax upon lower income citizens. For the "WE ARE THE WORLD...WE ARE THE CHILDREN" crowd he should promote the idea that an energy self-sufficient USA raises living standards of the developing world. HOW? Falling energy prices.

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by hank - 2008/06/20 16:17

McCain recently said he supported Souter and Ginsberg.

Do I need to get some kool-aid so I can believe he will appoint Constitutionalist judges?

Are we grasping at straws or what? Let's face the fact that the national leadership of the Republican party are democrats.

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by ella - 2008/06/20 20:56

I'm buying clothes pins before I go and vote for McCain....those should make it much easier for me to vote for this RINO in November. :laugh: :laugh: :laugh: :P

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by LittleKell - 2008/06/20 21:24

I don't buy Senator McCain's "Flip Flop" regarding drilling for oil. He side-steps the issue by leaving it up to the States to decide. Most of those states have liberals in control of the state government. No way they are going to allow drilling off their coasts. McCain knows this.

If McCain was serious about drilling for oil here at home. He should have said "I support drilling for oil in America and off of Her shores, PERIOD".

Just because he was a POW, doesn't make him a leader.

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by jsnape - 2008/06/20 22:45

I'm still writing in myself. I can do a better job than him because I promise to fix nothing. Maybe I'll let all non violent offenders out of federal prison and fire all the federal prosecutors, and not replace them. Congress wont have to worry about grilling my staff because there wont be a staff. And if the phone rings at 3:00AM it will only be one of those half rings, before being automatically forwarded to the military. And with my short attention span, and no staff, most legislation will just get veetoed.
McCain will get no help from me.

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by Marco - 2008/06/21 11:45

Empty Suit OBAMA

I cordially invite you to read the lyrics of a Leon Russell song "Tightrope" It is quite possible you will see some parallel's in the lyrics to our modern empty suited Democrat hero Obama.

I'm up on the tight wire
One side's ice and one is fire
It's a circus game
With you and me

I'm up on the tight rope
One side's hate and one is hope
But the top hat on my head
Is all you see

And the wire seems to be
The only place for me
A comedy of errors
And I'm falling

Like a rubber-neck giraffe
You look into my past
Well, maybe you're just
Too blind to see

I'm up in the spotlight
Ohh, does it feel right?
Ohh, altitude
Seems to get to me

I'm up on the tight wire
Flanked by life and the funeral pyre
Putting on a show
For you to see

Like a rubber-neck giraffe
You look into my past
Well, maybe you're just
Too blind to see

I'm up in the spotlight
Ohh, does it feel right?
Ohh, the altitude
Really gets to get to me

I'm up on the tight wire

Flanked by life and the funeral pyre
Putting on a show
For you to see

<http://music.yahoo.com/Leon-Russell/Tightrope/lyrics/39018591#lyricstop>

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by Kenny - 2008/06/21 13:25

Your three point are all true, Jack, but I would still urge McCain to keep hitting B. Hussein Obama over the head for his racist spiritual advisors and his ties with racidals for the 60's.

Frankly, I cannot conceive of an America that would vote a man like Obama in as president -- I really can't.

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by eddd7 - 2008/06/22 05:47

Quote:

"Let's face the fact that the national leadership of the Republican party are democrats."

Yes, too true. BUT, the good news-bad news is that the national leadership of the Democrat party are Marxists

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by eddd7 - 2008/06/22 06:04

Leon Russell??!! Excellent Marco! (who, apparently, is NOT a young man)

"This Masquerade", unfortunately, only fits in title, not lyrics. Otherwise, this could be Obambi's campaign song.

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/06/22 06:55

Don't forget the dhimmicrat anthem, which constantly plays in the background: Taxman And what do we get for all those taxes? We get even more intrusive government in our lives, less sovereignty for ourselves and our nation, higher fuel prices to finance our enemies, government indoctrination centers masquerading as public education. This needs to be the drumbeat behind McCain: what we lose with the obamanation. Pain will be our only gain.

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/06/22 07:19

I can't see Obama being elected, since he is ineligible to run for President:

CAN OBAMA BE PRESIDENT?

It seems that Barack Obama is not qualified to be president, after all, for the following reason:

Barack Obama is not legally a U.S. natural-born citizen according to the law on the books at the time of his birth, which falls between 'December 24,1952 to November 13, 1986? . Presidential office requires a natural-born citizen, if the child was not born to two U.S. citizen parents, which of course is what exempts John McCain though he was born in the

Panama Canal.

US Law very clearly stipulates: "If only one parent was a U.S citizen at the time of your birth, that parent must have resided in the United States for at least ten years, at least five of which had to be after the age of 16."

