

FREDERICK WILLIAM DAME

CENSORING OBAMA

History has always shown that assassination is a political expedient to get rid of a regime and absolutist rulers.

- The Author

Prelude

Barack Hussein Obama was illegally elected to the Office of President of the United States of America in 2008 and illegally re-elected in 2012. In the March Report of *The Obama Timeline*, Don Fredrick points out what American constitutionalists have known concerning Barack Hussein Obama's birth and what the American enemedia, the progressives, obots, leftists, dumber-downers, and the Democratic Party refuse to admit. It is this: "According to Kenya's constitution, a person born of a Kenyan parent—irrespective of the place of birth—automatically becomes a citizen of Kenya. Obama was therefore a Kenyan citizen at birth, by virtue of his father's citizenship."¹ Therefore, Barack Hussein Obama is an illegal occupier of the Oval Office.

Since 2008 up to the present time, Barack Hussein Obama has constructed out of this usurped public office a regime of political Absolutism unknown in the history of the United States of America. Barack Hussein Obama's Absolutism is characterized by:

1. complete disregard of the supreme law of the land, the *Constitution for the United States of America*;²
2. by the isolation of the United States Congress from its legal right to political action and participation in the decision-making processes;³

¹ For the reasons why Barack Hussein Obama is a putative president and usurper, read the following:
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/acountrywithoutapresident.pdf>.
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/questionsthesupremecourt.pdf>.
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/americanpatriotvsunconvictedfelon.pdf>.
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/theconstitutionfortheunitedstatesofamerica.pdf>.
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/reportonnaturalborncitizenfraud.pdf>.
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/thecolonialfrenchconnection.pdf>.
<http://www.theobamatimeline.com/id706.html> is the source of the quotation.

² <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/theconstitutionfortheunitedstatesofamerica.pdf>.

³ <http://atlantablackstar.com/2012/05/23/obama-avoids-congress-and-congresss-feelings-are-hurt/>.
<http://www.independentsentinel.com/2011/10/obama-tells-his-advisors-to-avoid-congress/>; <http://nation.foxnews.com/fiscal-cliff/2012/11/27/obama-avoids-personal-negotiations-congress-fiscal-cliff-fight>.

3. by chronic lying to the American voting and non-voting, legal citizens regardless of the political policy.⁴

Barack Hussein Obama has governed by signing over 150 executive orders;⁵ by naming czars to circumvent Congressional approval of position appointments;⁶ by disregarding "state laws and state constitutional amendments prohibiting the enforcement of ObamaCare (thus guaranteeing that) federal agents from the Department of Health and Human Services will assume absolute control over states' health insurance industry and regulation in states that refuse to comply with the federal healthcare mandates;"⁷ and by *fait accompli*, literally *accomplished fact*, that is, something has already happened and it is unlikely to be reversed. In politics it is also called a *done deal*. With Barack Hussein Obama being involved it smacks of Chicago thug politics.

⁴ The illegals, or rather not-yet-documented Democratic Party voters, do not care if Barack Hussein Obama lies. For Barack Hussein Obama's chronic proficiency in lying read:

<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/obamaberlinspeechcritique.pdf>
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/obamadncconventionspeech.pdf>
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/comradeforkedtonguerepaired17jan2011.pdf>
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/anexpose.pdf>
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/obamasliestothebritishparliament.pdf>
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/thelyingaddress.pdf>
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/donotcallobamaaliar.pdf>
<http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/ataletoldbyadopedupidiot.pdf>

⁵ <http://1461days.blogspot.de/2009/01/current-list-of-president-obamas.html#.UVLN4FdY-k>.
<http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/executive-orders/obama.html>. The most recent Barack Hussein Obama *Executive Order* establishes the Presidential Commission on Election Administration. Critics point out that this will nationalize America's "elections for partisan advantage." The Commission will establish "the number, location, management, operation, and design of polling places; the training, recruitment, and number of poll workers; the efficient management of voter rolls and poll books; voter education; and voting accessibility for individuals with disabilities, limited English proficiency, and other special needs." A "Virginia local elections official called the move, 'Frightening,' adding, 'Because of my position, I'm non-partisan, which is precisely why I find this to be so troubling. The genius of American government is rooted in its separation of powers – not only between the branches of federal government, but also between the levels of government in general – state and Federal. When we have a commission comprised only of individuals appointed by one man, from one party, from only one branch of the government, that will be setting rules and making suggestions as to how local elections should be managed it's beyond alarming – it's just plain wrong.'" <http://princevega.com/category/breaking-news-2/>.

⁶ <http://www.glennbeck.com/content/articles/article/198/29391/>.
<http://answers.sunnyinla.com/2009/06/how-many-obama-czars-names.html>.
<http://frontpagemag.com/2011/mike-bauer/obama%E2%80%99s-czars-and-their-left-wing-affiliations/>.

⁷ The quote is from *The Obama Timeline* (March 2013) at <http://www.theobamatimeline.com/id706.html>. See also: <http://www.thepostemail.com/2013/03/27/armed-federal-agents-to-impose-obamacare-on-states/> and <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/constitution/item/14892-obama-admin-ignores-nullification-federal-agents-will-enforce-obamacare>.

The Definitions of the Motif

One prime method that the pre-Obama regime activists and the Obama regime itself have used in censoring, whether directly or by an alternate execution of censorship, is by annihilation. Indeed, we can call it absolutist-enacted annihilation by use of political assassination. It behooves us to present the definitions, etymology, and the uses of political assassination. For the purposes of this essay the following exact definitions apply:

1. **Absolutism** is a "form of state government in which all power is vested in the monarch and his advisors."⁸ These singular persons' decisions are not controlled by law. In many cases the Absolutist disregards law. The word **absolutism** derives from the Indo-European word stem *leu*¹, meaning *to cut apart, to separate*. This has transferred into modern English as one person or group of persons separating themselves from the mainstream of a society.
2. **Annihilate** means "to destroy completely, to wipe out, to reduce to non-existence, to nullify, to render void, abolish."⁹ The word derives from the Indo-European stem *ne*, meaning *not*. Thus **to annihilate** causes something to become not, i.e., to become nothing.
3. **Assassination** is the "murder of a prominent person or political figure by a surprise attack, usually for payment or political reasons."¹⁰ The word derives from the *hashshashin*, ḥashshāshīyīn, Hashishin, Hashashiyyin, in Persian حشّاشین, literally meaning *hasisheaters*, supposedly because they took hashish to build up their courage before they committed the act of assassination. The etymological root is from the Arabic حشيش (*ḥashīsh*).¹¹ Founded by Hassan-i-Sabbah (1050?-1124) of the Nizari branch of the Ismā'īlī Shia, the assassins evolved from members of a secret religious and military society located in the fortress of Alamut in Iran as early as the 8th century and continuing into the 14th century. Due to political and religious reasons during this time, the assassins killed rival members

⁸ William Morris, editor. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, Houghton Mifflin company, Boston: 1976.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Bernard Lewis, *The Assassins: a radical sect in Islam*, Widenfeld and Nicolson, London: 1967, pp. 11–12.

of the Muslim Abbasid Dynasty, the Seljuq Turkish Sunni Muslim Dynasty, and above all Christian elitist crusaders. The first known use of the word **assassination** in the English language is by William Shakespeare (1564-1616) in *Macbeth* (1601-1607).¹²

4. **Censoring** is the examination and expurgating of an adversary.¹³ The word derives from the Indo-European stem **kens-**, meaning *to proclaim, to speak solemnly*, which evolved into Latin *cēnsēre, to judge, to assess, to estimate*.

The Motif

Human history is rife with dictatorships and totalitarianism. In fact, when seen through a particular perspective, human history seems to be defined by the struggle between despots and the popular will. It is extremely difficult to determine how or why an extraordinarily small minority of the human population is able to rule over the sprawling majority. However, proving that this is the case is a much easier task. The struggle to gain a political voice is often motivated by moral issues. Also, it is just as often spurred by economic issues. This means that the same elite minority that stands against popular will in terms of social and cultural ideals, also stands against the popular will on economic issues. It is thus a good strategy for any self-interested ruler or despot to deny cultural and economic freedom and opportunity to the masses.

