

Frederick William Dame

I

Proem

I! I am! I am an American! I am patriotic! I am an American patriot! I am a citizen! I am a natural born citizen! I am an American patriotic, natural born citizen!

This is my statement. It is the statement of all true, natural born American citizens who are patriots. *I am an American patriot* is the statement of every true American citizen. Every single I is that I in American. We are thus one because We are the People – the source of political power in the Republic of the United States of America as stated in the Preamble to the *Constitution for The United States of America*.¹ The *Constitution* was not meant to become undercut and politically shredded so that it would have no political meaning, as the present putative president Barack Hussein Obama is continually and intentionally doing. Yet the single, important fact is that not one *I am an American patriot* can be deconstructed. I cannot be deconstructed! I cannot be a socialist! I cannot be a communist! I cannot be a fascist! In becoming any of these or in becoming a mixture of them, I would

¹ This is the real title of the document that regulates American Freedom justly, ethically, and morally. For the complete discussion read this author's essay *The Constitution for the United States of America* at <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/theconstitutionfortheunitedstatesofamerica.pdf>.

relinquish my being free, independent, and republican in the democratic Republic of the United States of America.

I am I! Every patriotic American is I am I! No, they cannot be deconstructed and extinguished. The individual I's² make up the source of political power: WE! WE cannot be deconstructed!

The Meaning of Deconstructionism

Essentially, deconstructionism is a method of criticism and a means of analytical inquiry. It does not mean destruction of a text, a speech, a composition of any sort, including music, architecture, or art, in its widest sense, or even a historical, a philosophical, or a political movement.³ It is a critical analysis. In fact, deconstructionism is very close in core to the original meaning of analysis, the etymological source of which is the word stem **leu-**¹ meaning *to loosen, divide, cut apart*, from whence we obtain the Greek *luein*, meaning *to loosen, release, untie*, and thus the Greek *analusis*, meaning *a releasing*, but not a destroying of that which is being critiqued.

Analysis and deconstructionism as literary terminologies are synonyms. When a critic deconstructs a text, a speech, a composition of any sort, including music, architecture, or art in its widest sense, or even a historical, a philosophical, or a political movement, the result is that significant, competing forces within these fields are disentangled from their competitive relationships.

² I is the first person singular pronoun in the nominative case. The plural of I in the first person plural nominative case is we. I's is the plural of I as it is used here. Is is also the plural form. However, the author chose the permissible I's in order that the reader would not be confused with the word Is. I's is pronounced like eyes.

³ This formulation will be repeated throughout the essay for the purpose of completeness, cohesiveness, and emphasis.

If in the process of disentanglement anything is destroyed, it is only the inferiority of one content aspect over another content aspect. Deconstructionism is an analysis of the critical conflicts within an entity. The analysis may even go so far as to concern itself with carping or caviling aspects. The critic will find fault with something and complain about it, or the critic will unnecessarily mock, jest, scoff, and make fun of something, thus causing deconstructionism to become a sophomoric intellectualism and possibly or even eventually an exercise in futility. If, for example, the innate, the self-defeating, the self-betraying, the self-contradicting, and the treasonous components of a text, a speech, a composition of any sort, including music, architecture, or art in its widest sense, or even a historical, a philosophical, or a political movement includes elements that are not in the text, etc., elements that are outside, according to the inventor of deconstructionism, the French linguist and philosopher Jacques Derrida (1930-2004), then there are words *dehors de texte*, in actuality elements that are not stated, and we have a presence of what is absent. The conclusion is that the presence of these absent elements contains assumptions and propositions important for the text, the speech, the composition of any sort, including music, architecture, or art in its widest sense, or even the historical, the philosophical, or the political movement regarding matters that are not said. Deconstructionism can lead to absurdity because *dehors de texte est à la intérieur de texte toujours quand à la intérieur de texte est dahors de texte et à l'envers ad infinitum*.⁴ If anything is absurd, it is this logic.

⁴ Outside the text is inside the text always when inside the text is outside the text and vice-versa into infinity.