Barack Obama's father was not a U.S. citizen and Obama's mother was only 18 when Obama was born, which means although she had been a U.S. citizen for 10 years, (or citizen perhaps because of Hawaii being a territory) the mother fails the test for being so, for at least 5 years **prior to** Barack Obama's birth, but *after* age 16. It doesn't matter *after* . In essence, she was not old enough to qualify her son for automatic U.S. citizenship. At most, there were only 2 years elapsed since his mother turned 16 at the time of Barack Obama's birth when she was 18 in Hawaii. His mother would have needed to have been 16+5= 21 years old, at the time of Barack Obama's birth for him to have been a natural-born citizen (Were our founding fathers sharp as tacks, or what? They made sure an adult foreigner couldn't impregnate a minor and later have him become President of the United States. At least that seems to be what they intended, however, Barack Hussein Obama seems to be getting away with this gross violation of election law, at least for now. Makes one wonder if this was the intention of Barack Hussein Obama, Sr. all along, doesn't it?) As aforementioned, she was a young (naive Kansas liberal) college student at the time and was not yrs 21 of age. Barack Obama was already 3 years old at that time his mother would have needed to have waited to have him as the only U.S. Citizen parent. Obama instead should have been naturalized, but even then, that would still disqualify him from holding the office. (If he wasn't naturalized, how is it that he is a U. S. senator? Sounds like he doesn't obey any of the rules, doesn't it?)

*** Naturalized citizens are ineligible to hold the office of President***. Though Barack Obama was sent back to Hawaii at age 10, all the other info does not matter because his mother is the one who needed to have been a U.S. citizen for 10 years prior to his birth on August 4, 1961, with 5 of those years being after age 16. Further, Obama may have had to have remained in the country for some time to protect any citizenship he would have had, rather than living in Indonesia.. Now you can see why Obama's aides stopped his speech about how we technically have more than 50 states, because it would have led to this discovery. This is very clear cut and a blaring violation of U.S. election law. I think the Gov. of California would be very interested in knowing this if Obama were elected President without being a natural-born U.S. citizen, as it would set precedence.

Can anyone refute this? If so, please do so with U. S. law or precedent.

Could this be Hitler's October surprise for America's first wannabee Marxist Arab-American Muslim President? Sure would clear the way for her to un-suspend her campaign for the Presidency. I sure wouldn't put it past her.

You do know Obama is 50% white, 43.25% ARAB and less than 7% black? (Claiming to be black when one is less than 7% black seems like political opportunism at its worst. Why won't he even be honest about his ancestry?)

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by Kenny - 2008/06/22 07:31

Don't forget the dhimmicat anthem, which constantly plays in the background: Taxman And what do we get for all those taxes? We get even more intrusive government in our lives, less sovereignty for ourselves and our nation, higher fuel prices to finance our enemies, government indoctrination centers masquerading as public education.

This is true, but the problem here is who the "we" are.

What I mean is this. There are tens of millions of Americans who define their freedom as being on the government dole either as a direct welfare recipient or in government jobs of one type or another from federal bureaucrats to state employees to school teachers, etc. or the recipient of government grants (artists, activists, etc.).

To these people, the Taxman is a savior that squeezed money out of those greedy enough to be in the private sector.

Again, the question arises. Have we reached the tipping point where there are more parasites in society than producers? I myself don't think so, but we're sure getting dangerously close.

As for intrusive government, the likes of homosexuals, abortion mills, pronographers, poverty pimps, etc. demand intrusive government. Why? Because, without it, they would be marginalized by wholesome social pressure whereas with intrusive government, society is forced to accommodate these people. The whole thing is ass-backwards, and it's that way because of big government.

Make no mistake about it; big government has a strong following in this country. And as the Mwilhite said, the public are

brainwashing centers and that only makes this situation grow worse each year.

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by Marco - 2008/06/22 08:23

Spartan, mwilHITE could use your help on this one?

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by chay - 2008/06/22 19:44

"You'll have to eat some crow. But crow doesn't taste so bad when it's served on the White House china."

Great line, really great.

Sarah Palin would also fill a void for a lot of Hillary supporters who aren't really comfortable with McCain, nor are they comfortable with Otrauma.

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by skye - 2008/06/22 20:35

Very good point! Although I'm well aware of what the 'crats are, I hadn't looked at it from your perspective...

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by skye - 2008/06/22 20:47

Wow! If this is still good law, there are going to be massive riots, looting, and arson - if the judges who are assigned the case have the guts to decide it on the basis of the law. Big IF, but not impossible.

Considering how long it takes to get to the Supremes, a decision from on high might well arrive after Omarxist is sworn in, meaning his VP would become president. Moreover, all the laws that he had signed would be void... Mind blowing if still true.

Where did you find out about this fascinating possibility?

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/06/22 20:56

A friend who knows how to read law and looks for the things others overlook.