The reason for this is self-evident in that no member of an *elite* class could remain *elite* in a truly egalitarian society. Because no truly egalitarian society exists – nor has one ever existed – the popular will is often expressed through subversive conduct such as counter-culture and political demonstration. When these avenues of recourse are taken away and the rule of a despot becomes increasingly severe, the populist will toward emancipation often becomes violent and the violent expression against political Absolutism sometimes takes the form of political assassination. The act of political assassination is distinct from non-political murder in that political assassination, whether merely attempted or actually carried out, has as its aim the elimination of a specific person (or persons) in order to achieve a political end.

Already in 1977 in his article *Political Assassination Events as a Cross-Cultural Form of Alternative Justice*, the sociologist Nachman Ben-Yehuda offered a well-reasoned and quasi-comprehensive definition of political assassination. According to

¹² *Macbeth*, act I, scene vii, Macbeth's Castle.

¹³ *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, op. cit., entries *cancel* and *expurgate*.

Nachman Ben-Yehuda, political assassination can be convincingly defined as "the discriminate, deliberate, intentionally planned, and serious attempt(s) ... to kill a specific social actor for political reasons having something to do with the political position (or role) of the victim."¹⁴ This definition is, of course, like the one above, incomplete in the sense that it makes no judgment regarding the philosophical or ethical implications of political assassination. The question of what kind of moral impacts and ethical implications are created by political assassinations is a highly fluid and subjective question.¹⁵ In fact, the fluidity and ambiguity that is associated with the topic may well be the most defining feature of political assassination. On the one hand, political assassination appears not only justifiable but politically expedient. On the other hand, the use of political assassination can be shown to impede freedom and justice as well as to severely impact states of war and peace.

Another important matter to keep in mind about political assassination is that such action is carried out in many cases in flagrant opposition to the rule of law. Indeed, it is intrinsically obvious that the use of political assassination is generally enacted illegally. The basic rule with regard to legality associated with political assassinations is that "decisions to assassinate are typically not the result of a fair legal procedure, based on a 'due process.'"¹⁶ One of the reasons why this is such a pertinent point with regard to the use of political assassinations is because the use of assassination is typically not something that is in any way controlled. While it might be associated with organizations such as cabals, conspirators, and even governments – the use of political assassination is basically an uncontrollable political force limited only by capacity and target access.

Another important point to keep in mind about political assassination is that it represents an action of focused political will, rather than a general action of terror. There are distinct differences between acts of terrorism and political assassinations. The first difference is that a political assassination can be carried out without any association with the generation of terror. This is due to the fact that "The target of a political assassination

¹⁴ Nachman Ben-Yehuda, *Political Assassination Events as a Cross-Cultural Form of Alternative Justice* in *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 38, no. 1-2: 1997 located at <http://www.questia.com/library/1G1-19788702/political-assassination-events-as-a-cross-cultural>.

¹⁵ The terms *ethics* and *morals* are often interchangeable. *Ethics* is the study of the nature of moral principles that people make in their choices. The study of *ethics* is called the philosophy of morals or moral philosophy. *Morals* have to do with the judgment of right or wrong, of goodness or badness, of good or evil.

¹⁶ Nachman Ben-Yehuda, op. cit.

plot is a very specific individual; the target of terrorism is not."¹⁷ In other words, the act of political assassination should be viewed as a tool which is meant to achieve a very definite and specific political result. Of course, this means that political assassination is a tremendously complex and profound ethical topic. It can be argued quite successfully that political assassinations stand as a resort of popular justice against the Absolutism of tyranny. However, it can also be argued successfully that political assassination represents the assertion of chaos against the preservation of law.

It is easy to glamorize the impact of political assassination when it is viewed in the context of a totalitarian regime or dictatorship. The usual temptation in these cases is to see the assassination of a corrupt or abusive ruler as a more favorable alternative than a full-scale war of revolution or foreign intervention and occupation. For example, it is often suggested that the assassination of Adolph Hitler (1889-1945) in the mid-1930s would have prevented the outbreak of the Second World War and would have prevented the Holocaust.¹⁸ Hundreds of millions of lives would have been saved with the elimination of this single tyrant. Whether or not this example with reference to Adolf Hitler can literally be substantiated, it shows the way that many people envision the use of political assassination to attain positive results. It demonstrates that in relation to Absolutism and tyranny, political assassination can frequently be regarded as a practical and ethically viable tool for political change.

This kind of reasoning associates political assassination with justice. What is interesting about this association is that political assassination is, as previously mentioned, almost always undertaken in opposition to law. Therefore, the association with political assassination is peculiarly based on an ethical moral justification that is entirely outside of the law. This means that whatever ethical principles human beings use with regard to creating laws governing the use of political assassination, they stand in ambiguous opposition to how human beings seem to regard the justifiable use of political assassination against authoritarianism and Absolutism. For most of us, it is easy to understand that even with regard to formal ethics, political assassination "can be interpreted sociologically as an alternative and popular system of justice. We can easily view this form of killing within the conceptual context of conflict resolution."¹⁹ The

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Counting plans to assassinate Hitler, the failed attempts, and possible killing via war attacks, there were 58 attempts to murder/assassinate Adolf Hitler between November 1921 and February 1945. See the historical presentations at <http://valkyrie.greyfalcon.us/hitlermurder.htm> and Christian Zentner, Friedemann Bedürftig, *The Encyclopedia of the Third Reich*, Macmillan, New York: pp. 47-48.

¹⁹ Nachman Ben-Yehuda, op. cit.

idealization of political assassination almost always stems from the ethical framework depicted above. This means that when political assassination is used against authoritarian oppression, it will most likely be viewed as ethically justifiable.

The danger, of course, with this generalization is that anyone committing a political assassination could use the argument that they were motivated to take action against oppression and tyranny because it was ethically justifiable. Obviously, a famous example of this is the case of John Wilkes Booth (1838-1865) who assassinated President Abraham Lincoln (1809-1865, President 1861-1865). As is well-known, Booth was a member of a group of conspirators who sought to kill Lincoln in order to bring back the Confederate South from its defeat during the American Civil War (1861-1865). The killing of President Lincoln was viewed not only as morally justifiable by Booth and his fellow conspirators, but also viewed by them as an act against tyranny. During the assassination, Booth "entered the presidential box unobserved, shot Lincoln, and vaulted to the stage (breaking his left leg in the process) shouting 'Sic semper tyrannis!' 'The South is avenged!' "²⁰ The result of Booth's action was not only to bring greater suffering to the Southern States in the post-Civil War era, but also to cement Abraham Lincoln's stature as an icon of freedom and as one of America's greatest leaders and most beloved Presidents.

With regard to the assassination of President Lincoln, the irony of the previously described ethical justification for the use of political assassination is understandable. If all instances of political assassination were based on the exact same circumstances, it would be easy to dismiss the idea that political assassination can be rightly associated with justice. However, history is not only filled with instances of political assassination. History is also filled with instances of political assassination that show its use as a weapon against tyranny and Absolutism.

In these situations the association of political assassination with the idea of justice is far from ironic. Instead, political assassination emerges as a heroic act; or willy-nilly, as a necessary act of humanity. In a case like the assassination of President Lincoln, the application of political assassination is a tragedy. In the case of Adolf Hitler the *lack* of a well-timed political assassination and *lack* of success is a tragedy. The contrast between the two shows not only the wide range of moral implications that are associated with political assassinations, but the way that political assassinations carry profound historical impact.

²⁰ *Thus always to tyrants. Booth, John Wilkes* in *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, 6th ed., Columbia University Press: 2012.

Feliks Gross in the book *The Revolutionary Party: Essays in the Sociology of Politics* notes that while political assassination is an event that is recorded commonly in many past ages and on a continuous basis, it is also a practice that varies in frequency from culture to culture. Gross writes that "Violence and assassination has appeared frequently in the past Among some nations, political assassination ... was frequent. Among others, individual assassination was seldom used."²¹ The variance in use across specific nations and cultures is also a reflection of the way in which the use of political assassination was viewed from a moral or ethical standpoint. In some cultures political assassination was regarded as being more ethical than in others. Similarly, in certain cultures at certain times the moral viewpoint on the use of assassination has been more or less supportive.

