

Frederick William Dame

(Exercising freedom of speech ... as long as it still exists.)

JUST THINKING

Number 12

Guy Benson, Political Editor at Townhall.com in his *Analysis: Obama's Worst Speech Yet* (http://townhall.com/tipsheet/guybenson/2012/04/03/obamas_worst_speech_yet) writes in his introduction to Obama's speech on April 3, 2012: "Today we witnessed something truly remarkable. Barack Obama managed to out-do himself by uncorking what very well may have been the most dishonest, demagogic, and bitterly partisan speech of his presidency. I render that assessment as someone who has sat through and analyzed countless Obama lectures, some of which earned [very high marks](#) for deceit and ideological invective. Indeed, today's Occupy-inspired rant takes the cake. It was a depressing and enraging preview of the next seven months, over which this president will [unleash a barrage](#) of sophistic and pernicious arguments deliberately designed to sow discord and divide Americans. He will do so with no regard for the truth, history, or the Constitution he swore to uphold. I genuinely cannot see how anyone who considers him- or herself a "conservative" in any meaningful sense could watch this screed and *not* immediately redouble his resolve to help defeat the man who delivered it. Adequately addressing and debunking this speech is going to be a Herculean undertaking. Nearly every single paragraph is littered with distortions, scorched straw men, and flat untruths. But I'm going to take a stab at it."

JT: I recommend that you read the rest of the analysis that also contains videos supporting Mr. Benson's correct arguments. At the same time I must say that I personally didn't know that Obama made good speeches. He is not a rhetorician. He is not a good orator. The best that he can do, other than to read from a teleprompter, is to make erm-uhm-ahh-err speeches. I also recommend the following analytical presentations of some of Barack Hussein Obama's blabbering and saying nothing that is historically correct or truthful.

- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/obamaberlinspeechcritique.pdf>
- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/obamadnconventionsspeech.pdf>
- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/comradeforkeDTongueRepaired17Jan2011.pdf>

- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/neverletatragedygotoanotheraste.pdf>
- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/anotherobamascrew.pdf>
- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/ATruthfulCritique.pdf>
- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/anexpose.pdf>
- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/thecauseoftruth.pdf>
- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/obamaslies-to-the-british-parliament.pdf>
- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/obamas-fathers-day-essay.pdf>
- <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/the-lying-address.pdf>

FoxNews.com reports, "Two top Republican lawmakers investigating the [Operation] Fast and Furious controversy are demanding the White House make a former aide available for testimony to see whether the scandal reached the upper echelons of the administration, according to a letter obtained by Fox News. Rep. Darrell Issa, R-Calif., and Sen. Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, fired off the letter Wednesday urging the White House to make available Kevin O'Reilly, a former National Security Council staffer who is currently stationed in Iraq for the State Department. ... "

JT: I don't want to see the writing on the wall, but Mr. Kevin O'Reilly is now stationed in Iraq. He is out of the way, but not entirely. He can be put out of the way for good, especially in Iraq. Obama would surely consider this extinction of a witness as a possibility.

NBC's *Today* program edited George Zimmerman's conversation with a 9-1-1 dispatcher the night he shot Trayvon Martin.

JT: Really? NBC? Not Beyond Criticism? It is not racist to ask if someone is white, black or Asian or whatever. It is not racist to be able to identify suspicious persons or criminals according to their skin color. If a black or an Asian is beaten up by a white person, the police want to use such criteria to narrow down possible groups of people they would be looking for. Perhaps Obama should issue a dictator decree that says it is only permissible to ask if possible criminals have one or two legs or one or two arms, or

one or two hands. No! That is impossible. A person having only one leg might be a Muslim who had the leg cut off because s/he kicked an imam. A person having only one arm might be a Muslim who was caught hugging his/her girlfriend/boyfriend in public. A person with one hand might indicate that the person was/is a Muslim thief! Now that would really be discrimination!

At WashingtonTimes.com Charles Hurt writes, “The past seven brutal days will go down as one of the worst weeks in history for a sitting president. It certainly has been, without any doubt, the worst week yet for ...Obama. Somehow, ...Obama managed to embarrass himself abroad, humiliate himself here at home, see his credentials for being elected so severely undermined that it raises startling questions about whether he should have been elected in the first place—let alone be re-elected later this year.” Hurt notes Obama’s “election-year race-pandering” in the Trayvon Martin shooting; his promise to Russia that he would “sell America and her allies down the river once he gets past the next election;” the embarrassingly weak performance of Obama’s Solicitor General while attempting to defend ObamaCare before the Supreme Court; and a 414–to–0 vote against his proposed 2013 budget. “Not that you will see any trace of embarrassment in the face of ...Obama,” observes Hurt. “He has mastered the high political art of shamelessness, wearing it smugly and cockily. Kind of like a hoodie.”