Fuhgetaboutit

Posted by spartan - 2008/06/22 22:28

A person born in Hawaii on or after August 12, 1898, and before April 30, 1900, is declared to be a citizen of the United States as of April 30, 1900. A person born in Hawaii on or after April 30, 1900, is a citizen of the United States at birth. A person who was a citizen of the Republic of Hawaii on August 12, 1898, is declared to be a citizen of the United States as of April 30, 1900.

http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode08/usc_sec_08_00001405---000-.html

Hawaii was an incorporated territory of the United States as of 1898. "Incorporated" means that it was rendered an inseparable, permanent part of the United States proper. The Alaska Territory was incorporated in 1912 (statehood also in 1959). The Oklahoma Territory in 1890 (statehood in 1907). Etc.

Citizens of incorporated territories are citizens of the United States of America.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Incorporated_territory

These two items seem to conflict with the law that mwilHITE cites. They would take precedence over the law that mwilHITE cited. However, my research seems to have found another problem for Obama. I have seen his birth certificate (it was posted by our friends :angry: at the Daily Kos). The Mother is Stanley Ann Durham and the Father is Barack Hussein Obama. It appears that it is quite possible that Durham and Obama were not officially married. This would make Obama, ahem, a bastard (not that we did not know this). Before you reach for the argument of "common law marriage", I can not find any evidence that Hawaii allowed common law marriages in 1961. They do not presently allow them.

There seems to be some controversy concerning the birth certificate. The document produced by the Daily Kos folks states the father is African. However, the policy of Hawaii in 1961 was to use Black/Negro. The State of Hawaii has not officially released Obama's birth certificate and the folks at the Daily Kos are dubious by nature. It would not surprise me that this document was doctored by the Daily Kos folks.

Therefore, it is my opinion as board consigliere that any challenge to Obama's eligibility would fail. Most likely, you will run into a judiciary comprised of NJ, FL, MA, and CA Supreme Court justices.:angry: :angry:
It is also my legal opinion, absent any further evidence, that Obama is a bastard.

=====

Re:Fuhgetaboutit

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/06/22 22:56

A person born in Hawaii on or after August 12, 1898, and before April 30, 1900, is declared to be a citizen of the United States as of April 30, 1900. A person born in Hawaii on or after April 30, 1900, is a citizen of the United States at birth. A person who was a citizen of the Republic of Hawaii on August 12, 1898, is declared to be a citizen of the United States as of April 30, 1900. http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode08/usc_sec_08_00001405---000-.html

Hawaii was an incorporated territory of the United States as of 1898. "Incorporated" means that it was rendered an inseparable, permanent part of the United States proper. The Alaska Territory was incorporated in 1912 (statehood also in 1959). The Oklahoma Territory in 1890 (statehood in 1907). Etc.

Citizens of incorporated territories are citizens of the United States of America.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Incorporated_territory

These two items seem to conflict with the law that mwilHITE cites. They would take precedence over the law that mwilHITE cited. However, my research seems to have found another problem for Obama. I have seen his birth certificate (it was posted by our friends at the Daily Kos). The Mother is Stanley Ann Durham (Sure that's not Dunham?) and the Father is Barack Hussein Obama. It appears that it is quite possible that Durham and Obama were not officially married. (big surprise there) This would make Obama, ahem, a bastard (not that we did not know this). Before you reach for the argument of "common law marriage", I can not find any evidence that Hawaii allowed common law marriages in 1961. They do not presently allow them.

What would this have to do with a Kenyan daddy and an underaged Kansas mama? The law I cited was not state law, but federal law, was it not?

There seems to be some controversy concerning the birth certificate. The document produced by the Daily Kos folks states the father is African. However, the policy of Hawaii in 1961 was to use Black/Negro. The State of Hawaii has not officially released Obama's birth certificate and the folks at the Daily Kos are dubious by nature. It would not surprise me that this document was doctored by the Daily Kos folks.

Therefore, it is my opinion as board consigliere that any challenge to Obama's eligibility would fail. Are you saying that the law of the land at the time of his birth is replaced by a later law? Or are you saying the marxist judges on the Supreme Court would ignore law and rule against the constitution again? Most likely, you will run into a judiciary comprised of NJ, FL, MA, and CA Supreme Court justices.
It is also my legal opinion, absent any further evidence, that Obama is a bastard.

=====

Re:Fuhgetaboutit

Posted by spartan - 2008/06/22 23:23

What would this have to do with a Kenyan daddy and an underaged Kansas mama?The law I cited was not state law, but federal law, was it not?

It is federal law as well as the two examples I cited. There seems to be a conflict. Which law do you think the judiciary will uphold? I will give you 3 guesses and the first two don't count. It will not be very difficult for the judiciary to come to a decision in favor of Obama. The law you cite is subsequent to my 2 examples. One would have to look at the law's intent. If the law you cite did not intend to overrule my 2 examples then it will fail in this challenge.