An exercise in deconstructionism can show that any text, any speech, a composition of any sort, including music, architecture, or art in its widest sense, or even any historical, any philosophical, or any political movement can be examined to be communicating something different from what it appears to be communicating. It may be communicating a plethora of meanings. It may be communicating matters, subjects, and ideas that are at conflict or variance with what is, or was once considered a stable sensibility. The immediate and long-term consequence is that there is nothing left except the text, the speech, the composition of any sort, including music, the architecture, or art in its widest sense, or even the historical, the philosophical, or the political movement. There may be so many meanings in the respective field of concern that the chosen, investigated field and criticized field may not have a meaning at all. *No singular meaning is guaranteed.* Even this sentence can be deconstructed. All we have to do is to pose the following questions:

- What does the word *no* mean in the context of the sentence?
- What does the word *singular* mean in the context of the sentence?
- What does the word *meaning* mean in the context of the sentence?
- What does the word *guarantee(d)* mean in the context of the sentence?

If we answer these questions, we have the enumerated deconstruction below and the sentence means something quite different from the original sentence. The reader should note at this point that the predicate *is* cannot be supplemented because there is no supplement for *being*. This aspect will be presented shortly.

There are approximately 69 words/phrases, including slang words/phrases and foreign words/phrases, that can be substituted for *No*. For

the first time, the author closes his eyes and goes down the list with his finger, stops and chooses the phrase *anything but*. There are approximately 57 words/phrases that can supplement *singular*. For the second time, the author closes his eyes and goes down the list with his finger, stops and chooses *unparalleled*. There are 35 words/phrases that can replace *meaning*. For the third time, the author closes his eyes and goes down the list with his finger, stops and chooses *essence*. There are 50 words that can take the place of *guarantee(d)*. For the fourth time, the author closes his eyes and goes down the list with his finger, stops and chooses *ensure(d)*. The statement *No singular meaning is guaranteed*. now reads *Anything but unparalleled essence is ensured*. There is quite a different meaning of the second sentence that is a result of deconstruction, than the meaning of the first, original sentence. The first sentence means that *there is no guarantee whatsoever for a singular, specific, particular meaning*. The second sentence means that *every thing outside the confines of an unparalleled essence is ensured*. *There is no warranty for unparalleled essence*.

The author's mathematical computation says that there are 6,882,750 supplement word combinations for the statement *No singular meaning is guaranteed*.⁵ The conclusion is that there are at least 6,882,750 deconstruction possibilities and each one will have a different meaning. But ..., the original sentence says exactly what the word-thought is and what the written statement says. NO SINGULAR MEANING IS GUARANTEED. Period! End! Point! Full Stop! Nothing else!

⁵ For a list of the supplements consult the respective entries in J. I. Rodale, *The Synonym Finder*, Warner Books, New York: 1986.

Jacques Derrida's conclusion in his theory of deconstruction is that origins are illusions. Since this is the case, this author can conclude that the simple deconstruction of this simple sentence *No singular meaning is guaranteed.* leads to 6,882,750 illusions! In other words, the results of deconstructionism are allusioned illusions!

Because the author chose supplements from lists of words/phrases with his eyes closed, the result is deconstruction by chance. This type of deconstruction is the best because it rules out deconstruction by premeditated intent. Such an attitude of deconstruction on the part of a literary critic indicates some degree of maliciousness from the very beginning. The same accusation of maliciousness also applies to a politician who deliberately and destructively deconstructs. This is exactly what Barack Hussein Obama and his Thugs are doing with his socialist-communist-fascist, and even Islamist politics of intentionally causing crises where there are none, of intentionally making false accusations, particularly with the word racist, and of intentionally pitting one group of Americans against another group of Americans.

The Barack Hussein Obama Use of Deconstructionism

If we take the same logic that was presented above and relate it to the politics of Barack Hussein Obama, deconstructionism is taken out of its literary domicile and placed in the political arena. Here it becomes a destructive, indeed, a lethal weapon applied against American culture, American tradition, and above all, American individual freedom.⁶

⁶ http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/daily/2012/07/16/barack_obama_hates_this_country.
http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/daily/2012/07/16/the_dismantling_of_the_american_dream.
<http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/309559/what-shall-we-do-together-yuval-levin>.

Of course, the political situation that Barack Hussein Obama wants to change was analyzed by anti-American ideologues before he began to execute his planned, destructive deconstruction. Once implemented, competing forces in American politics and society were/are positioned against each other so that they would be/will be disentangled from their political and competitive relationships. It is the Barack Hussein Obama hope that in the process of opposition and disentanglement something will be destroyed, thus allowing for the supremacy of one content aspect – the Barack Hussein Obama content aspect – over the content aspect of American tradition, freedom, and culture.