JT: There is nothing I would like better for the year 2012 than to see Obama get ripped in the elections and then be brought before a court of law to answer for his myriad crimes. At the same time I have this bad dream that on the night of the presidential election (presidential and Obama, a sure misnomer!), Obama is trailing by a few million votes and shortly before the winner is announced, Barack Hussein Obama wins by a few million votes ... from dead people, cartoon characters (the Democrats), foreign citizens, and a few hundred from Michelle, who decided to separate herself into many portions for thuggy-hubby!

At an Occupy Wall Street gathering, Obama’s domestic terrorist ghost-writer William Ayers tells admirers, “I get up every morning thinking, ‘Today, I’m gonna make a difference; today, I’m gonna end capitalism; today; I’m gonna make a revolution.’ I go to bed every night disappointed, but I’m back again tomorrow, and that’s the only way you can do it.”

JT: Little Billy Boy Ayers is suffering from an incurable, childhood, psychiatric condition known as The-Sky-Is-Falling, The-Sky-Is-Falling Syndrome. Not even leftist ideology can cure it because the condition cannot cure itself!

Obama says the following about the constitutionality of ObamaCare:, "I'm actually... continue to be confident that the Supreme Court will uphold the law. And the reason is, because in accordance with precedent out there, it's constitutional."

JT: What? Constitutional precedence means that the law is constitutional? The same argument can be used for Obama's occupying the Oval Office illegally. Constitutional precedence means that his usurpation of office is constitutional. Anyone who believes this Obama crap is a dumbsh*t! The logic proves the truth. Obama believes his crap!



Source: <http://iowntheworld.com/blog/?m=201203>

JT: This is not a bad idea. American taxpayers can send Michelle (and Barry to the moon on a one-way trip. The taxpayers would surely be more than happy to make this one-time expenditure. They would have to send a case of XXXL hamburgers, too. And for Barry ... well, how about a gay, rubber, inflatable doll! It seems that this would fit his psyche. Perhaps it could look like him! That would be a good investment in America's future!



Source: <http://tomfriedmann.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/burqa-00.jpg>

JT: Now that the victim has seen the lineup, will you please choose the one who attacked you in the name of Allah?



Source: <http://www.theblaze.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/taliban1-620x513.jpg>

JT: In Aesop's fable (flourished c. 550 BC) *The Wolf in Sheep's Clothing* we read the following: "The lamb ... began to follow the wolf in sheep's clothing." This is what Aesop meant. The wolf is a Taliban and the lambs are the idiots who follow them!

Raven Clabough at <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/11387-arizona-legislature-passes-internet-censorship-bill> reports, "The Arizona state legislature has passed an Internet censorship bill that has provoked the ire of liberty seeking Arizonians.

The bill extends telephone harassment laws to the Internet and other means of electronic communication. Under the pretense of being anti-bullying, the bill states that virtually anything said online that is deemed “offensive” by the state, to include editorials, illustrations, etc., could be a punishable offense.

H.B. 2549 would make it a crime to use any electronic or digital device to communicate using obscene, lewd or profane language or to suggest a lewd or lascivious act if done with intent to :annoy," "offend," "harass" or "terrify" ... "Lewd" and "profane" are not defined in the statute or by reference. "Lewd" is generally understood to mean lusty or sexual in nature and "profane" is generally defined as disrespectful or irreverent about religion or religious practices.

H.B. 2549 is not limited to a one to one conversation between two specific people. The communication does not need to be repetitive or even unwanted. There is no requirement that the recipient or subject of the speech actually feel offended, annoyed or scared. Nor does the legislation make clear that the communication must be intended to offend or annoy the reader, the subject or even any specific person.

The Comic Book Legal Defense Fund [explains](#):

The bill is sweepingly broad, and would make it a crime to communicate via electronic means speech that is intended to "annoy," "offend," "harass" or "terrify," as well as certain sexual speech. Because the bill is not limited to one-to-one communications, H.B. 2549 would apply to the Internet as a whole, thus criminalizing all manner of writing, cartoons, and other protected material the state finds offensive or annoying.