Yes, it is Dunham. A Boy Named Sue and A Girl Named Stanley. You wonder why Barack has problems.:blush: :blush:

=====

Re:Fuhgetaboutit

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/06/22 23:44

Just an aside to this whole mess; I heard BO and his former rev were in the candy business together. Their specialty seemed to be fudge packing. Have you heard any of this, or are my sources merely trafficking in scurrilous accusations? That sure would, if were true, make for a nasty October Surprise, wouldn't it? The damage he could do to this country almost persuades me the end justifies any means to deep-six his presidential aspirations.

=====

Re:Fuhgetaboutit

Posted by jsnape - 2008/06/22 23:45

Where did they get that birth certificate, and why isn't it notarized? I've never received a copy of my birth certificate without it being notarized.

http://i170.photobucket.com/albums/u280/ironicsurrealism/BO_Birth_Certificate.jpg

A real birth certificate from Hawaii:

<http://www.valeehill.net/genealogy/showmedia.php?mediaID=169>

And both are fully scrutinized here:

<http://polarik.blogtownhall.com/>

=====

Re:Fuhgetaboutit

Posted by spartan - 2008/06/23 08:26

@mwilHITE

There are those rumors. The irony is that there is another Black minister (the name escapes me)that Obama uses as his mentor. He is also a IL State Senator. He has railed against homosexuals and their behavior.

The most interesting item I had read is an article from The New Republic which stated that Rev. Wright used to be a Black Moslem. This could explain the affinity for Farrakhan. The "christianity" that Wright spews from the pulpit is not the Christianity I recognize. It is full of contempt, hatred, and paranoia.

@jsnape

Good points. Like I posited earlier, the Daily Kos folks are dubious by nature. The Polarik article does not seem to come up. I doubt Stanley and Barack were married. There would be a paper trail for the divorce. Since Stanley was an avowed atheist, where did she get married?

Is it any wonder why Obama preaches Hope and Unity? There isn't much of substance to this empty suit. You dare not look behind the curtain, it is quite ugly. No wonder Bill Clinton called it a fantasy. The first time Bill Clinton had been honest in a long while.:dry: :blush: :dry:

=====

Re:Fuhgetaboutit

Posted by jsnape - 2008/06/23 09:14

I did run accross a site with a very real looking social security form of his mom's with the number. Wish I would have taken the option to run credit reports on my Quickbooks point of sale software now, just for the hell of it to see where it leads :)

<http://www.webofdeception.com/obamamother'ssssapplication.html>

Re:3 SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY-FREE TICKETS

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/06/23 18:05

Totally off the point:

FREE TICKETS

I have 10 extra tickets for the Robbie Knieval event at the fairgrounds next weekend if anybody wants them.

He's going to try to jump 500 Obama supporters with a bulldozer.

M.W.

Re:3 SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY-FREE TICKETS

Posted by jsnape - 2008/06/23 18:09

Here's one Spartan might like:

What do you call 1,000,000 Omama supporters at the bottom of the Ocean?

The '\Real\ Problem?

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/06/25 11:17

No offense to Spartan et al:

The Democrat Party has become the Lawyers' Party. Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton are lawyers. Bill Clinton and Michelle Obama are lawyers. John Edwards, the other former Democrat candidate for president, is a lawyer, and so is his wife, Elizabeth. Every Democrat nominee since 1984 went to law school (although Gore did not graduate). Every Democrat vice presidential nominee since 1976, except for Lloyd Bentsen, went to law school. Look at the Democrat Party in Congress: the Majority Leader in each house is a lawyer.

The Republican Party is different. President Bush and Vice President Cheney were not lawyers, but businessmen. The leaders of the Republican Revolution were not lawyers. Newt Gingrich was a history professor; Tom Delay was an exterminator; and, Dick Arney was an economist. House Minority Leader Boehner was a plastic manufacturer, not a lawyer. The former Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist is a heart surgeon.

Who was the last Republican president who was a lawyer? Gerald Ford, who left office 31 years ago and who barely won the Republican nomination as a sitting president, running against Ronald Reagan in 1976. The Republican Party is made up of real people doing real work. The Democrat Party is made up of lawyers. Democrats mock and scorn men who create wealth, like Bush and Cheney, or who heal the sick, like Frist, or who immerse themselves in history, like

Gingrich. (Where is Tom Delay, exterminator of pests when we really need him?)

The Lawyers' Party sees these sorts of people, who provide goods and services that people want, as the enemies of America . And, so we have seen the procession of official enemies, in the eyes of the Lawyers' Party, grow. Against whom do Hillary and Obama rail? Pharmaceutical companies, oil companies, hospitals, manufacturers, fast food restaurant chains, large retail businesses, bankers, and anyone producing anything of value in our nation.(Not so sure about the bankers.)