In some historical periods the use of political assassination was almost institutionalized. The frequency of assassinations was such that they contributed directly to the fabric of ruling institutions and the reality of law and war. For example, political power was frequently transferred from one ruler to another by means of assassination in many important times in history and across a wide variety of cultures. What is important about the observations that are shown is that they reflect not only the cultural ethic of a particular nation or time-period in connection to the use of political assassinations, but also the way in which the use of political assassinations actually define a given nation or cultural time-period.

"In ancient Rome, in Arab countries of the early medieval periods, in the Ottoman Empire, assassination of competitors to power was widely practiced and was later called 'sultanism.' Such practice diffused the pattern of individual violence and assassination into political struggles."²²

The one constant feature of political assassinations is, as noted earlier, the targeting of a specific person for a specific political purpose. Such a view of the use of political assassination is one which has its basis in the idea of autocratic rule. Consequently, this statement means that political assassination does not represent the opposition to autocratic rule so much as it stands as a representation of the way autocratic power is transferred from one ruler to the next. This brings to light a fine, but

²¹ Feliks Gross, *The Revolutionary Party: Essays in the Sociology of Politics*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT: 1974, p. 172.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 173.

important, distinction between the nature of intent of *popular*-based assassinations and those which are *insider*-based assassinations. In the case of political assassinations that preserve the basic flow of autocratic power, but transfer the authority from one autocratic ruler to another, the use of political assassination cannot be justified on the same moral grounds as assassinations which are targeted against tyrants.

The Mentally Unstable

Ostensibly, the irrational basis of this form of political assassination as an individual act resulting from obsession or mental derangement necessitates yet another moral circumstance that must be weighed in the overall evaluation of political assassinations. This is the conclusion in the case of political assassinations that are undertaken by deranged or mentally unstable people who are acting on unique psychological grounds that may reference political concerns, but simultaneously are completely divorced from reality. This factor allows the realization that the use of political assassination in most free societies is likely to come not from conspiratorial organizations, or power-seeking rivals, but from lone individuals who are mentally unstable.

A most recent example within the last generation was the attempted assassination of President Ronald Reagan on March 30, 1981 upon his leaving the Washington Hilton Hotel in Washington, D. C. No one was killed, although Reagan's Press Secretary James Brady was paralyzed and permanently disabled. The assassin, John Hinckley Jr., was tried in a court of law and found not guilty by reason of insanity. He has been in institutional psychiatric care since his trial.²³

The use of political assassination by the mentally disabled is also an exception to the morally justifiable argument that was previously described. Instead of being ethically justifiable, the act of political assassination by a mentally unstable individual is regarded as tragic and as a consequence of the hazards that are sometimes associated with trying to protect public figures. Accordingly, Feliks Gross remarks that "Political assassination in most cases in democratic countries has been an individual act, a result of psychological obsession or derangement, frequently in times of political crisis or rapid political change."²⁴

²³ <http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/hinckley/hinckleyaccount.html>.

²⁴ Feliks Gross, op. cit., p. 167.

Sociology

By attempting to view the many sides of the debate that circulate around the topic of political assassination, it is possible to see that political assassinations are not only a political issue, they are a moral and philosophical issue, as well as a sociological issue. All political assassinations carry a social consequence. Therefore, they must be examined by means of a sociological perspective. The sociological consequences of a political assassination are clear "when the act or attempt is considered in relation to the three major variables: the social and political situation and process; the actor and his personality; the political party or groups he represents and which support him."²⁵ In many respects the sociological issues associated with political assassinations are the most historically significant. This is because the use of political assassination, particularly in instances where it is used as a populist expression against Absolutism, represents the motion of social evolution that advances generally toward a greater degree of individual freedom and liberty.

Rome

History evidences many cases where political assassination was used by selfish power-seekers or delusional psychopaths. History also shows important instances when political assassination resulted in the termination of abusive and inhumane dictatorships. An article in London's *Daily Mail* titled *Rome's Dirty Dozen; How Violence, Insanity and Incest Destroyed the Empire's 12 Caesars* notes that the succession of Roman Caesars shows the frequency and purpose of political assassinations. The article observes that "there were 12 Caesars ... each with their own little foibles – such as trying to seduce the moon, or praising a tortured entertainer for the musicality of his screams."²⁶ This was symptomatic of the prevalence of tyranny in the Roman era. The article then notes that "Of these Caesars, all despots, most psychopaths and perverts, six were assassinated!"²⁷ The use of assassination as a political means to rid a system of a corrupt or inept ruler was and still is a part of the overall paradigm of political assassination as an act against tyranny. However, the assassination of corrupt or unjust rulers is not always carried out by populist consent even when it results in a greater expansion of populist freedom. The assassination of certain rulers as a result of corruption is carried out by insiders.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 174.

²⁶ *ROME'S DIRTY DOZEN; How Violence, Insanity and Incest Destroyed the Empire's Caesars* in *BOOK OF THE WEEK*, Daily Mail, London: June 8, 2012.

²⁷ Ibid.

For example, in the famous case of the Roman Emperor Gaius Caligula, the popular will of the Roman people stood with Caligula (*Gaius Julius Caesar Augustus Germanicus*, 12 AD-41 AD, Roman Emperor from 37 AD) during the beginning years of his reign. The *Daily Mail* article notes that "At first, the crowd loved Gaius Caligula; it was a year or so into his four-year rule that he degenerated into paranoia, creating a myth of himself as a God-king and ... took an orgiastic delight in slaughter, treating Rome as his own homicidal circus."²⁸ (See pages 26-32 below. Any modern-day American comparison is purely coincidental!) The tyranny of Caligula was quite real and carried profound consequences not only for the Roman people, but for the entire geo-political world at that time. The case of Caligula is not especially more disheartening or brutal than any other number of tyrannical dictatorships that have been present in human history. Yet, Caligula does offer an excellent example of just how profound the impact of a corrupt or tyrannical ruler can be on multiple levels, including political, cultural, and economic levels.

One example of this is the way in which Caligula squandered his own military. (Does this sound familiar?) He was able to court them like puppets to achieve purely political gains. In one extreme case, "His was the first army to invade Britain – though to the disgust of his soldiers it was just a masquerade to impress the Senate. Instead they gathered seashells as the 'spoils' of victory."²⁹ As his brutality and waste increased, Caligula's tyranny became not only a local threat, but an international threat. It is not difficult to imagine what might have been the consequences to the Roman people and to the nations of the world had Caligula lived to enjoy his reign into old-age. If he had not already bankrupted the Roman Empire and weakened its military, he had done his best to try. (Does this not also sound familiar and remind the reader of modern American politics?) For these reasons and many others, "At 41 he was assassinated by his own imperial bodyguard."³⁰ Caligula's failure to live into his *golden years* was a blessing for Rome and for the world. His assassination shows the way in which the killing of a single, specific, political figure can altar history for the better.

Similarly, the assassination of Julius Caesar (100 BC-44 BC, Roman dictator/consul from 49 BC) is noted by historians as one of the most important events in Roman history. Harriet I. Flower asserts in her book *Roman Republics* that the assassination of Caesar was not only one of the signal events of Roman history, but that

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid:

³⁰ Ibid.

it was a focal point for the cultural and political evolution of Rome itself because "historians would choose Caesar's assassination in 44 BC as the turning point, as if his dictatorship was still part of 'republican' politics (because many) thought that Caesar's death would see the immediate and spontaneous re-emergence of a republic, which in the event did not happen."³¹ In this instance, the hoped-for result of increased freedom from tyranny backfired and the assassination of Caesar resulted in an expansion of tyranny. The threat of Absolutism is such that assassinations of single figures are often effective short-term responses, but they also prove to be ineffectual at preventing the resurgence of tyrants.

Russian Royalty

In some instances acts of political assassination actually seem to serve the purpose of maintaining Absolutism, rather than striking against it. One example of this is the way that political assassination was used in the history of Russian royalty in the late eighteenth century. Max Beloff in his study *The Age of Absolutism, 1660-1815*, mentions that in Russian history an act of political assassination can actually be used to mark the end of absolutist rule in that era.