UCLA law professor Eugene Volokh, who runs the Volokh Conspiracy website, analyzes the broad application of such a law on something as simple as a blog comment that may not be well received:

So, under the statute, posting a comment to a newspaper article — or a blog — saying that the article or post author is "f***ing out of line" would be a crime: It's said with intent to offend, it uses an electronic or digital device, and it uses what likely will be seen as profane language (see, e.g., [City of Columbia Falls v. Bennett \(Mont. 1991\)](#)). Likewise if a blog poster were to post the same in response to a commenter's comment. Similarly, if someone posts something in response to an e-mail on an e-mail-based discussion list, or in a chatroom, or wherever else. (Note that if "profane" is read to mean not vulgarly insulting, but instead religiously offensive, see [City of Bellevue v. Lorang \(Wash. 2000\)](#), then the statute would be unconstitutional as well.)

...

Cass Sunstein, Obama's confidante and head of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, even proposed Internet censorship to be enforced and regulated through regulated links in news pieces to opposing opinions, though he later retracted that proposal, admitting it would be "too difficult to regulate in a way that would respond to those concerns," adding that it was "almost certainly unconstitutional."

In a 2008 *Harvard Law Review* paper written by Sunstein, he indicated that the government should be employing covert agents to "cognitively infiltrate online groups and website as well as other activist groups which advocate views that are 'false' about the government." Sunstein admits that even if the oppositional voices are in fact correct, they need to be discredited so as to "increase the citizens' faith in government officials."

Sunstein also called for the rewriting of the First Amendment.

More recently, Americans have had to contend with the Stop Online Piracy Act (SOPA), Protect Intellectual Property Act (PIPA), and the global Internet treaty signed by President Obama, which would permit foreign companies to demand that ISPs (Internet Service Providers) remove web content in the United States without any legal oversight without significant attention. Entitled the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement, the treaty was signed by President Obama on October 1, 2011, but it is currently a subject of discussion as the White House is circulating a petition demanding that Senators ratify the treaty.

What's worse is that the White House has done some maneuvering so that the treaty does not have to be confirmed by lawmakers to be implemented, regardless of the unconstitutionality of such an approach. Instead, it is presenting the treaty as an "executive agreement." By doing this, the entire legislative process has now been circumvented, without the Senate having to give its approval, as the Constitution demands.

Whether Brewer will sign the bill into law remains to be seen."

JT: Should H.B.2549 be signed into law by the Arizona governor, there will surely be some leftist idiot like William-no-ethics-Ayers who would be offended by the *Constitution for the United States of America*. He would surely prosecute against the Founding Fathers and Signers of the Constitution retroactively.

In *The New Yorker*, Jeffrey Toobin ridicules Justice Anthony Kennedy for suggesting that there is a "heavy burden of justification" for the individual mandate because forcing individuals to buy something is "unprecedented." Toobin claims, "The involvement of the

federal government in the health-care market is not unprecedented; it dates back nearly fifty years, to the passage of Medicare and Medicaid.” Toobin also points out that “...the Justices had no trouble upholding the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which used the clause to mandate the integration of hotels and restaurants.” Toobin makes the outrageous charge, “Now, ...the Supreme Court acts as a sort of supra-legislature, dismissing laws that conflict with its own political agenda.” Further, “If the Court acts in line with the sentiments expressed by the conservatives last week, it could curtail the policymaking options of Congress for a generation.” **(What a wonderful situation for the life of the American Republic!)** Toobin warns, “An adverse decision on the Affordable Care Act could even jeopardize the prospects for conservative legislative priorities, like health-insurance vouchers or private retirement accounts in lieu of Social Security. It is simply not the Supreme Court’s business to be making these kinds of judgments.” (Toobin cannot have it both ways. If he believes it is unconstitutional to pass legislation calling for health insurance vouchers or private retirement accounts, he cannot very well argue in favor of ObamaCare’s individual mandate.) Toobin adds, “The awesome, and final, powers of the Justices are best exercised sparingly and with restraint.” Toobin, concludes, “No one expects the Justices to be making health-care policy any more than we expect them to be picking Presidents, which, it may be remembered, is not exactly their strength, either.”

JT: Jefferey Toobin is wrong on almost every point, except where noted above.

Public Opinion to Jeffrey Toobin: You have just passed the American Idiot Test!

Jeffrey Toobin: Does that mean that I can continue to write my news reports?

Public Opinion: No. It means that you are an idiot!

JT: Muslims do not have Easter celebrations because there was never anyone in the Islamic faith who died for sinners and arose from the dead and ascended into heaven to fulfill the true holy prophesy. Rumor has it that Mohammed went to Jannat.

Frederick William Dame

Patriotic, Steadfast, and True

April 5, 2012.