This type of destructive deconstructionism is the result of an analysis of the supposed critical conflicts within an entity, and where there are none, the conflicts are created by Barack Hussein Obama and his Thugs with Obama and his Thugs supplying the solutions to the problems that did not heretofore exist. The Obama-Thug analysis even goes so far as to concern itself with the aforementioned carping or caviling aspects. The purpose of finding fault where no fault exists, of complaining when there is no need to complain, or of mocking a person, a tradition, or culture where no mock or jest is appropriate or necessary, is to create an illusioned crisis atmosphere to which the Obama-Thugs who raise the fuss and gripe, who ridicule, will provide the afore-prepared solutions.⁷ The result is that Barack Hussein Obama's form of intended, destructive deconstructivism is nothing more than a pseudo-intellectual exercise that makes the dumbed-down citizen believe that Obama is a genius, when in fact Obama is nothing more than a pseudo-sophomoric

⁷ The reader should obtain a copy of Saul Alinsky's *Rules for Radicals*, wherein this process of carping and caviling are discussed as an important method to destroy one's opponents and thus gain political power.

Sisyphean and an executor of futility. This is the *hope* and *change* that the American voter was brainwashed into believing in the 2008 presidential elections.

The innate, the self-defeating, the self-betraying, the self-contradicting, and the treasonous components of Barack Hussein Obama and his politics include elements that are not in the stated political program, etc., elements that are outside the communicated political philosophy, in actuality, elements that are not stated. However, do not be fooled! Barack Hussein Obama has a presence of what is absent. Moreover, Barack Hussein Obama and his Thug minions know exactly what that presence contains. The conclusion is that the presence of these absent elements contains assumptions and propositions important for Obama's political movement regarding matters that are not said. Indeed, Obama's preconceived, destructive deconstructionism leads to absurdity because outside of the political policy is always the interior of the political policy when the interior is outside and reverse ad infinitum. If anything is absurd, it is this logic, Barack Hussein Obama, and his dumbed-down followers.

Applying this knowledge to the Barack Hussein Obama political movement, we can examine it and find that it is proclaiming something different from what it claims to be proclaiming. It may be a declaration of numberless meanings. It may be a transmission of ideas, matters, and subjects that are at contention or difference with what supposedly is, or, what Barack Hussein Obama and his Thugs contend was once a lasting awareness, but in their created crises is no longer enduring. The instantaneous and protracted significance is that there is nothing left except

the political movement of nothingness change and nothingness hope leading to an absolute political nothingness and a non-individual, which is the goal of the Obama Thug-devised destruction.

Barack Hussein Obama will always claim that his politics mean so much in the respective, invented field of concern. Yet, once examined and investigated, the intentional chaos that the Obama Thug team invented will prove to have no meaning at all. When freedoms are exterminated, the individual, the *I am*, becomes nothing! In other words, Barack Hussein Obama's concerns are nothing more than allusioned illusions! Consequently, we should ask an important question: Is Barack Hussein Obama's political and destroying deconstructionism not similar to a critical casket? Think about the following word-thoughts:

Obama's politics are filled with created illusions creating allusions that create the base of power that worships the created illusions which are Obama-Thug made. Thus, nothing from Barack Hussein Obama is real, except his destruction of America, and people are, by not seeing this fact, creating their own caskets, in which they can die a real death after having illusioned an Obama-Thug-created-political-life illusion in an atmosphere of allusioned illusions.

Obama's concerns do not actually exist because he concocts them out of nothing. That is the core of his political policies. In Barack Hussein Obama's mind, that is okay because the destruction of the United States of America, its *Constitution*, *We the People*, and the individual *I* are the goals. Barack Hussein Obama thinks that if the invented crises illusions lead to this result, – all the better!

The I Virtue in Me Cannot Be Undone!

Deconstruct *Being!* Right at the beginning of this section the present author contends that one cannot do it. *Being* is! It withstands all attempts at deconstruction. Because *I am* is an integral part of *being*, *I*, the true American Patriot, will withstand all attempts to purposefully and destructively deconstruct me!

Jacques Derrida and other deconstructionists claim that every written sentence can be deconstructed. He and they would have their problems with *To be, or not to be.*⁸ In one and the same instance William Shakespeare (1564-1616) included the core origin and the *dahors de text* in one sentence. Shakespeare meant what he said and said what he meant. The imperative sentence cannot be deconstructed because there is nothing to supplant *being* unless it is something *dehors de texte*. However, the supplement *dehors de texte* is part of the text itself. It is the same with the concept *I am I because I am because I am not. Sum ergo cogito et creo.*⁹ This is why *I am* **can not** be undone. Essentially, this is the reason why *being* cannot be deconstructed and in Barack Hussein Obama's goal, this is the reason why *I am an American Patriot* cannot be destroyed, unless the *I-am-an-American-Patriot citizen(s)* is/are exterminated completely. The reader is reminded that socialism, communism, fascism, and Islam exterminate those who refuse to be part of their political dogmas and usurpations.