Beloff writes that "The Age of Absolutism in Russia may be said to have extended from the beginning of the personal rule of Peter the Great in 1789 until the assassination of Paul I in 1801."³² The way that assassination functioned in Russian history at this point was to create an atmosphere conducive to conspiracy, which led to assassinations within the elite level of society that failed to fundamentally alter or even interrupt the rule of the monarchy. This shows that political assassination can be used to create movement and change within an existing Absolutist power-structure polity without actually changing the overall strength or position of the tyrannical authority that holds power. In these situations, the ethical implication of political assassination is very different than the circumstances in which political assassination is used against a tyrant with the intent of curbing oppression and Absolutism. This kind of political assassination also differs from those which are committed by mentally unstable actors, as previously described.

Political assassinations that are carried out within existing monarchies are often methods of consolidating rather than ending tyrannical and dynastic power. With regard

³¹ Harriet I. Flower, *Roman Republics*; Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey: 2010, p. 14.

³² Max Beloff, *The Age of Absolutism, 1660-1815*, Hutchinson's University Library, London: 1954, p. 133. Peter the Great (1672—1725) ruled Russia beginning in 1682. Paul I (1754-1801) was Emperor of Russia from 1791 until his assassination.

to the ending of the Age of Absolutism in Russia, the end of Absolutism failed to bring about any kind of true change within the rule of the nobles, for "despite this long succession of conspiracies and assassinations, the monarchy survived with unimpaired strength."³³ This is an important fact to keep in mind with regard to the examination of political assassination as a whole because it demonstrates that political assassination is not only a tool of radicalism, but a tool of conservatism as well. The fact that political assassination manifests itself in so many different ways means that adapting traditional philosophical and ethical systems to the issue is often difficult.

Seeing political assassination from this perspective, it would appear that the use of political assassinations with regard to tyranny and Absolutism exists as a part of a cycle. The cycle is based on just how far the populist will can be ignored or subverted before political assassination is brought forward as a tactic for fighting against oppression and exploitation.

A Matter of Ethics?

As mentioned during the opening of this examination into the ethics of political assassination, it is when the tactic of political assassination is used against despots and Absolutism that the greatest degree of ethical justification is possible. In fact, under circumstances such as those which are associated with tragically brutal and unjust dictators and absolutists, the use of political assassination can actually be considered to be an extension of popular will.

Political assassination can occupy ambiguous ethical grounds. In terms of how the influence of political assassination has been felt in different cultures at different periods of time, the ethical perspective on political assassinations has either been condemning or condoning. In either case, acts of political assassination need not be used only against tyrants. Also, even when political assassination is directed against a tyrant, the assassination is not always carried out by a party that is interested in altering the tyrannical policies associated with the targeted victim. Often, political assassination was and is simply used to replace one tyrant with another tyrant.

Immanuel Kant's Categorical Imperative

In the year 1785 the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) formulated his Categorical Imperative in his work *Die Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*.

³³ Ibid., p. 142.

"Der kategorische Imperativ ist also nur ein einziger und zwar dieser: handle nur nach derjenigen Maxime, durch die du zugleich wollen kannst, das sie ein allgemeines Gesetz werde." (*The categorical imperative is only one and it is this: Act only according to that maxim whereby you can, at the same time, will that it should become a universal law.*)³⁴

With regard to the use of political assassinations in general, an ethical system such as Kant's Categorical Imperative would seem to reject the practice of assassination as being un-ethical under any circumstance. In their study *Kant, Eleventh Reading in Ethics: The Study of Moral Values*, Mortimer J. Adler and Seymour Cain pose a series of questions relative to Kant's formulation of ethics. Among these inquires is the issue of assassination. They write,

"Does the categorical imperative forbid men to assassinate tyrants in order to end their unjust rule and save thousands or millions of men from being harmed or murdered?"³⁵

Naturally, the question is answered by the authors in strict relation to their interpretation of the Kantian ethical perspective. One interesting aspect about the application of Kant's formal ethical system to the issue of political assassination is that it immediately disregards the emotional and subjective psychological attributes of the issue.

Basically, according to Kant's Categorical Imperative, it is necessary that any ethical law has its basis in a rational appraisal of the value of a given decision or behavior. According to Kant a moral act need not have its base in any kind of emotional response because "If the act were moral, it would not be motivated primarily by compassion and benevolence, and it would not be a prudential means of attaining an end beyond itself."³⁶ Therefore, the rational approach to morality and ethical decision-making is the only approach allowed under Kant's ethics. Another aspect of Kant's Categorical Imperative is that any ethical law must be universal. This means that with regard to political

³⁴ <http://korpora.org/kant/aa04/421.html>.

³⁵ Mortimer J. Adler and Seymour Cain, *Kant, Eleventh Reading in Ethics: The Study of Moral Values*, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Chicago: 1962, p. 224.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

assassinations it is not appropriate to change the ethical parameters on a case-by-case basis. Under Kant's ethical system all acts of political assassination hold the same level of ethical viability and there are no alterations or distinctions due to the context of the assassination.

The basic, ethical justification that has been given for political assassination in the presented discussion above has been that political assassination when used against tyrants for the purpose of expressing a popular will against oppression can be regarded as an ethically good act. The reason that this justification is claimed to be viable is because it asserts a belief that the consequences of the admittedly unlawful act of assassination will produce a greater good despite the immediate negative impact of murder and law-breaking. Such a view is often characterized as one which believes that *ends justify the means*. It is unlikely that any genuine argument in support of political assassination as an ethically sound act could be made that does not to some extent rest on this basic belief. In Kant's view, however, it is never permissible to sacrifice the universality of an ethical conviction in order to attain a desired result, not even if the desired result is ethical.

In terms of how Kant's Categorical Imperative stands in relation to the issue of political assassinations, even those which are directed against tyrants, the best way to explain the ethical paradigm at work is that political assassination violates Kant's precepts due to its lack of being universally applicable and also because it is predicted on a knowing breach of existing law. In Kant's view,

"Any decision made on the basis of a calculation of consequences – even the decision not to tell a lie because it might ultimately harm us – cannot become a universal law."³⁷

The failure of Kant's Categorical Imperative to accommodate an ethical justification for political assassination is obvious and it demonstrates how difficult it is to find any kind of formal justification for the use of political assassination, particularly in absence of an appeal to subjective conditions and emotional response.

It is this difficulty in approaching a formal, ethical justification for political assassination that has resulted in the issue being both volatile and pragmatically dangerous in the modern world. The real-world impact of political assassinations is not

³⁷ Ibid., p. 215.

based on and contained in abstract ethical theories, no matter how convincing and logical the systems may be. The comparison of Kant's Categorical Imperative with the ethical question of political assassination serves to illustrate that in attempting to justify political assassination as an ethically sound choice, even when it is used against tyrants, the more abstract and formal the ethical criteria being employed are, the less likely that the act of political assassination will be found to be morally justifiable. The Kantian reference is also useful in showing that universality plays a tricky role in the subject of political assassination. Obviously, the formalization of a justification for any type of political assassination could be increasingly formalized until it became a true paradigm or law. The inability to articulate such a paradigm indicates just how ambiguous the justification for political assassination on moral grounds has traditionally been and continues to be, regardless of the philosophical formulations.

Niccolò di Bernardo dei Machiavelli

Rather than adhering to Kant's Categorical Imperative, the act of political assassination might find a better basis for justification in a purely political system of ethics. Such a system is, of course, offered by the famous Florentine philosopher Niccolò di Bernardo dei Machiavelli (1469-1527). His ethical theories, unlike those of Immanuel Kant, are based not in universality but on the pragmatic accumulation and preservation of political power. This is not to say that the ethical ideas that are offered by Machiavelli are grounded only in self-gratification or egoism. What is more accurate is to see Machiavelli's ethical ideas as being the results of his thoughts concerning practical realism. In other words, the ethical system recognizes human nature for what it actually is rather than what would rationally be an ideal. This corresponds, if in a not so obvious way, to the emotional appeal for the justification of political assassination against Absolutism. It corresponds because it recognizes that human beings are not only rational creatures, but also emotional creatures who are motivated by feelings and ambitions as well as by intellectual understanding.

