



Forums of Pravda.Ru > Main Forum

Rockefeller shutting down Internet - Bills 773 & 778

User Name Remember Me?
Password

[Register](#) [Blogs](#) [FAQ](#) [Members List](#) [Calendar](#) [Today's Posts](#) [Search](#)

[Post Reply](#)

Page 1 of 2 1 2 >

Thread Tools Display Modes

Today, 03:55 PM #1

[Revo](#)
Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2008
Posts: 559

Rockefeller shutting down Internet - Bills 773 & 778


These criminals know thier game is up because of the internet.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jCkCWxv3kUE>

[Quote](#)

Today, 06:17 PM #2

[RobertD](#)
Registered User



Join Date: Jan 2006
Location: Canada
Posts: 9,356

We're going to shut down Offhisrockers, and that gang of godless thieves and murderers who want to murder all the christians on the planet starting with the americans in fema camps... after they gag them and disarm them of course.

No-Fly list is your ticket to FEMA death camp.
<http://jjrd.tripod.com/>

[Quote](#)

Today, 06:21 PM #3

[sb11](#)
Registered User



Join Date: Feb 2004
Location: USA
Posts: 32,402


Senator Rockefeller's totalitarian views, a direct violation of the 1st amendment, one repudiated ever since the Alien and Sedition Act was thrown out, are shared by the former Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell and Obama's current director Admiral Dennis C. Blair.

Last edited by sb11 : Today at 06:35 PM.

[Quote](#)

Today, 07:13 PM #4

[Zharkov](#)
Registered User



Join Date: Oct 2003
Location: Casino Obama - Where change is worthless
Posts: 10,315

The internet is an extremely valuable source of intelligence on international and domestic terrorism, and I think the government has within it an opposition that wants to keep the internet just as it is.

Without the internet, our secret services will be blind, as they rely heavily on the internet for all sorts of things.

Rockefeller is showing himself to be the idiot everyone thinks he is.

[Quote](#)

Today, 07:18 PM #5

[Revo](#)
Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2008
Posts: 559

Quote:

Originally Posted by [Zharkov](#)

The internet is an extremely valuable source of intelligence on international and domestic terrorism, and I think the government has within it an opposition that wants to keep the internet just as it is.

Without the internet, our secret services will be blind, as they rely heavily on the internet for all sorts of things.

Rockefeller is showing himself to be the idiot everyone thinks he is.

Sorry, but who are the terrorists to you?

Have you noticed how many alleged accused terrorists by governments are found not guilty when they go to court?

Don't tell me that you can't see that this terror bullshit is simply Governments terrorising its citizens yet?

God I thought we were making headway!

[Quote](#)

Today, 07:28 PM #6

[Zharkov](#)

Registered User



Join Date: Oct 2003
 Location: Casino Obama -
 Where change is worthless
 Posts: 10,315

Quote:

Originally Posted by [Revo](#)*Sorry, but who are the terrorists to you?**Have you noticed how many alleged accused terrorists by governments are found not guilty when they go to court?**Don't tell me that you can't see that this terror bullshit is simply Governments terrorising its citizens yet?**God I thought we were making headway!*

Can you not view anything from another perspective?

The government uses the internet for all kinds of things and it depends on it to reach ordinary citizens to influence their opinions. Shutting down the internet would reduce the influence of government agents and also reduce their ability to get an accurate view of public opinion. In short, they would become blind once they control the input into the internet. They would see only what their own people wanted them to see.



Today, 07:42 PM

#7

[Revo](#)

Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2008
 Posts: 559

Quote:

Originally Posted by [Zharkov](#)*Can you not view anything from another perspective?**The government uses the internet for all kinds of things and it depends on it to reach ordinary citizens to influence their opinions. Shutting down the internet would reduce the influence of government agents and also reduce their ability to get an accurate view of public opinion. In short, they would become blind once they control the input into the internet. They would see only what their own people wanted them to see.*

ummm, you saw the Zionazi stooges walk out in tandem in thier pre planned "when Amhadenejad speaks" script didn't you? That was propaganda! But the internet is shooting that farce to pieces!

Do you get it yet?

The internet is giving control of the government back to the people, the Rothschilds who are in control of all ZOG politicians cannot survive when thier chosen polictians cannot control the people. There has never been a better invention ever in human history than the internet, it guarantees your freedom. Tell me what better invention than that?

Now you wonder why the ZIONIST slime that want thier new world order hate and are trying to control the internet?

Did you even know about Rothschilds before you heard about them on the internet? They have been around causing shit for everyone for 200 years! But you only learned about them because of the free uncontrolled internet, right?

You want the internet to be like the MSM? that's what Rockefellers want, you bet they do, thier criminal shit will stop if they don't get it!

Last edited by Revo : Today at 07:50 PM.