This is the natural consequence of viewing everything through the eyes of lawyers. Lawyers solve problems by successfully representing their clients, in this case the American people. Lawyers seek to have new laws passed, they seek to win lawsuits, they press appellate courts to overturn precedent, and lawyers always parse language to favor their side.

Confined to the narrow practice of law, that is fine. But it is an awful way to govern a great nation. When politicians as lawyers begin to view some Americans as clients and other Americans as opposing parties, then the role of the legal system in our life becomes all-consuming. Some Americans become "adverse parties" of our very government. We are not all litigants in some vast social class-action suit; we are citizens of a republic that promises us a great deal of freedom from laws, from courts, and from lawyers.

Today, we are drowning in laws; we are contorted by judicial decisions; we are driven to distraction by omnipresent lawyers in all parts of our once private lives. America has a place for laws and lawyers, but that place is modest and reasonable, not vast and unchecked. When the most important decision for our next president is whom he will appoint to the Supreme Court, the role of lawyers and the law in America is too big. When lawyers use criminal prosecution as a continuation of politics by other means, as happened in the lynching of Scooter Libby and Tom Delay, then the power of lawyers in America is too great. When House Democrats sue America in order to hamstring our efforts to learn what our enemies are planning to do to us, then the role of litigation in America has become crushing.

We cannot expect the Lawyers' Party to provide real change, real reform, or real hope in America. Most Americans know that a republic in which every major government action must be blessed by nine unelected judges is not what Washington intended in 1789. Most Americans grasp that we cannot fight a war when ACLU lawsuits snap at the heels of our defenders. Most Americans intuit that more lawyers and judges will not restore declining moral values or spark the spirit of enterprise in our economy.

Perhaps Americans will understand that change cannot be brought to our nation by those lawyers who already largely dictate American society and business. Perhaps Americans will see that hope does not come from the mouths of lawyers but from personal dreams nourished by hard work. Perhaps Americans will embrace the truth that more lawyers with more power will only make our problems worse.

Will Shakespeare had it right: "...first we kill all the lawyers..."except Spartan.

Re:The \Real\ Problem?

Posted by Capo - 2008/06/25 12:51

"The Republican Party is different."

No, it's not.Get real. Please, I get enough RNC BS in the mail I don't need it on TTP.

Re:The \Real\ Problem?

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/06/25 13:13

You're right, should have said: WAS, before the dhimmicrats wussified them. I still think the article more applies to the current run of the mill Republican Party member, than the average member of the Democrat Party. We are not necessarily talking about the leadership, but some Republican reps and senators haven't succumbed to the wussification. Damn few, though.

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by Kenny - 2008/06/25 13:56

Re: "The Real Problem" by MWilhite.

Excellent analysis, sir. It explains a lot, and you packaged the description of the Dims nicely. I will use that information in the future.

Back to the GOP. Lord knows the party is far from perfect (what an understatement) but compared to the Democrats, the party of lawyers, pronogrophers, homosexual activists, eco-nuts, American hating Leftists, Hollywood scum, race hustlers & poverty pimps, the university establishment, the media, unions, etc. the Republicans are relatively a breath of fresh air.

The Republican problem is weakness as much as anything else.

With that being said, what's the alternative except to stay in the GOP and fight to reform it.

Spartan is our hero!

Posted by cephran - 2008/06/25 14:01

Three cheers for Spartan! He will save us from those wild-eyed Liberal lawyers. :laugh:
<http://www.tothepointnews.com/images/fbfiles/images/Nacho.jpg>

BTW, good job mwilhite. Ding for you!

Re:Spartan is our hero!

Posted by Capo - 2008/06/25 14:28

Oh,Oh! Ceph.jpg is unleashed!:ohmy:

@mwilhite

Clarification understood.

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by martinbb - 2008/06/25 19:01

I would love to agree with some of the points on this subject but alas i cannot.....
John McCain is the illegitimate reincarnation of Bob Dole (its only a matter of time before he falls off a stage and then thanks the crowd from the wrong city,,,,,yeeeeeeesh)
Obama will win in november much to the chagrin of the Clintons and the decent hardworking people of the country of which i am a proud member.

but all is not lost.....

there is another.....

he was stolen away at birth from the liberal stromtroopers before his parents were trampled to death in a frenzy of political lust and debauchery.....

he shall come to the aid of his party in its hour of need and speak truth to the citizenry at great cost to his own personal safety and reputation.....and he will deliver

B) B) B) B) B) B)

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by jsnape - 2008/06/25 19:20

What is his name?

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by tonova - 2008/06/26 10:10

... sounds like Pizza Boy!

Nomination in 30 minutes or less or your candidate is free!

