



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

The 1st Amendment Is No Word Game

During my formative years, both in high school and college, *free speech* went unquestioned, except for Oliver Wendell Holmes provision disallowing ‘clear and present danger’ of violence. We were free to express our conscience, knowing full well—what we said could invite a punch in the nose.

Things have changed. From both sides of the aisle comes censure of free speech. All that BS around Jewish students harassed on the way to class by demonstrators was just that—BS. The university culture, as viewed from the right, functioned to censure any criticism of Israel (Zionism), without regard for students right to speak up and confront the government.

The 1st Amendment text: *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.* 45 words that mean exactly what they say.

Within 45 words, Americans are guaranteed that no state religion can supplant personal religious views, nor can government censure the practice of those beliefs. What would our founders think of Pete Hegseth anointing the slaughter of Iran with Jesus Christ in the drivers seat? Or how about the shutting-down of religious services during Covid?

No abridgment of free speech/free press. Or of the right of the people to peacefully assemble. Instead, anti-government demonstrators are labelled terrorists—as prone to violence. During the Vietnam protests, it was the cops initiating violence against demonstrators.

A present, leftist wok-ism (built around a false notion that no one be made uncomfortable), acts to rein-in/curtail free speech. That's not the intent of the 1st Amendment. In fact the intention of the 1st Amendment is the opposite. The 1st Amendment is not intended to be a word game. Instead, it's the foundation for what it is to be an American. Consider the 1st and the 2nd Amendments in the Bill of Rights. The 1st, I'm addressing in this article, is followed by the 2nd, with an intention to guarantee American citizens the power to defend the 1st. 1st/2nd Amendments come 1/2 for that reason.

Americans are now forcibly removed from institutional forums for a lack of respect and decorum for authority. Was it the intention that free speech was only allowed with proper etiquette/genuflection?

Terminiello v. City of Chicago (1949) was a landmark 5-4 Supreme Court decision holding that freedom of speech is protected even if it *stirs public anger, invites dispute, or creates unrest*. The Case: Father Arthur Terminiello gave a 1946 speech in Chicago, attacking various groups/protestors, resulting in his arrest for breach of peace. *Ruling*: The Supreme Court reversed his conviction on 1st Amendment grounds, finding that a city ordinance cannot restrict speech simply because it is provocative. *Significance*: Justice William O. Douglas wrote: 'a function of free speech... is to invite dispute'. Speech is not restricted unless it poses a '*clear and present danger*'. *Context*: This case significantly limited the ability of local governments to use *disorderly conduct* charges to silence controversial speakers simply because they upset an audience. *Broad Protection*: 1st Amendment protects speech that causes dissatisfaction or unrest, not just pleasant or

popular speech. What became of that ruling?

The left, since the Obama Administration, increasingly abridges free speech. Anti-Obama demonstrators were restricted to an area not in proximity to the event. And Obama is credited with going after whistleblowers—more than any his predecessors.

Trump sees the *law of the land* as *suggestions* from the founders—negotiable *terms of service*. Because he understands nothing about the Constitution, he makes his own rules—accelerating the economic/political destruction of the republic. Standing between Palantir/mass surveillance, and Zionist/freedom haters—would could go wrong?

Just because Trump says it, don't make it so. He is subject to international law—that owes its existence to Nuremberg, the Geneva Convention, and UN Charter. The US Congress passed laws (law of the land), that blockades/threats of aggression/wars of aggression are prosecutable crimes under US law. But, Iran, which is not a formal party to *UN/Law of the Sea*, breaks no law controlling the Strait of Hormuz.

The 1st amendment is not a living thing subject to opaque interpretations. What it means now is what it meant in the latter 1700's. The 1st Amendment disallows compromise around far-fetched woke/Zionist interpretations intended to silence Americans. How can Americans deal with such insanity?

Knowing contentiousness is always close by, listen carefully to rhetoric used to suck you down the rabbit hole. Know that elites don't want to take your rights—the goal is to transfer them to entities they support. As in: an unconstitutional Citizen's United, granting corporations the rights of citizens. Are corporations unconstitutional? How long will it be until AI chatbots are granted protection under the Bill of Rights—the United States Constitution?

I can't remember who said it but 'It is no measure of health to be well-adjusted to a sick society. That's what the US has become—a sick and dying

republic. Wherein we are asked to forsake what makes us Americans—a citizenry in support of individual/national sovereignty. Citizens of a nation that minds its own business-whose leaders diligently avoid aggression.

Trump's threats/wars of aggression are about global control (if possible), or at least Western hemisphere/global/oil. But neither, as a result of fair competition and diplomacy—instead by means of blunt-force fist of trauma.

Let's get philosophical. There's a line from a 17th century poem: 'Where ignorance is bliss—tis folly to be wise', which dovetails nicely with an idea that reality is depressive. What the means for a questioner, is the longer you live, you understand that the human condition is depressive. 'Ignorance is bliss' comes from someone who sees and not from someone who does not

With that in mind, know that along the path on which we find ourselves, there are no apparent solutions and not much to put stock in. Groups, in which you are not a member (whether it be democrats/Christians whatever), will never view you without maintaining group skepticism about you.

With that in mind, protect yourself by avoiding situations, whether it be with authorities or neighbors, that reek of confrontation. This is no time to portray yourself as being in touch with reality. Instead, if you must, go where you need to go with banter (become a master of banter), slipping punches.

There's much to think on. Today, I heard the oil crisis could affect global GDP up to 10%. Energy is not 10% of GDP—energy is most all of GDP. I see some wide-ranging articles: It's best to not suffer fools gladly, but that isn't an invitation to make fools suffer—shared with onrushing energy fears?

The only way I gain new readers is from the *middle*—not the *right* or *left*. If you know someone who might benefit from my articles, please forward so that I can maintain subscribers against un-subscribers. Get my articles by e-mail with a request, or comment: erik@neverhadaboss.com. Thank you