⁸ William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Act III, Scene i, line 56 of any edition.

⁹ I am, therefore, I think and I believe.

Some explanatory argumentation is herewith necessary. It concerns virtue, character identity, and the etymology of I.¹⁰

The *I am* virtue is important in American character identity as an American Patriot. The denoting of *I am* as a virtue means that *I am* has a quality of moral excellence. Whenever the aspect of having a moral quality appears, Barack Hussein Obama's efforts at change receive resistance! That there is righteousness intrinsic in the individual and that the individual has probity and goodness are prerequisites to the individual becoming a positive member of a society with a standard of morality and mores. These standards are most usually reflected in a person's religious belief and in the society's laws. A dictatorial government has few, if no qualities of moral excellence. A democratic-republican form of government possesses the largest amount of qualities of moral excellence.

Irrespective the heritage of a person, Native American, Afro-American, White, Anglo-Saxon Protestant, or Roman Catholic, each individual has a combination of qualities of moral excellence. Regarding Islam the situation is exceedingly questionable. For every supposed moral claim in Islam, there is an immoral, contradictory element accompanying the claim. When some persons by their behaviour qualities show badness, immorality, and evil, we can conclude that with respect to these instances of extremely negative

¹⁰ Comparativism is an academic discipline that concerns the study of cultures with respect to major fields, e.g., religion, history, art, literature, philosophy, psychology, music, painting, sculpture, architecture, engineering, area and environmental planning, scientific developments, etc. Philologists study words and the history of languages and cultures to the extent that they can explain how words interact with cultural elements like politics, history, art, feelings, patriotism, psychology, philosophy, etc. Comparativism is exceedingly interesting due to its practically unbounded spectrum from A to Z, from darkness to light. Should the reader be interested in the best source concerning etymology, albeit in German, s/he is directed to Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols. A. Francke Verlag, Tübingen und Basel: 2005. The etymology of I, that is *eǵ-*, is on page 291 of Volume One.

behaviour, the individual, or even the group as a collective is lacking in virtues. Thus, character identity has its positive, moral attributes as well as negative, immoral attributes. The positive, moral attributes will dominate in a free society. If qualities of moral excellence are not supreme, the infected society will eventually cease to exist.

The French philosopher René Descartes (1596-1650) is famous for the maxim *Cogito ergo sum*. (*I think, therefore I am*.) To say it another way, the fact that I think is the means by which I know that I exist, that my person is in the **being** condition and that the **being** exists before and is concurrent with thinking, but it is not supplemented by thinking. The *am* is **being**. Thus, not only does the **being** condition include the *am* and enwraps it, the *am* permeates all of the **being**, as well. My **being** is *am* just as *am* is my **being** and *am* would not exist in **un-being**, just as **being** would not exist in *un-am*. They are as inseparable into infinity. My *am* is invoked by the supremacy and concurrency of **being**, but my *am* cannot call **being** or its own self into existence. *Am* is dependent upon **being**. Because **being** is *am* as well as *are*, and as well as *is*, they cannot become **being** alone, yet are a part of it. Thus, **being** is the origin of, indeed, the creator of *am*.

My symbolical letter preceding *am* looks like an I-beam, at least to some engineers. It is the support of all that ever exists. Perhaps that is the reason the Great Engineer made it that way. It is the image, the form, the shape of the ideal me and my *am*. The I is an eidolon of idolons, and thus my *am* and my **being** is the eidolon of the eidolon. My symbol is so much more because it is a member of the *me-family*, coming from the inner self, the ego home of

being and permeates all that is about me. It has always been with me and will always be.

In the thousands of centuries that I have lived, am living, and will live, it has meant all that is, was, and will ever be. From the very first moment when life came into being, I was with *me*. When I leave(s) this present world to go on to another, I will go with *me*. At the same time, I will stay with you and accompany you in all of your dimensions. I permeate(s) all about *me* and become(s) part and parcel of all that ever was, is, and will be in **being**. This was my purpose even before my descendant I's with a stroke of divine genius intelligently put *me* into speakable and then into writeable, symbolic form.