Ruth W. Grant examines Niccolò Machiavelli's ethical system in her study *Hypocrisy and Integrity: Machiavelli, Rousseau, and the Ethics of Politics* and concludes that much of the ethical ideas championed by Machiavelli evolved from "the recognition of natural human weakness and the limitations of political reality that follow from it."³⁸ In other words, according to Grant, for Machiavelli, hypocrisy was a universal human trait that should be factored into the pragmatic application of morals in any given political

³⁸ Ruth W. Grant, *Hypocrisy and Integrity: Machiavelli, Rousseau, and the Ethics of Politics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 1997, p. 26.

context. This means that "In a world where men are not good ... immoral political actions are justified when, and only when, moral ones would be worse in their effects. An assassination that prevents a war could be justified in this way, for example."³⁹

Ecco!

At last!

This is a system of formal, or at least semi-formal ethics that allows for the justification of political assassination. It is emphatically pointed out that the justification for political assassination is still given on moral and ethical grounds rather than legal grounds. This is due to the fact that, as previously stated, the specification of how to justify political assassination has been a task that has so far eluded humanity as a collective species. Political assassination is seldom, if ever, justified on legal grounds. Instead, those who wish to justify political assassination make an appeal on emotional and ethical grounds. The key difference between the law and Niccolò Machiavelli's interpretation of political morality is that the law tends to reflect what humanity aspires to be, while Machiavelli's ethics aspires to describe human nature as it is, without any form of idealization.

Historical Support

Along with Niccolò Machiavelli's ethical justification for political assassination, there is an extensive amount of historical support in the form of philosophical observations and paradigms. Mark V. Vlasic's article *Assassination & Targeted Killing – a Historical and Post-Bin Laden Legal Analysis* explores the way in which political assassinations have been accepted as morally and ethically justifiable throughout history in various cultures, and under various conditions while still remaining, for the most part, illegal. Vlasic examines many incidents of history and various philosophical ideas in order to present a background to the evolution of moral and legal thought regarding political assassinations. He writes that "Assassination is far from a modern phenomenon. Before the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency's (CIA) infamous attempts on figures like Fidel Castro, the early Romans, Greeks, and Persians plotted their own acts of assassination."⁴⁰ The reason that Vlasic goes to such great pains to establish the

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Mark V. Vlasic, *Assassination & Targeted Killing – a Historical and Post-Bin Laden Legal Analysis* in *Georgetown Journal of International Law*, 43, no. 2: 2012, located at <http://www.accessmylibrary.com/article-1G1-299535988/assassination-amp-targeted-killing.html>.

historical context for the use of political assassination is to show that while it has been a fairly common and always-present practice, it has rarely, if ever, been codified into law.

The use of political assassination against tyrants found early justification from many thinkers. According to Vlastic, the Florentine philosopher-poet Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) wrote about assassination and connected it with the idea of *tyrannicide*, while "Saint Thomas Aquinas opined that killing a sovereign for the common good was legally justified, and in some cases, even noble."⁴¹

History shows both in word and action that political assassination can play a key role in the shaping of culture and the evolution of nations. Consequently, the interaction between the use of political assassination and the formulation of law, and also of International law, is one that resists easy understanding. Roughly speaking, political assassination is rooted in human nature, but prohibited by human law.

The historical justification for the use of political assassination is often reasoned by the thesis that nations and individuals each have an instinct for self-preservation. Therefore, "Not merely by the law of nature but also by the law of nations ... it is in fact permissible to kill an enemy in any place whatsoever; and it does not matter how many there are that do the deed, or who suffer... ." ⁴² Obviously, the trick with this kind of justification is arriving at a suitable definition of *enemy*. However, the examining of various justifications for political assassination that are evident in history helps to support Vlastic's later discussion of the contemporary standards of international law and how they apply to the use of political assassination. This aspect is of particular interest due to the fact that political assassinations are on the increase in the post-9/11 world. ⁴³

The so-called War on Terror has brought with it an expansion of the practice of political assassination, even if most of these actions are not called assassinations, but *targeted killings*. Such an expansion of the use of political assassination by the United States and other governments represents not only a crucial turning point both in the evolution of politics and warfare, but also in the evolution of the debate concerning political assassinations. This fast-paced evolution of technology and conditions is a development that forms an important basis of the argument in favor of political assassination. Concurrently, the expansion of targeted killings that are actually political assassinations and which are committed as such, stand in violation of international law.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ 9/11 refers to the Islamic terror attack and destruction of the World Trade Center, New York City on September 11, 2001.

According to United Nations statutes,

"any *assassination* would be encompassed by the UN prohibition against unlawful use of force. Further, any action on behalf of a state to supply and control foreign agents in an attempt to conduct an assassination would likely violate the prohibition against aggression."⁴⁴

The way that nations who employ political assassination circumvent the prohibition is to claim that the prohibition is valid only in peacetime. During war, what would otherwise be considered an unlawful political assassination becomes a targeted killing. With the advent and proliferation of drones, the entire paradigm of political assassination, particularly in connection with global warfare, has become exceedingly complicated and difficult to control.

The fact remains that political assassinations even when conducted by nations are generally done so against the law. That said, the mitigating circumstance of warfare is an important matter to keep in mind. According to the United Nations,

"The international law of assassination differs, however, when states are involved in armed conflict; during armed conflict, a separate doctrine of law applies, the international law of war, referred to by some as international humanitarian law."⁴⁵

Therefore, the globally non-specific War on Terror basically gives the United States a blanket exemption from international law with regard to the use of political assassination as a tool of foreign policy. This is a profound development in the way that nation-states are seen to operate in relation to each another. The repercussions of this policy are only beginning to be felt on a world scale. Only time will tell if the targeted killings and political assassinations that have been carried out by the United States and its allies in the War on Terror will result in a de-escalation of violence and the promotion of international stability.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Louis Rene Beres, *The Newly Expanded American Doctrine of Preemption: Can It Include Assassination?* in the *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy* 31, no. 2: 2002 located at <http://www.questia.com/library/1G1-106764542/the-newly-expanded-american-doctrine-of-preemption>.

State-Sponsored Political Assassination

At first glance, the issue of state-sponsored political assassinations has little or nothing to do with the topic of assassination as a tool to resist Absolutism. However, on closer inspection it should be obvious to any observer that the reason the discussion of state-sponsored assassination is so important is because it represents yet another dimension of the political assassination dynamic as a whole. State-sponsored political assassinations show the dangers and repercussions that are inherent when the state targets individuals or groups with political assassination. Once more, a moral rather than legal justification is claimed. However, the use of political assassination and targeting killing by the state represents the complete inversion of the original justification for political assassination. If we can conclude that the original justification for the use of political assassination was based on the idea of fighting tyranny, then we can conclude that the use of political assassination by the state represents an obvious expansion of tyranny.

While the historical paradigms associated with political assassination show that the act is commonly unrelated to the rebellion against tyranny, the evolution in the modern age of strategies of political assassination on a wide scale by the state usher in a new era of fear and oppression. It may be that the trend of the future is that the tool of political assassination will become increasingly more and more difficult to be used by the average citizen, while the process of political assassination will become more and more efficient when executed by the state. This sets the stage for a totalitarian police-state where one of the most effective weapons for the exertion of popular will has been taken over by the ruling class. This will mean that the masses will have less political recourse than they already experience and that the governing class will have greater latitude of control and immunity. These are extremely important aspects of the debate about political assassination because they directly relate to the immediate and long-term future. Welcome to the present political regime!

One immediate concern with the use of state-sponsored political assassinations is what other potential actions could result from the adoption of this doctrine? For example, what if a foreign country with which the United States is not at war begins to pose such a significant threat that the United States then decides to use political assassination as a preemptive tool? Louis Rene Beres in his article *The Newly Expanded American Doctrine of Preemption: Can It Include Assassination?* postulates a scenario involving the potential threat of nuclear proliferation. He describes a hypothetical situation where "a particular state determines that another state is planning a nuclear or chemical surprise

attack upon its population centers"⁴⁶ and that furthermore, according to the first state's intelligence reports "the assassination of selected key figures (or perhaps just one leadership figure) would prevent such an attack altogether."⁴⁷ Beres further suggests that such an application of political assassination would be justifiable both in ethical and practical terms.

The projection is that political assassination, particularly when connected to the War on Terror, should not be limited to its use against known combatants. In fact, according to Beres, the use of political assassination is justifiable even when applied to those who *support* those who are engaged in a military conflict with the United States and its allies. Such a policy basically opens the door for the assassination of any political figure on the face of the earth.