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by jsnape - 2008/06/26 12:54

Its all but proven Obama is a fake and a forgerer:

The "birth certificate" claimed by the Barack Obama campaign is not certified as authentic and appears to be a photoshopped fake.

The image, purporting to come from the Hawaii Department of Health, has been the subject of intense skepticism in the blogosphere in the past two weeks. But now the senior spokesman of that Department has confirmed to Israel Insider what are the required features of a certified birth document -- features that Obama's purported "birth certificate" clearly lack.

<http://web.israelinsider.com/Articles/Politics/12939.htm>

Re:Fuhgetaboutit

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/06/26 15:47

What do you make of this:

Unstamped certificate suggests Obama may not be "natural born" US citizen
By Reuven Koret June 24, 2008

The "birth certificate" claimed by the Barack Obama campaign is not certified as authentic and appears to be a photoshopped fake.
(Photos not shown)

The image, purporting to come from the Hawaii Department of Health, has been the subject of intense skepticism in the blogosphere in the past two weeks. But now the senior spokesman of that Department has confirmed to Israel Insider what are the required features of a certified birth document -- features that Obama's purported "birth certificate" clearly lack.

The image became increasingly suspect with Israel Insider's revelation that variations of the certificate image were posted on the Photobucket image aggregation website -- including one listing the location of Obama's birth as Antarctica, one with the certificate supposedly issued by the government of North Korea, and another including a purported photo of baby Barack -- one of which has a "photo taken" time-stamp just two minutes before the article and accompanying image was posted on the left-wing Daily Kos blog.

That strongly suggests that Daily Kos obtained the image from Photobucket, not the State of Hawaii, the Obama family, or the Obama campaign. Photobucket is not generally known as a credible supplier of official vital records for any of the fifty states, and the liberties that other Photoshoppers took with the certificates confirms this.

Some of these oddities surfaced in Israel Insider's previous article on the subject, but new comparative documentary evidence presented below, and official verification obtained by Israel Insider from a senior Hawaiian official, provides the strongest confirmation yet.

An authentic Hawaiian birth certificate for another Hawaiian individual has since surfaced which, using the same official form as the presumptive Obama certificate, includes an embossed official seal and an authoritative signature, coming through from the back. Obama's alleged certificate lacks those features, and the certificate number referencing the birth year has been blacked out, making it untraceable.

Janice Okubo, Director of Communications of the State of Hawaii Department of Health, told Israel Insider: "At this time there are no circumstances in which the State of Hawaii Department of Health would issue a birth certification or certification of live birth only electronically." And, she added, "In the State of Hawaii all certified copies of certificates of live birth have the embossed seal and registrar signature on the back of the document."

Compare the top image presented by his campaign as evidence of Obama's 1961 birth and the other certifying the birth of one Patricia Decosta. (Photos not shown.)

Re:Fuhgetaboutit

Posted by jsnape - 2008/06/30 13:06

It's not a good sign when Obama has to give a speech today to try and convince people that he is a patriot. His mistake right now is acknowledging the rumors. And not just that, but bringing the subject up on his own. I still stand by what I said 3 months and 1 week ago:

On McCain:

So far, the last two or three weeks anyway, he's been acting like the nervous date picking up the governors daughter. All he needs to do is stay polite, and stay on whatever meds is making him polite, and he might make it through.

The passion is gone from Obama supporters and Obama is standing in quicksand. Everything he say's and does, he goes deeper.

If his poll numbers suddenly get 5 points below McCain, and the timing is right he'll drop like a stone and never recover.

I just hope he doesn't bottom out too quickly, and rebound because of pity just before the election (like PIAPS did in the primaries). If he drops below McCain in the polls, then spends 3 months denying it, he won't get a pity rebound. My money will be on denial. If that makes no sense, you haven't noticed the dems penchant for rewarding losers.

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by mwilHITE - 2008/07/01 18:41

If the following article is correct, we've been f****d over by the power elite for several decades; the whole thing is a house of cards, smoke and mirrors. The following scenario seems to make sense; also seems to make whatever we do irrelevant. That is hard to take. I read Quigley's Tragedy and Hope, which in a mere 1000+ pages fleshes out the whole plan of the power elites. BTW, Quigley was gung ho for the plan and got into not a little bit of trouble for penning the tome. They considered it too much information, too soon.

THINK YOU ACTUALLY HAVE A CHOICE?

By Dennis L. Cuddy, Ph.D.