Today, 07:59 PM

#8

[Zharkov](#)

Registered User



Join Date: Oct 2003
 Location: Casino Obama -
 Where change is worthless
 Posts: 10,315

The internet was designed to withstand a massive nuclear attack across the entire United States. And now it has become global. Today, the internet cannot be shut down or controlled by any single country.

Years ago, much of the internet was located within the U.S., but today, the U.S. could control only the servers located in the US, and not elsewhere without the consent of other governments. That consent is unlikely as long as governments wish to remain sovereign. So shutting down the US portion would not stop much of anything now.

There is also the little problem of the US Constitution. Once a free speech platform is allowed to the public, the government cannot arbitrarily withdraw it merely because some government officials do not like what is said.

A shutdown of the US portion of the internet would result in thousands of lawsuits, some of which may be directed at Rockefeller, personally. At least mine would. I would quickly sue him personally for violating my civil rights if he succeeded to block lawful use of the internet. But I am certain he won't succeed. I think most major corporations like the internet just as it is. It creates new business for them.



Today, 08:05 PM

#9

[Zharkov](#)

Registered User



Join Date: Oct 2003
 Location: Casino Obama -
 Where change is worthless
 Posts: 10,315

There are two sides to free speech.

One is that Mahmoud has the right to say whatever he wants in front of the U.N., because the U.N. is located in the U.S. and the U.S. protects free speech on the instant a person crosses the border.

The second is that the listener has the right to leave if he does not like what he hears and so a speaker has no right to a captive audience.

If the listeners at the U.N. wanted to hear Mahmoud's views, they would not have left.

It's called freedom.

A lot of people died in America to make sure we keep that freedom.

A few people are dying in Iran today in order to get that freedom - such as the blogger who died in Iran's prison.

If Iranian officials did not like what he wrote, they could turn away and look at something else. But no, they preferred to kill him. If Mahmoud had Iranian rules at the U.N., he might not have left the building alive.



Today, 08:06 PM #10

[Revo](#)
Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2008
Posts: 559

Quote:

Originally Posted by [Zharkov](#)

The internet was designed to withstand a massive nuclear attack across the entire United States. And now it has become global. Today, the internet cannot be shut down or controlled by any single country.

Years ago, much of the internet was located within the U.S., but today, the U.S. could control only the servers located in the US, and not elsewhere without the consent of other governments. That consent is unlikely as long as governments wish to remain sovereign. So shutting down the US portion would not stop much of anything now.


There is also the little problem of the US Constitution. Once a free speech platform is allowed to the public, the government cannot arbitrarily withdraw it merely because some government officials do not like what is said.

A shutdown of the US portion of the internet would result in thousands of lawsuits, some of which may be directed at Rockefeller, personally. At least mine would. I would quickly sue him personally for violating my civil rights if he succeeded to block lawful use of the internet. But I am certain he won't succeed. I think most major corporations like the internet just as it is. It creates new business for them.

So if it violates the first amendment why is this Rockefeller criminal mother f ucker even trying it? Why would he try it if he thought he had no chance, or he was gonna get sued?


The US government is owned and they have passed many illegal laws already and got away with it and no one including you said Jackshit about all the other illegal laws like wire tapping being passed. So why am I supposed to believe all of a sudden Americans can stop this shite?

The first amendment is protected by the second amendment, get that in your head!



Today, 08:13 PM #11


[telly2](#)
Registered User



Join Date: Aug 2008
Location: KangarooKoalaStan
Posts: 1,604

Revo...this is one area in which we agree. This Rockefeller is a complete ultra-rightist nuthead. Having watched his confused and nonsensical speech on Youtube I'm convinced he is nothing but a complete idiot. Personally I think there'd be a major revolt and loss of control in the States if any branch of government tried something so foolish as to kill off internet access.

I am leaving soon and you'll forgive me if I speak bluntly. The universe grows smaller every day and the threat of aggression by any group anywhere can no longer be tolerated. There must be security for all or no one is secure. Now this does not mean giving up any freedom, except the freedom to act irresponsibly. Your ancestors knew this when they made laws to govern themselves and hired policemen to enforce them.



Today, 08:15 PM #12

[Revo](#)
Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2008
Posts: 559


Quote:

Originally Posted by [telly2](#)

Revo...this is one area in which we agree. This Rockefeller is a complete ultra-rightist nuthead. Having watched his confused and nonsensical speech on Youtube I'm convinced he is nothing but a complete idiot. Personally I think there'd be a major revolt and loss of control in the States if any branch of government tried something so foolish as to kill off internet access.


Hey telly2.
They doing the same in Australia, can ya give us an update on how the Aussies are fighting back against internet censorship?