"In assessing assassination as a permissible form of preemption against terrorism, we must recognize that the prospective target of assassination may be not only terrorists themselves, but also officials of states that support terrorism."⁴⁸

Clearly, this thinking shows how the act of political assassination can turn from one of liberation and populist will to an act of extremely dark and foreboding political oppression and the spread of state-sponsored tyranny. The basic contrast between these two modes forms the heart of the conflict of the debate on the issue of political assassination.

Drones and Domestic Assassination

Political assassination is becoming a tool of government to be used against the people rather than a last resort of the people against the government regime. On March 4, 2013, CNET.com reported that

"The U.S. Department of Homeland Security has customized its Predator drones, originally built for overseas military operations, to carry out at-home

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

surveillance tasks that have civil libertarians worried: identifying civilians carrying guns and tracking their cell phones, government documents show. The documents provide more details about the surveillance capabilities of the department's unmanned Predator B drones, which are primarily used to patrol the United States northern and southern borders but have been pressed into service on behalf of a growing number of law enforcement agencies including the FBI, the Secret Service, the Texas Rangers, and local police. Homeland Security's specifications for its drones, built by San Diego-based General Atomics Aeronautical Systems, say they 'shall be capable of identifying a standing human being at night as likely armed or not, meaning carrying a shotgun or rifle. They also specify 'signals interception' technology that can capture communications in the frequency ranges used by mobile phones, and 'direction finding' technology that can identify the locations of mobile devices or two-way radios."⁴⁹

In answering a question raised by Senator Rand Paul (R-KY), the Obama regime's Attorney General Eric Holder said that the government did not have any intentions of using drones against Americans, but added that such use could be authorized should circumstances require it.⁵⁰ Moreover, a recent poll shows that at least 41 percent of Democrats are in favor of giving the power *to decide on his own* to use drones in the killing of American citizens on United States soil if Barack Hussein Obama, the putative head of state, alone believes they are terrorists. The phrase *on his own* means that there would be no investigation, no arrest, and no trial – just an assassination of a United States citizen.⁵¹ Such killings are in violation of amendments four, five, and six to the *Constitution for the United States of America* because such killings would violate the constitutional rights of due process of law. (Would this really bother Barack Hussein Obama?)

It is also emphasized that the Obama regime via stimulus money is financially supporting Northrup Grumman, producer of pilotless aircraft, and General Atomics

⁴⁹ http://news.cnet.com/8301-13578_3-57572207-38/dhs-built-domestic-surveillance-tech-into-predator-drones/.

⁵⁰ <http://dailycaller.com/2013/03/05/holder-us-drone-strikes-only-in-extraordinary-circumstance/>

⁵¹ <http://www.countercurrents.org/kishore050213.htm> and <http://hotair.com/archives/2013/03/04/poll-41-of-dems-think-president-should-have-power-to-kill-suspected-american-terrorist-on-american-soil/>.

Aeronautical Systems, a producer of predator drones so that they are able to use a strip of land in Southern California as a *drone zone* – an area used to test pilotless aircraft.⁵²

The killing of Americans by an American government regime is not new. At the same time President William Jefferson Clinton (President 1993-2001) was normalizing the United States relationship with the China by providing the Chinese with "11 million pages of classified data for the Chinese to modernize their missile and nuclear technology" – and also trying to achieve friendly terms with Fidel Castro, the William Jefferson Clinton and Hillary Rodham Clinton regime had their contributions to such perfidious censorships. Shall we call them assassinations? Clinton allowed Cuba to shoot down four American pilots flying for an American rescue organization called the Brothers to the Rescue (BTTR) on February 24, 1996.⁵³ At the very least this was silent approval of the killing of these pilots. Clinton took no retaliatory measures against Castro.

Hillary Clinton's first cover-up of an American government official's death was on April 3, 1996 and throughout the following days. The then-Commerce Secretary Ron Brown and 34 others died in a plane crash in Bosnia. The cause of Brown's death appears to have been a gunshot wound to the head. However, all information, like Brown's life and the lives of the other 34 dead was censored.⁵⁴

There are many mysterious deaths of persons associated with the Clintons. They are named below.⁵⁵ It surely would behoove the reader to conduct as much investigation as possible concerning the deaths of these persons. That such a large number of Clinton associates and persons having some sort of relationship to the Clintons and/or their politics, died from natural causes, heart attacks, accidents, or common crimes like robbery, is a difficult-to-believe coincidence.

James McDougal, Mary Mahoney, Vince Foster,⁵⁶ Ron Brown, C. Victor Raiser II, Paul Tulley, Ed Willey, Jerry Parks, James Bunch, James Wilson,

⁵² <http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2013/03/25/Defense-Industry-drone-zones>.

⁵³ http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/04/complicity_in_murder_shades_of_cuba_in_benghazi.html.

⁵⁴ <http://www.wnd.com/2013/04/ron-brown-was-hillarys-1st-chris-stevens/>. The question as to why there was a cover-up – and there was one – remains unanswered.

⁵⁵ <http://dccllothesline.com/2013/04/06/the-clinton-dictatorship/>. The positions of these people and their proven, as well as possible connections to William Jefferson Clinton and Hillary Rodham Clinton are explained.

⁵⁶ The book *The Strange Death of Vince Foster An Investigation* by Christopher Ruddy comes to the

Kathy Ferguson, Bill Shelton, Gandy Baugh, Florence Martin, Suzanne Coleman, Paula Grober, Danny Casolaro, Paul Wilcher, Jon Parnell Walker, Barbara Wise, Charles Meissner, Dr. Stanley Heard, Barry Seal, Johnny Lawhorn, Jr., Stanley Huggins, Hershell Friday, Kevin Ives, Don Henry.⁵⁷

Americans are still being assassinated with tacit consent by the present Barack Hussein Obama regime. Border Agent Brian Terry was killed by a Mexican drug cartel on December 14, 2010.⁵⁸ The lax federal control of the border with Mexico and the fact that the federal government is taking no action to protect Americans from Mexican drug cartels means that the drug cartels and their affiliate organization the Aryan Brotherhood have open season on Americans and are using this opportunity to assassinate government officials. For example, the District Attorney for Kaufman County in Texas, Mike McLelland and his wife were assassinated over the April 2, 2013 weekend. Former District Attorney Mark Hasse was assassinated in the parking lot of the Kaufman County courthouse on January 31, 2013.⁵⁹ On March 19, 2013 Colorado's Chief of Department of Corrections Tom Clements was assassinated.⁶⁰ According to a report by Katie Pavlich,

conclusion that Vince Foster could not have killed himself in Fort Marcy Park, Virginia and that the mainstream media did not investigate properly and failed to ask the right questions.

⁵⁷ The origin of this list is Linda Thompson's *The Clinton Body Count: Coincidence or the Kiss of Death* (1993) which can be read at <http://www.skeptictank.org/files/conspire/wacoburn.htm>. An internet site that has supplemented the information concerning these names as to whether or not the deaths are assassinations and whether or not there is any evidence that proves that the Clintons were involved in these deaths is <http://www.truthorfiction.com/rumors/c/clintonfriends.htm#.UWJ5-FdIM-k>. This author suggests that the reader compares the information on the death of Ron Brown with the information contained in the link at footnote number 54. Research the information regarding the other names and judge for yourself! Some suggested links are: <http://www.buchal.com/library/coverups/ronbrown.htm>, <http://scribbleguy.50megs.com/vincefoster.htm>, <http://www.alamo-girl.com/03159.htm>, <http://www.zpub.com/un/un-bc-body.html>, <http://www.zpub.com/un/un-bc.html>, <http://www.zpub.com/un/traindeath.html>.

⁵⁸ http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/News/fast-furious-scandal-man-claims-shot-brian-terry/story?id=18242489#.UV7CRldIM-k; <http://townhall.com/tipsheet/katiepavlich/2012/12/14/border-patrol-agent-brian-terry-died-two-years-ago-today-n1467215>.