June 30, 2008

power elite (PE) on June 20, 2008 while addressing the Economic Club of Toronto by signaling his support for the Security and Prosperity Partnership. He said the next president will add to the "security and prosperity of North American." He also referred to our "security partnership," the "integration of our economies," and our "shared destiny." He further indicated he would "defend NAFTA without equivocation," and that the U.S. should "deepen its partnerships throughout the hemisphere and the world." Because of upcoming national economic difficulties, McCain would serve only one term. Then the power elite could bring Hillary back in 2012. Regarding the future, on ABC News June 19, 2008, was reported that Basra is an Iraq "success story." This is important because according to H.G. Wells in THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME (1933) Basra, not Baghdad or any other city in the world, is where a global conference will establish a world government.]

In Carroll Quigley's book TRAGEDY AND HOPE (1966) about Cecil Rhodes and the PE, he expresses his support for the PE and says there really should be no significant differences between the two major political parties. Similarly, Skull & Bones (SB) member William Whitney in the late 19th century developed a plan whereby the PE would finance both major political parties and have them alternate power so the public thinks it has a choice when it really doesn't. The first SB member to be elected president was Republican William Howard Taft a century ago in 1908. His opponent, Democrat William Jennings Bryan was also acceptable to the globalist PE because he promised tariff reduction and favored beginning the income tax.

In 1912, SB member Taft ran again, but was defeated by Democrat Woodrow Wilson who was a PE puppet managed by its agent Colonel Edward M. House, a promoter of "socialism as dreamed of by Karl Marx." This is because the PE was interested in establishing a Federal Reserve to get the country in debt. Wilson was re-elected in 1916 with the theme "He kept us out of war," although secret plans had already been made to enter World War I on the side of Britain and the Allies. This was discussed by Lord Esher (a member of Cecil Rhodes' secret Society of the Elect) and a chief Wilson financial backer and PE member, Henry Morgenthau. Wilson's opponent, Charles Evans Hughes, was guaranteed to lose because he failed to renounce support from German-American and Irish-American groups critical of Wilson's pro-British policies.

In 1920, Warren Harding was elected president. Although he was a patriotic nationalist opposed to the League of Nations, he was controlled by party bosses "owned" by the PE. His opponent, James Cox, was acceptable to the PE because of his support of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Calvin Coolidge was elected president in 1924 with the support of the PE, who approved his advocacy of a World Court, arms limitation, and international cooperation to maintain peace. His opponent, John Davis, was also acceptable to the PE because he advocated disarmament and the League of Nations.

In 1928, Herbert Hoover was elected president because he continued Coolidge's foreign policy. His opponent, Al Smith, was also acceptable to the PE because his protégé was PE puppet Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR). Although Hoover was acceptable to the PE, he was defeated in 1932 by FDR who was greatly influenced by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). On November 21, 1933 FDR wrote PE agent Col. House that they both knew the PE "owned" the U.S.

Colonel House's promotion of socialism fit with FDR's policies, which were described as socialist by Al Smith in 1936. In that year, FDR won re-election over Alf Landon who proposed no alternatives to FDR's socialist programs, thus ensuring his defeat during those hard times.

Similarly, in 1940 the PE (J. P. Morgan interests and Lord Lothian of Cecil Rhodes' secret society) had Wendell Willkie run against FDR so that Roosevelt's re-election would be assured. After the election, Willkie went on missions for FDR and wrote ONE WORLD (1943) advocating world government.

FDR won re-election again in 1944 after doing the PE's bidding by making a secret deal with Stalin on December 1, 1943 to give the Soviets Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, etc. after World War II. FDR's opponent, Thomas Dewey, was also acceptable to the PE because he, like FDR, advocated an international organization (UN) to maintain world peace.

In 1948, Harry Truman was elected president. Though most people remember Truman as an all-American fellow, he was actually a supporter of world government, carrying in his pocket Lord Tennyson's poem "Locksley Hall" about a "Federation of the World." This made him acceptable to the PE, as was his 1948 opponent, Thomas Dewey, mentioned already.

In 1952, Dwight Eisenhower was elected president and, like Truman, he is perceived as a strong nationalist. Actually, he was puppet of PE managers and CFR leaders John Foster Dulles and his brother Allen Dulles. "Ike" was chosen by the PE because he was a globalist, advocating a "global flag" according to the July 24, 1951 CHICAGO TRIBUNE. His opponent, CFR member Adlai Stevenson, was also a globalist who wanted to continue FDR's New Deal programs, thus making him acceptable to the PE.

Eisenhower was re-elected in 1956, later supporting a federal Atlantic Union and an international school "purged of national bias." His opponent was again Adlai Stevenson.

In 1960, John Kennedy became president and was acceptable to the PE because he was a globalist, advocating complete disarmament, deferring to a new UN peace force. His opponent, Richard Nixon, was also a globalist and CFR member who supported a federal Atlantic Union as desired by the PE. In 1947, Congressman Nixon had introduced a resolution to allow the UN to enact, interpret and enforce world law. In 1964, Lyndon Johnson won the presidency, expanding the PE's no-win Vietnam War that diminished patriotic values among American young adults. His opponent was Barry Goldwater, who was a rarity, not acceptable to the PE, which conducted a major media campaign scaring the public that Goldwater would start a nuclear war if elected.