Regards



Today, 08:23 PM #13

[telly2](#)
Registered User



Join Date: Aug 2008
Location: KangarooKoalaStan
Posts: 1,604

Quote:


Originally Posted by [Revo](#)

*Hey telly2.
They doing the same in Australia, can ya give us an update on how the Aussies are fighting back against internet censorship?*

Regards

There has been quite but massive opposition from individuals and major ISPs who have all shaken their heads in disgust at the relevant minister's (Stephen Conroy) actions. The ISPs have pointed out that any move to "filter" the Internet will slow our Internet access down (and Australia's internet speeds are super fast to begin with...) and may be unlawful as regards free-speech. Each set-back has put Conroy on the back foot and the rest of the government is slowly wishing the issue (and Conroy) would go away. Even the conservative Liberal party is dead-set against the plan and would reverse it if they came to power, were the plan to be put into full effect. My opinion (shared by many down here) is that the bluff and bluster will continue but the whole thing will die a slow and quiet death...thank God.

I am leaving soon and you'll forgive me if I speak bluntly. The universe grows smaller every day and the threat of aggression by any group anywhere can no longer be tolerated. There must be security for all or no one is secure. Now this does not mean giving up any freedom, except the freedom to act irresponsibly. Your ancestors knew this when they made laws to govern themselves and hired policemen to enforce them.



Today, 08:39 PM #14

[Revo](#)
Registered User

Join Date: Dec 2008

Quote:

Originally Posted by [telly2](#)

Posts: 559

There has been quite but massive opposition from individuals and major ISPs who have all shaken their heads in disgust at the relevant minister's (Stephen Conroy) actions. The ISPs have pointed out that any move to "filter" the Internet will slow our Internet access down (and Australia's internet speeds are super fast to begin with...) and may be unlawful as regards free-speech. Each set-back has put Conroy on the back foot and the rest of the government is slowly wishing the issue (and Conroy) would go away. Even the conservative Liberal party is dead-set against the plan and would reverse it if they came to power, were the plan to be put into full effect. My opinion (shared by many down here) is that the bluff and bluster will continue but the whole thing will die a slow and quiet death...thank God.

Pathetic really!

Your whole hope that free speech continues is that all you Aussies hope the issue with this government of censoring free speech just goes away!

Then the opposition will change it all if they win???? WTF, don't you get it yet, you have a two party system just like the USA, they are both owned, they both follow orders otherwise none of those politicians in both these parties would be politicians.

John Howard Liberal party Prime Minister Banned guns in Australia, right?

Kevin Rudd Labour Party Prime Minister is trying to ban free speech on the internet, right?

What's the difference between the two?:



Today, 08:48 PM

#15

telly2

Registered User



Join Date: Aug 2008
Location: KangarooKoalaStan
Posts: 1,604

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Revo**
Pathetic really!

Your whole hope that free speech continues is that all you Aussies hope the issue with this government of censoring free speech just goes away!

Then the opposition will change it all if they win???? WTF, don't you get it yet, you have a two party system just like the USA, they are both owned, they both follow orders otherwise none of those politicians in both these parties would be politicians.

John Howard Liberal party Prime Minister Banned guns in Australia, right?

Kevin Rudd Labour Party Prime Minister is trying to ban free speech on the internet, right?

What's the difference between the two?:

Well...they are both very aware that the last election was really quite close. It was won by Rudd on policies alone BUT the Internet policy was buried deep in the appendices of their policy documents and really only indicated "filtering" of the net to get rid of child porn (a noble pursuit). The other nonsense was dreamed up by Conroy and his stupid lackeys. The Libs have seen the effect this is all having in the opinion polls and have grabbed onto it, hoping it will boost their chances come the next election. Rudd and his mates have seen the damage and fallout from the proposed Conroy plan and are slowly, slowly dumping him, and the plan, and heading south. Take my word for it, it will never happen. When you have the largest and most-conservative ISPs like Optus and Telstra scoffing at the plan you have a public left wondering why the heck any government would try to make it fly.

I am leaving soon and you'll forgive me if I speak bluntly. The universe grows smaller every day and the threat of aggression by any group anywhere can no longer be tolerated. There must be security for all or no one is secure. Now this does not mean giving up any freedom, except the freedom to act irresponsibly. Your ancestors knew this when they made laws to govern themselves and hired policemen to enforce them.



Post Reply

Page 1 of 2 1 2 >

<< Previous Thread | Next Thread >>

Posting Rules

You **may not** post new threads
You **may not** post replies
You **may not** post attachments
You **may not** edit your posts

vB code is **On**
Smilies are **On**
[IMG] code is **On**
HTML code is **Off**

Forum Jump

Main Forum

Go

All times are GMT +3. The time now is 11:43 PM.

Contact Us - Forums of Pravda.Ru - Archive - Top

Powered by vBulletin® Version 3.6.8
Copyright ©2000 - 2009, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.

Rambler's Top100 [Rambler's Top100](#) Ðáéøëïá@Mail.ru 1)d.write('--'+>)//-->