⁵⁹ <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2271450/Mark-Hasse-shooting-Manhunt-gunmen-county-prosecutor-involved-Aryan-Brotherhood-investigation-shot-dead-courtroom-parking-lot.html>

⁶⁰ http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/03/20/tom-clements-dead-colorado_n_2914314.html

the assassination was sending a message: *No one is safe, no one is beyond our reach. We will kill you and your loved ones. We are in control here.*⁶¹

Other indications that there could have been at least 43 assassinations – many causes of death of the domestic assassinations were attributed to heart attacks – since Barack Hussein Obama entered the political limelight are listed at many internet sites like the one documented below. All of the claims can be further explored upon clicking the respective links given in the text.⁶² This author cannot attest to the veracity of the list. Some internet sites say the list is true and others (pro-Obama sites?) say the list is bunk. At the same time, it must be said that it is an understatement to claim these questionable deaths – and there are many – are mysterious coincidences.⁶³ This same statement applies to the Clinton list presented above in spite of the claims that there are some discrepancies in the list.

1. **Jamie Zapata** - Homeland Security Investigations Special Agent who was murdered in an ambush. Revelation that I.C.E. Report of Investigation on seizure of Fast & Furious weapons in Texas in August 2010 was [signed by Zapata](#). Speculation that he was murdered as part of a cover-up of the Gunwalker scandal. (Nachumlist Gunrunner-Gate scandal files [here](#))
2. **Federal Judge John McCarthy Roll** – was the Chief Judge for the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, murdered by the same gunman attacking Gabrielle Giffords. Theory that Roll's [preliminary ruling on "United States of America v. \\$333,520.00 in United States Currency et al"](#) (Case Number: 4:2010cv00703 Filed: November 30, 2010) was cause for the assassination and that the shooter used the mass shooting as a cover for the government. - [Claim: Giffords hit a planned assassination: Judge Roll real target.](#)
3. **Andrew Breitbart** – Died of a massive [heart attack](#), walking outside late at night, alone, in the dark approximately one week before he was to [produce tapes](#) of

⁶¹ <http://townhall.com/tipsheet/katiepavlich/2013/04/01/mexican-cartels-getting-strong-foothold-in-the-united-states-n1554480>

⁶² <http://wtpotus.wordpress.com/2012/04/28/crossing-obama-can-be-deadly/comment-page-1/#comments> and <http://www.knowthelies.com/node/7882>. Consult other related information and links given at <http://www.nachumlist.com/deadpool.htm>. This author is unable to verify the veracity of the contents. The list is presented because the author feels that more questions are raised concerning these unusual deaths than have ever been answered. The original formulations have been repeated and the list has been reformatted.

⁶³ Some interesting related links are: <http://www.coachisright.com/why-eric-holder-covered-up-the-1995-trentadue-murder/>, <http://www.westernjournalism.com/eric-holders-two-decades-of-concealing-murder/>, http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=gMAxT1hxENA#!

Obama's extremist activities in college. More speculation: [Breitbart: "Wait 'Til They See What Happens March 1st"](#), [Breitbart's Footage Shows Obama 'Palling Around' With Terrorists...](#) Sheriff Joe Arpaio: [I Spoke with Andrew Breitbart Shortly Before he Died](#) ... An Eyewitness Speaks Out About [Andrew Breitbart's Death Scene... Breitbart's skin color described as bright red.](#) ... Was [Andrew Breitbart assassinated?](#)... More murder speculation: [Was Andrew Breitbart Murdered?](#)... Coroner: [Breitbart Died of Heart Failure...](#)*

4. **Christopher Lasseter** – Dissapears... [witness to Breitbart's death vanishes -Follows suspicious demise of member of coroner's team](#) (possibly in hiding to avoid reporters), ... Breitbart witness: [He dropped like sack of bricks Describes 'thick white band' around forehead at death](#)
5. **Michael Cormier** – respected forensic technician for the Los Angeles County Coroner died under suspicious circumstances at his North Hollywood home April 20, the same day Andrew Breitbart's cause of death was finally made public. Medical examiners in Los Angeles [are investigating the possible poisoning death](#)..... [Conspiracy theorists cry foul after Andrew Breitbart's 'coroner' dies of arsenic poisoning](#)-Police [Debunk Theories Linking Breitbart, L.A. Coroner](#) Tech Deaths
6. **Steve Bridges** – Dies At 48 – Impersonator Who [Offended Obama](#) ...Steve Bridges as [President Obama - August 2011](#)It appeared that he [died of natural causes](#)...
7. **Seal Team Six** The [deaths of Seal Team Six](#) ...who never would fly an entire company in one helicopter alone.
8. **Robin Copeland** – 46, 11/4/2011: former Energy Department official who took part in several significant disarmament programs, [died suddenly](#)
9. **Matt Simmons** – an investment banker and whistle blower in the British Petroleum oil spill. Died suddenly at home of a heart attack at the age of 67. An autopsy by the state medical examiner's office concludes that Simmons died from accidental drowning "with heart disease as a contributing factor." Speculation of murder: [Assassinations by induced heart attack and cancer](#).
10. **Kam Kuwata** – was [found dead](#) inside his Venice home after friend – concerned that they had not heard from him for a few days – alerted police. Political consultant in California. Democratic insider. Possibly the Obama consultant referred to in the *Ulsterman Report*: Allegedly viewed [bizarre drug induced behavior](#) from Obama during the 2008 campaign.: ["The Troubling Timeline"](#).... The Death of a Political Operative – [The Troubling Timeline... \(UPDATED\)](#)

11. **Bill Gwatney** – a close friend of Bill and Hillary Clinton and a Clinton super delegate at an upcoming convention in Denver and [was fatally shot in 2008](#). Shooter had a [post-it note with a mystery phone number](#). [Did Obama Assassinate Clinton delegates? Bill Gwatney and Stephanie Tubbs Jones?](#)
12. **Stephanie Tubbs Jones** – [found brain dead](#) in 2008. Democratic Rep. Stephanie Tubbs Jones of Cleveland, a super delegate and one of Hillary Clinton's most prominent black supporters, was found in her car unconscious. Also: [Did Obama Assassinate Clinton Delegates?](#) Additional: [Hollywood Producer Bettina Viviano: Bill Clinton Directly Told Me Barack Obama Not Eligible - ...Caucus death threats \(audio\)](#)... Also reported by Jerome Corsi at WND: [Hillary supporter's untold Obama horror stories Allegations of intimidation, manipulation, sudden death](#)
13. **Madelyn Payne Dunham** – Obama's grandmother, died 2 days before the general election. Flew up to see her for one hour – alone. No records. Cremated immediately, ashes dispersed.
14. **Lieutenant Quarles Harris Jr.** – [A key witness](#) in a federal probe into passport information stolen from the State Department was fatally shot in front of a District church
15. **Christopher Kelly** – [Committed suicide](#), under pressure to testify against former Gov. Rod Blagojevich
16. **John Wheeler** – former presidential and Pentagon aide John Wheeler III was [found in a Delaware garbage dump](#). [Wheeler's cell phone discovered](#) – [Cause of death released in Wheeler case, blunt force trauma](#) – [Wheeler's cell phone found in a taxi](#) – [His family wants information](#) – [John Wheeler was assassinated by a hitman in a targeted killing, his widow has claimed](#) – [Who killed Jack Wheeler?](#)
17. **Donald Young** – Openly gay friend of Obama's at [Murdered at Trinity Church](#) in Chicago ... [Key Witness In Obama Passport Fraud Case](#) – [Video report: Obama-Donald Young murder \(December 24, 2007\)](#)...
18. **Larry Bland** and [Two other black members of Trinity Church Murdered](#) at the same time – [Report: Mother Of Obama's Murdered Gay Lover Speaks Up – With Video](#)
19. **Nate Spencer**: [All 3 Homosexual Members Of Obama's Trinity Church Murdered Within 6 Weeks](#).
20. **Beverly Eckert**, Continental Flight Victim, was 9/11 widow ([VIDEO, SLIDESHOW](#)), was at the White House with Barack Obama, part of a meeting the president had with relatives of those killed in the 2001 attacks