In 1968, Nixon became president after writing in the CFR's FOREIGN AFFAIRS of nations' disposition "to evolve regional approaches to development needs and to the evolution of a new world order," a key element of Cecil Rhodes' secret society's plan "to take the government of the whole world." Nixon further endeared himself to the PE by telling Rhodes Scholar reporter Howard Smith that he (Nixon) was a Keynesian (socialist) in economics. Nixon's opponent, Hubert Humphrey, was acceptable to the PE because he had supported FDR and LBJ's policies regarding the Vietnam War.

Republican Nixon won re-election in 1972 against George McGovern, whom the PE set up to lose overwhelmingly because of his extreme anti-war views. This was necessary at this time because the PE wanted Nixon to open the door to Communist China via PE agent and CFR member Henry Kissinger. In 1976, it was time for the PE's "alternation of power" mentioned at the first of this article. Democrat Jimmy Carter became president, winning over Republican Gerald Ford who had simply filled out Nixon's second term and wasn't very knowledgeable, though he was a CFR member and also acceptable to the PE. The PE had groomed Carter as a globalist, having Trilateral Commission (TC) director and CFR member Zbigniew Brzezinski become his National Security Advisor and many CFR members part of his administration.

Ronald Reagan defeated Carter in 1980 and is perceived as a nationalist. However, the PE "persuaded" him to have

globalist and SB member George H.W. Bush (who sponsored a federal Atlantic Union in Congress in 1969) as his vice-president. The PE also knew Reagan had been a member of the World Federalist Association, and during a May 28-30, 1983, G-7 Economic Summit, Reagan pleased the PE by claiming "only a world currency will work." This assured his re-election the next year (1984) against Walter Mondale, who was also acceptable to the PE because he was a CFR and TC member.

In 1988, globalist George H.W. Bush became president and proclaimed the need for a "new world order." Once again, the PE provided a soft opponent in Michael Dukakis, whom the PE had surrounded with CFR advisors (seven of his eight foreign policy advisors).

In 1992, it was once again time for the PE's "alternation of power," as Republican Bush lost to Democrat Bill Clinton, who was mentored at Georgetown University by Prof. Carroll Quigley mentioned earlier. Clinton was a Rhodes Scholar who supported world government. The PE wanted NAFTA, GATT and the World Trade Organization, and Clinton unlike Bush could persuade enough Democrats to vote for them.

Bill Clinton won re-election in 1996 over Bob Dole who was endorsed by Rhodes Scholar and CFR member James Woolsey, former Clinton CIA director. Dole was also acceptable to the PE as he was greatly beholden to globalists such as Dwayne Andreas, head of Archer-Daniels-Midland, which was founded by SB member Thomas Daniels.

Alternating power once again, SB member and globalist George W. Bush became president in 2000, defeating Vice-President Al Gore. Gore's father was vice-president of Occidental Petroleum under Armand Hammer, who was close to all Soviet dictators. Vice-President Gore was also acceptable to the PE, and on October 12, 1998 announced his globalist "Declaration of Interdependence."

In 2004, the PE saw to it that Bush's re-election was assured as his opponent, fellow globalist and SB member John Kerry (CFR member), ran a lack-luster campaign.

Regarding the 2008 presidential election, I have in recent articles already explained how Senators John McCain and Barack Obama are both acceptable to the PE and are surrounded by CFR advisors. The point is that in election after election, the people think they have a choice but they really don't.

In 1912, Woodrow Wilson said: "...We have come to be... one of the most completely controlled and dominated governments in the civilized world – no longer a government of conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and duress of small groups of dominant men...." The PE have been in control ever since and are currently manipulating events to bring about a world currency. In the June 6, 2008 ASIA TIMES, Hossain Askari and Nourredine Krichene wrote "Time Overdue for a World Currency," in which they stated: "The world economy is suffering from high inflation stemming from overly expansionary policy in the United States." Their proposed solution – a world currency! Just what the P.E. wants.

=====

Re:THREE SIGN POSTS TO A MCCAIN VICTORY

Posted by jsnape - 2008/07/13 06:01

Followup to my last post about Obama in quicksand, and everything he does puts him deeper:

The race for the White House is tied. The Rasmussen Reports daily Presidential Tracking Poll for Saturday shows Barack Obama and John McCain each attract 43%

<http://tinyurl.com/2zlw2z>

He can't stay left and he CAN'T move to the center.

Now, in the works is a big violent demonstration outside the republican convention called the RNC Welcoming Committee. That's going to be a win/lose situation with republicans coming out the net winner in that.

<http://www.nornc.org/>

=====