My origin as well as ancestral descendant is the unwritten Indo-European linguistic culture. Because it is capable of being reconstructed, we can inform ourselves of the character and symbols of its word-thoughts and phrases. Comparative linguistics, archaeology, palaeontology, ethnology, and philosophy enable us to learn of its grammatical structure and to understand my I as a member of the *me-family*.

Beginning at least 10,000 years before Christ and existing to about 2000 BC, you and I were part of an Indo-European culture that could communicate without the use of translators. After that, Indo-European vanished into offspring-language-culture horizons used by the cultures that the breakaway languages served, thus giving rise to several cultural language families. Yet, regardless of the family, I was always there, and still (is) *am*, and will always be (of **being**).

To my fellow Indo-Europeans I – the personal symbolical sign of the self of which the speaker talks – is and I *am* (is) in Old High German *ich*. I find myself (the self) in Middle High German as *ich*, and in Anglo-Saxon and Middle Low German I exist(s) as *ik*. I transform(s) my I in Middle Low Dutch into *ic* and in Dutch I *am* (is) *ik*. In Old English (my) I (am) is *ic*, and in modern English my permeating I is (am). (My) *am* permeation become(s) more thorough as (my) I in Old Nordic evolves into *ek*. My Swedish realm has *jag* for I, while my I in Gothic has recognizable *ik*. Since I all trace back to Indo-European **eĝ(h)om* (ich), and Old Indian *ahám*, and to the Indo-European variant **eĝhom*, and since I all relate to Latin *egō* and Greek *ego* (εγώ), with differing consonants – compare me with Old Slavic *azъ*, with Russian *ja* and with Indo-European **eĝ(h)om* – I (am) is perhaps neuter in gender with the meaning of my *hereness*, my **being** in the midst of what is transpiring and what **being** transpires.¹¹

As the I as I-addiction, my presence exists in the English language in the form of *egoism*, the placing of the **being** of I in the foreground – a derogatory form meaning *self-importance* – beginning around 1720. Before that time, the esteem of the I was in the *am* of **being**. The negative implications and attitudes are thus modern and possibly human-evil-derived, as the Genevan/French composer, educator, writer, natural scientist, philosopher, and founder of the Enlightenment Movement, Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), would argue and undoubtedly prove. This indicates an instigated, human-evil-derived transportation of the I in me away from the **being** of before human time, and the negative aspects of me as I and *am* are not in the supremacy of **being** and are consequently not Godly. Yet, I am

¹¹ An asterisk * before a word in etymology means that etymologists have reconstructed the exact word.

being Godly in His image. Perhaps the permeation is full circle as the single-double-track of the infinite Möbius ribbon of time within my *am* and **being**.

The creator **I** within me transcends to encompass all that my **being** is, and as I transcend to become **being** in the Creator **I**, I know that the creative is in my ego. Intuitively, I know that my *am* as **being** and as *poet* must *create*, because there are five important root stems that find their **being** respectively from the Indo-European: my *am*, from **es**, *that which is (real)*, and from **er-¹**, *to set in motion, to exist*; my *am* as **being**, from **bheu-** *to exist, to grow, to bring forth*; my *am* as *poet* from **kwei-¹**, *to build, to do, to make*; and my *am* as *create*, from **ker-²**, *to grow, to create, to bring forth*.

I exist because my *am* in **being** is my own *poem* and it is my own *creation*, as well. I am being. I am paradise. ***I am I because I am because I am not.*** I am in my **being** because I am not a futile undertaking. I **am** not an illusion beyond the essence of creation. I **am being** the essence. My **being** is the source of character identity for my country and me. There can be no character identity for my country without me. **Being** cannot be deconstructed. **Being** is the primordial condition and it is ever the present condition in the journey through time.

If we accept deconstructionism as fact, then it is also fact that the ultimate, indeed, extreme consequence of Barack Hussein Obama's purposeful, destructive deconstructionism is that it is a futile effort – unless he exterminates *I am being* – because any text, any speech, any composition of any sort, including music, any architecture, or any art in its widest sense, or even any historical movement, any philosophical movement, or any political movement is constantly in flux, but not necessarily unstable. Yet, the

condition of instability is exactly what Barack Hussein Obama wants to create. Instability in the complete spectrum of the American political and social atmosphere will facilitate the end of The United States of America.

