

Obama's Baby-Sitters

Barack Obama is a determined guy. He appears to be on a one-man mission to eliminate the Constitution of the United States – or at least the collection of Amendments known as the Bill of Rights. Working in his favor is the fact that most Americans have never read the Constitution, and the document is likely not high on the list of topics deemed critical by the leftists who currently run the American school systems. Also in Obama's favor is a Supreme Court that has several members who've shown an eagerness to interpret the Constitution as loosely as Mariah Carey follows a melody.

Liberals like Obama frequently talk about the Constitution's "right to privacy" when defending unrestricted federally-funded abortions. Of course, no right to privacy is in the Constitution. Granted, Americans expect to be able to go to bed without the police knocking down their front door in the middle of the night, but all bets are off if prior to brushing your teeth and saying your prayers you knocked off a liquor store with a Glock pistol and your girl friend's pantyhose stretched over your head. (Note to civil libertarians: you may want to find out what Obama has in mind with the "civilian national security force" he has proposed.)

Obama pledged that the first piece of legislation he will sign into law is the "Freedom of Choice Act," which will overturn all state laws that currently place limits on abortion. So much for that pesky Tenth Amendment to the Constitution – the one about leaving to the individual States all functions not specifically granted by the document to the Federal Government.

The Second Amendment, being incompatible with Obama's goal of removing all guns from the United States, will probably be next to go. Between now and November he'll "talk the talk" about not preventing hunters from enjoying the great outdoors, but once he's firmly ensconced in the Oval Office the pen will come out and Americans can say good-bye to their right to self-defense. No word yet on how he'll get the criminals to give up their guns, but Obama has argued in the past that we need "more hospitals, not more prisons," so perhaps he thinks free health care will be enough to persuade the bad guys to give up their lives of crime. (After all, most criminals are only in the business to finance their mothers' cancer treatment.) Obama's own terrorist buddies - William Ayers and Bernadine Dohrn - probably counseled that even their ever-evolving new American revolution doesn't require guns - the bomb is their weapon of choice.

But Obama has to get in to the White House to get rid of the Second Amendment and, for the moment, the First Amendment is standing in his way. Even for the Generation X crowd that may never have heard of the Constitution, the text of that Amendment is pretty straight-forward:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of

the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

There will be no defined or forced national religion, Americans can worship as they darn well please, and the government can't stop you from speaking your mind, gathering with your friends to complain about the government, or starting a newspaper. Note that it does not say you'll be given the money to start that newspaper – although an awful lot of people seem to think that it does. Censorship is the government preventing you from speaking your mind. If no one wants to listen to you, that's your problem.

Those First Amendment rights - which even Joe “Penumbra” Biden can probably understand - are not to be taken for granted, especially when one considers that the citizens of many other countries don't have them. (I suspect that Iran television has no “That's My Ahmadinejad!” sit-com.) But because we do tend to take those rights for granted, we Americans don't always pay attention when they are being abused.

Barack Obama is hoping no one will pay any attention to the latest skirmish in his battle for the Presidency. The Obama campaign has dashed off a letter to the Department of Justice, complaining about a television commercial that links him to 1960s radicals William Ayers and Bernadine Dohrn, formerly of the infamous Weather Underground. The ad is being run by an organization called the American Issues Project. The attorney for the organization, Cleta Mitchell, said, “The majority of AIP's annual expenditures are not political expenditures but are devoted to grassroots lobbying and education on issues, public policies and other communications, activities and programs appropriate to a 501(c)(4) social welfare organization in accordance with all applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.”

IRS regulations allow non-profits to run ads on political issues, providing the majority of their activities are not purely political. Thus, NARAL can run ads defending abortion, because it engages in many activities other than political campaigns, and pro-life organizations can run ads denouncing abortions.

The Obama camp argues that AIP is a purely political group, simply trying to “Swift Boat” Obama. That's not a surprising charge, inasmuch as the main financial sponsor of AIP is a wealthy Texan, Harold Simmons, who helped fund the Swift Boat Veterans for Truth. The arguments as to whether the AIP is a proper 501(c)4 that can legally air the ads will play out in the courts. In the meantime, if Obama can get an injunction, the AIP's ads will be taken off the air until the issue is resolved - which Obama will try to delay until after Election Day.

Obama, like any candidate for public office, wants to define himself and not be defined by the opposition. Defining himself means not letting anyone know about his socialist leanings and history. (That is why Obama, in his book “Dreams From My Father,” refers to his Hawaiian mentor simply as “Frank.” He doesn't want the reader to know he means Frank Marshall Davis, a propagandist, radical agitator, and member of the Communist Party USA.) Having mug shots and “FBI most wanted” posters of Ayers and Dohrn on

television will not help Obama's self-definition cause. His problem is the public trail left by those pals. There is no small amount of damning information about them, and their connections to the candidate are out there as well. It may be hard to prove that Ayers and Dohrn were occasional baby-sitters for Obama, but it's not difficult to say that Obama and Ayers were close friends when they worked together on the Chicago Annenberg Challenge, an education project founded by Ayers and chaired by Obama.

Obama defended his association with Ayers and Dohrn with the statement, "The notion that...me knowing somebody who engaged in detestable acts 40 years ago... somehow reflects on me and my values doesn't make much sense." (How would Obama - or the media - react if John McCain was caught playing golf with O. J. Simpson or paying a social visit to Charles Manson? Could McCain get away with that same defense?) Obama is of course hoping the voters won't learn of the more recent activities and remarks of Ayers and Dohrn, which wouldn't exactly prompt middle-America to hold them in the same regard as Lee Greenwood. As an example, Ayers (and Obama) funneled money to Professor Rashid Khalidi, a known terrorist sympathizer, critic of Israel, and former spokesman for Yassir Arafat. (Khalidi also held fundraisers for Obama.) Obama is not talking to reporters about that.

As recently as 2007, Ayers describes the United States as an "...incipient fascist country," and talks about overthrowing capitalism, while Dohrn, at a reunion of the radical group Students for a Democratic Society, said that "...living in America constitutes living in the belly of the beast" and "the heart of the monster." Obama hasn't denounced those statements, because he's pretending they were never made. In a memoir published by Ayers after 9/11, he wrote that America is "not a just and fair and decent place... it makes me want to puke." No word from Obama about whether he shares that proclivity.

Ayers has traveled to Venezuela several times to applaud Hugo Chavez' efforts to impose greater control over teachers and better spread his socialist ideas. Did Ayers have those same kinds of views when he worked with Obama on educational reforms in Chicago with the Annenberg Project? Obama's not talking, except to make the Clintonite statement that he does not exchange ideas with Ayers "on a regular basis." (Giving themselves wiggle room is where politicians earn Olympic gold.)

Obama naturally doesn't want the airing of television ads connecting him with such stellar role models as Ayers and Dohrn, so he's trying to block them in the courts. Obama's lawyers will argue the technicalities of the law. AIP, through Mitchell, has already argued its basic defense: "Surely we have not come to a point where the government and its agencies are used to protect presidential candidates from citizens' speech, essentially destroying the very purpose, meaning and historical essence of the First Amendment."

In contrast to 2004, when some observers thought John Kerry let the Swift Boat ads go unchallenged, Obama wasted no time responding to the Ayers ad. But, not content to wait to see if they will have the law on their side, Obama's goons quickly demanded that

advertisers pressure television stations to refuse to air the ads. Obama seems determined to hide the truth about his past and, in the process, doesn't mind trampling the First Amendment rights of those who aren't willing to give him more power to abuse the Constitution.

Don Fredrick
August 26, 2008

Copyright 2008 Don Fredrick