21. **Michael Scott** – Although Chicago school board president Michael Scott's death had been ruled a suicide by the Cook County medical examiner's office. Chicago police characterized the case as a [death investigation](#), and have not concluded that Scott's death was a suicide – was subpoenaed to testify before a federal grand jury looking into the admissions practices of Chicago's elite schools – also was [under scrutiny](#) over Olympics-related real estate dealings.
22. **David Koschman**, murdered in a Chicago Rush Street brawl by Richard J. "R.J." Vanecko, a nephew of Mayor Daley and White House Chief of Staff Bill Daley – [Homicide case involving Daley nephew closed without charges](#), [Witness to Killing Involving Daley Nephew: Deceased Didn't Start It](#)
23. **Ashley Turton**, wife of the Obama administration's House of Representatives liaison, Dan Turton, was found dead in a burning car Monday morning, *Roll Call* and other news outlets are reporting. Fire officials said it appeared the car crashed as it was pulling in or out of the garage behind a row house in the Capitol Hill neighborhood of Washington, D.C., at about 5 a.m. Neighbors dialed 911 after spotting the fire. The body was discovered after fire crews doused the blaze. The fire also charred part of the garage. Nobody in the house was injured, fire officials said. Ashley Turton worked as a lobbyist for the utility giant Progress Energy, according to *Politico*. She was a former staffer for U.S. Rep. Rosa DeLauro, D-Conn. [The Rahm Emanuel Connection to the Deceased Ashley Turton](#), – [The ATF investigates – Ashley Turton Crashed Under the Influence](#)
24. **Dawn Sylvia-Stasiewicz**, Obama's First Dog Trainer [Dies At 52](#). Rumored to be salaried at over \$102,000 per year [at tax-payer expense](#)
25. **"Mama Lois" Anderson** – 79, and her 52 year old daughter **Zelda White** – Two US women aid workers [were shot dead in Nairobi in Kenya](#) (2008) were the retired Presbyterian Church missionaries of Pennsylvania (USA), known to thousands of Africans. The suspected killers of the US women, who were travelling in a car with diplomatic license plates, allegedly shot dead by police later. They were [well known for their work](#). There is speculation that they possibly had knowledge of the birth and care for Barack Obama in Kenya and were later murdered to cover the trail. When murdered, the husband had his full wallet which the thieves/car jacker didn't take, and there was never a connection made to the said attackers the police later shot dead, but blamed for the double homicide/car jacking. [Their church was burned in 2008](#), possibly to destroy any possible birth records there. Then police chief Mohammed Hussein Ali [was later removed from office](#) by Obama supported Kenyan

strongman Odinga. All possible witnesses are dead, all possible records of the care of infant Obama burned in the church fire, and the public official removed from office.

26. **Holiyah Soetoro Sobah, aka Lia Soetoro**, Obama's adopted sister: died under mysterious, sudden, and unusual circumstances just as she was getting ready to be reunited with her childhood companion and adopted brother. She spoke of many specific incidences in the household, where she grew up with "Barry" in Indonesia. She saved many items that Barry used during childhood. She was looking forward to seeing him, because she'd seen him on TV and was told that was "Barry", her little brother. However, Lia had reservations about it and so was anticipating seeing the scars he had from falling out of the mango tree and the limp she said he walked with. That was not to be because she up and died. Read about it [here](#) and watch [video of here... PDF document](#) from a web site of the Consulate General of the Republic of Indonesia appears to confirm a relationship between Lia and Barack Hussein Obama.

We must not forget the victims of the Fort Hood Shooting on November 5, 2009. Thirteen persons (14) were killed by Major Nidal Malik Hasan as he shouted "*Allahu Akhbar*," (Allah is the greatest.) Those killed were Michael Grant, Cahill Libardo, Eduardo Caraveo, Justin Michael DeCrow, John P. Gaffaney, Frederick Greene, Jason Dean Hunt, Amy Sue Krueger, Aaron Thomas Nemelka, Michael S. Pearson, Russell Gilbert Seager, Francheska Velez (She was pregnant when shot and killed. The fetus died. [14]), Juanita L. Warman, and Kham See Xiong. Thirty-one persons suffered gunshot wounds, but survived.

Assessing the Terrorist Threat, a report released by the Bipartisan Policy Center on September 10, 2010, concluded that "in 2009 at least 43 American citizens or residents aligned with Sunni militant groups or their ideology were charged or convicted of terrorism crimes in the U.S. or elsewhere, the highest number in any year since 9/11". *Assessing the Terrorist Threat* listed the Fort Hood massacre and the 2009 Little Rock, Arkansas United States Army recruiting office shooting as two successful Islamic terrorist attacks.⁶⁴ However, Barack Hussein Obama and his peacock generals and admirals view the Fort Hood massacre as workplace violence. At the very least, this standpoint and judgment is a silent condoning of the assassination of United States military personnel by a Muslim terrorist.

⁶⁴ <http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/NSPG%20Final%20Threat%20Assessment.pdf>, pp. 4-5.

Finally, we have the killings in Benghazi, Libya on September 11, 2012 of United States Ambassador to Libya **J Christopher Stevens**, **Sean Smith**, the United States Foreign Service Information Management officer, and two embassy security personnel, the former Navy Seals **Glen Doherty** and **Tyrone S. Woods**. Or can we call their killings assassinations because the Barack Hussein Obama regime undertook no action to save these persons' lives during a time period of seven hours?⁶⁵

There are indications of assassination paranoia on the part of the Barack Hussein Obama regime. Some regime members undoubtedly think that they could be assassinated. That Barack Hussein Obama has had an official White House food taster is no secret. In addition, he was the taster of Michelle Obama's food. Yet, when told to taste Valerie Jarrett's food, he resigned his position.⁶⁶

There have been no serious assassination attempts on Barack Hussein Obama. The Secret Service claims "the lack of assassination attempts on President Obama is believed to be directly linked to the bad economy and the apathy of the American people in general."⁶⁷

Da Capo

As the preceding discussion has clearly shown, the two major challenges that are inherent in trying to provide an ethical justification for political assassination are formality and universality. In other words, it is very difficult to draw up a law that could be universally applied with regard to the use of political assassination against Absolutism. Although it is obvious that human beings as a whole almost instinctively pursue political assassination as a course of social resistance against tyranny, it is also true that such a moral instinct is impossible to quantify or define. It is also true that many acts of political assassination are carried out by mentally unstable individuals who perhaps only inadvertently impact on political conditions. Still other acts of political assassination serve only to reinforce established power-bases and dynastic lines. In still other cases of political assassination, the use of state-sponsored killing is used to establish an even

⁶⁵ <http://hotair.com/greenroom/archives/2013/02/15/confirmed-obama-made-no-calls-took-no-action-during-benghazi-attack/comment-page-1/> and <http://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2012/10/25/benghazi-obamas-actions-amount-to-a-shameful-derelection-of-duty/>.

⁶⁶ <http://www.whitehousedossier.com/2013/03/25/exclusive-whd-interviews-obama-food-taster/>.

⁶⁷ <http://dailybleach.com/lack-of-assassination-attempts-on-president-obama-blamed-on-american-apathy/> and <http://mediabloodhound.typepad.com/weblog/2008/08/special-repor-5.html>.

higher order of oppression and tyranny that threatens to disempower the masses on a scale never before seen.

The most clearly shown aspect is that political assassination in the modern era is moving rapidly toward becoming a tool that is used to subvert, rather than serve the population. It is also an evident fact that while political assassination can be morally but not legally justifiable as a populist act of political will, it can be legally redefined by the state as *targeted killing* and therefore expanded and sustained at a rate that truly diminishes popular resistance or the populist will to change.

An Age of Absolutism has encapsulated the United States of America. Its tentacles are ever expanding and destroying American heritage, culture, and freedoms. The program of the *Declaration of Independence* is as timely nowadays as it was in 1776.

"When in the course of human events" the Obama regime decides it is necessary "to dissolve the political bands" established by the *Constitution for the United States of America* and to institute a political state of Absolutism, "it is the Right of the People" to censor that regime "and to institute a new government." Particularly "when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security. ... "The history of the present" absolutist regime "is a history of rejected injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny."

Given the actuality of these developments it could be in any respect only a matter of time when the assassination of the regime's assassins occurs. Assassination conducted by a government regime is a method that censors its political adversaries. The assassination of the regime's assassins and those ultimately responsible is the ultimate form of censorship.

Carpe diem!

Frederick William Dame
Patriotic, Steadfast, and True
April 10, 2013.