Ergo

Barack Hussein Obama is not and can never be the *I am an American Patriot* individual. Barack Hussein Obama was born into a Muslim society and raised in a Muslim country, Indonesia. According to the Islamic law of birth, he will always be a Muslim. He will always be a part of the world community of Muslims: the Umma. There are no free individuals in the Umma, just like there can be no free individuals in Islam. There are no *I am*. All are subservient to Islam. This fact also cancels out individual freedom. Islam and Mohammed tell a Muslim how to use abrogation; how to have sex; when to have sex; how to sleep; when to sleep; what you can sleep with, such as a sheep, a camel, a donkey on a cold night; how to commit bestialities;¹² how to make pedophilia legal; how to wash; when to wash; how to eat; when to eat; what to eat; how to choose your friends; how to defecate and urinate; how to beat the wives; what Islamic morals are; how to lie; how to deceive; how to become a follower of Mohammed and Allah in the likes of Mohamed and Allah, which is nothing more than becoming an opprobrium, indeed, evilness to the core.

The Umma and Islam exclude everyone from patriotism. Therefore, no American Muslim can ever be an American patriot. If they claim such status, they are contradicting Islam and the Umma; or, ... they are exercising the

¹² Read: <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/thrillsrunninguplegs2.pdf> for this and related aspects.

concept of *al-taqiyya*. They are conducting deception and lying for the greater cause of Islam. Consequently, Allah, Mohammed, the Koran, and the Islamic Sharia law permit a Muslim to conduct a behavior that allows a Muslim to tell a half-truth, to lie, to be moral, to be immoral, to be ethical, to be unethical, to obey the law, or to break the law and commit crimes as long as the Muslim and fellow Muslims are protected and the spread of Islam is assured. Allah, the great deceiver, is so forgiving!

This is exactly what an American Muslim – a contradiction in terms! – does when s/he takes an oath of office for a municipal, state, or federal position. There is absolutely no uprightness and respect for the laws of the United States of America behind a Muslim taking an oath of office with or without the Koran. They are taking the oath only because it is a requirement for the chosen employment position. Allah will forgive them for that! Their final allegiance is not to the United States of America, but to Islam and the Umma. Therefore, their oaths of office are not worth being administered by a governing official and are not to be respected. When a patriotic American takes an oath of office, s/he is declaring allegiance to We the People and to the Republic of the United States of America, of whom they are a part because of their individual I's.

Upon his exiting Independence Hall at the close of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in 1787, a woman asked Benjamin Franklin, “Well Doctor, what have we got, a republic or a monarchy?” Franklin answered, A republic, madam – if you can keep it.¹³

¹³ "The response is attributed to BENJAMIN FRANKLIN—at the close of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, when queried as he left Independence Hall on the final day of deliberation—in the notes of Dr.

"I Am An American"

*I am an American.
That's the way most of us put it, just matter of factly.
They are plain words, those four.
You could write them on your thumbnail,
or you could sweep them clear across this bright autumn sky.
But remember too that they are more than words.
They are a way of life.
So whenever you speak them, speak them firmly;
speak them proudly; speak them gratefully.
I am an American.*

14

Source: <http://www.purdue.edu/bands/aamb/images/iamanamericanjpg.jpg>.

We American Patriots shall not allow America to decline! We must keep it at all costs!

James McHenry, one of Maryland's delegates to the Convention. McHenry's notes were first published in *The American Historical Review*, vol. 11, 1906, and the anecdote on p. 618 reads: 'A lady asked Dr. Franklin, Well Doctor what have we got a republic or a monarchy. A republic replied the Doctor if you can keep it.' When McHenry's notes were included in *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, ed. Max Farrand, vol. 3, appendix A, p. 85 (1911, reprinted 1934), a footnote stated that the date this anecdote was written is uncertain." Quoted from <http://www.bartleby.com/73/1593.html>.

¹⁴ *Autumn* as used in line 5 has the secondary meaning of "a time or period of maturity verging on decline." Consult William Morris, editor. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston: 1976.

18

In the United States of America I am a free individual, with allegiance only to the republican government established by *We the People* and which is *We the People*. We must never lose that basic principle that guarantees our freedom. We must not allow a charlatan to destroy in four years that political entity for which a War of Independence, a Civil War, two World Wars, and many regional wars were fought. We must not allow Barack Hussein Obama and his minions filled with crap to place us in chains.

I am an American citizen. I am a natural born American citizen. I am patriotic. I am an American. I am an American Patriot.

I am

Frederick William Dame
Patriotic, Steadfast, and True
July 18, 2012