

from

Was Grandpa Really a Moron?

Critical Inquiries for a New American Century

by

Peter E. Hendrickson

It's Time To Stand, Or Fall



"As nightfall does not come at once, neither does oppression. In both instances, there is a twilight when everything remains seemingly unchanged. And it is in such twilight that we all must be most aware of change in the air-- however slight-- lest we become unwitting victims of the darkness."

– Justice of the Supreme Court, William O. Douglas

In October of 2007, the House of Representatives passed, 404 to 6, the first version of what is intended to be the next-- and perhaps, final-- weapon in the growing arsenal being assembled by the state in its program of binding the bulk of the American people into the status of livestock. The name given to the test-run version of this weapon against American liberty is 'The Violent Radicalization And Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act Of 2007' (VRHTPA). Although this first roll-out failed in the Senate, the purpose behind the VRHTPA is not going to go away. Like the 'USA PATRIOT Act', much of which was written several years before finally being enacted in 2001, the now written-and-ready VRHTPA will be back.

Simply put, this bill is intended to create an institutional mechanism by which American critics of government policy can

Was Grandpa Really a Moron?

be silenced, and by which the dissemination of information and views not originating with, or approved by, the state will be effectively suppressed. The mechanism in the bill is a formal commission whose portfolio is the "identification" (read: designation) of American citizens as "terrorists", and the designation of sources of disfavored information as "terrorist" "facilitators". These designations can be based upon nothing more than the target having challenged or disputed an official, government-generated version of reality, or having facilitated the dissemination of such challenges or disputes.

The bill defines the "violent radicalization" against which it is deployed as,

(2) VIOLENT RADICALIZATION- The term 'violent radicalization' means the process of adopting or promoting an extremist belief system for the purpose of facilitating ideologically based violence to advance political, religious, or social change.

More malleable language would be hard to come by. Indeed, a more malleable concept would be hard to come by. "Adopting" "an extremist belief system"? "Promoting" "an extremist belief system"?! "For the purpose of facilitating"?!!

We need not wrestle with what these deliberately vague and spinnable phrases really mean to see the impropriety of this legislation. Even just taking this language on its face, it is self-evident that "belief systems"-- whatever they might be-- are outside of governmental jurisdiction; and that this legislation is nonetheless intended to facilitate government promotion of the extremist belief that citizens cultivating the "belief system" of their choice is both a bad thing and IS within the government's proper purview.

However, a brief analysis makes clear that the reference to "belief systems" is just a red herring. Inconvenient information and opinions are the real target of this bill.

Indeed, there really is no such thing as a belief "system". The very use of this phrase is for the purpose of

generating confusion as to the target of the legislation, and to protect the VRHTPA from the charge that it seeks to attack beliefs-- an attack which would be readily recognized as illegal even by the heavily-conditioned American "mainstream" without further ado.

What there actually ARE are simply beliefs, and the information and opinions upon which those beliefs are based. The only sense in which this combination is a "system" is the sense in which all reasoning is a system: a given conclusion (belief)-- and possible associated action-- arises only after consideration of a given body of information and analysis.

The conclusion arrived at in any given case (like the response that it might call forth) is discreet from the information upon which it is based. This bill, however, wishes to conflate the discreet elements into a "system", so that if the response of any given individual to a certain body of information is violent, or even can merely be expected to be passionate (and therefore "potentially violent"), any body of information upon which the related conclusion might be based can also be condemned, and made inaccessible to EVERYONE.

Here's an example: Suppose someone were to write an editorial criticizing a piece of federal legislation as an illegal effort by the government to hinder the free flow of information, so as to ensure its ability to "engineer consent" to policies favored by its clients. This editorial persuasively characterized the effort as a grim usurpation of authority for the purpose of binding the sovereign people into blind servitude.

Now, suppose someone reading the editorial were to then engage in a violent, or even merely "threatening" (that is, impassioned) protest of the legislation (or the federal perpetrator). Under the VRHTPA, the protest would be condemned as "homegrown terrorism":

(3) HOMEGROWN TERRORISM- The term 'homegrown terrorism' means the use, planned use, or threatened use, of force or violence by a group or individual born,

Was Grandpa Really a Moron?

raised, or based and operating primarily within the United States or any possession of the United States to intimidate or coerce the United States government, the civilian population of the United States, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.

So would the editorial itself (since it would be accused of, "*promoting an extremist belief system for the purpose of facilitating ideologically based violence to advance political, religious, or social change.*")!

Here's another example: Suppose a website were to offer detailed information and analysis of what might have been a massive crime against the American people of a very immediate (and even ongoing) sort-- information that large and growing segments of the population were already closely studying, while simultaneously being reminded (on that site or elsewhere) of the principle that, *whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends [assisting individuals in securing their rights, by means to which those individuals consent], it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.*". Suppose that website (or others) also took note of the fact that the Second Amendment is explicitly provided in the federal Constitution in recognition of the fact that democratic processes might not suffice to reign in a rogue government, and that violent resort to the bayonets of the militia might be necessary in such cases.

Need I say it? Under the VRHTPA, the website offering the information about the possible crime (and those quoting the Declaration of Independence and the Second Amendment) would be designated as contributing to "homegrown terrorism". The VRHTPA actually announces its particular interest in

suppressing troublesome websites, declaring the "finding of Congress" that:

"(3) The Internet has aided in facilitating violent radicalization, ideologically based violence, and the homegrown terrorism process in the United States by providing access to broad and constant streams of terrorist-related propaganda to United States citizens."

I know. All of this sounds rather far-fetched at this point.

Surely, the VRHTPA is directed only at the dangerous "Islamofascism" manifesting itself in America today-- that is, all the wild-eyed "jihadists" constantly blowing things up around the country, marching in threatening protests in our big cities, and so on. It is mere stridency to propose that a bill such as this is intended to stifle critical inquiry inconvenient to the state... right? It has to be. It can't happen here...

Anyway, here's one final example of what can be expected under the VRHTPA: Suppose someone relentlessly promoted the notions that a particular foreign country was responsible for an attack on American soil leading to a substantial loss of life; that the country's ruler was facilitating the training and organization of terrorists in order to do more of the same; and that this ruler was even seeking to acquire nuclear weapons in connection with this purpose. The plain purpose of this promotion, and its direct consequence, has been to inflame large numbers into supporting, and even participating in, massive violence resulting in an ongoing loss of life already comparable to that of the deadliest war ever fought on American soil, and with no end in sight. (In this particular example, by the way, every single element of the information on which the violence is based has long-since been proven to have been not only false but deliberate lies.)

Under the provisions of the VRHTPA, the purveyors of this information would... continue to enjoy steady career

Was Grandpa Really a Moron?

advancement, lucrative benefits from their investments, and eventual settlement into well-cushioned positions in, or lobbying for, the industries whose bottom-lines have been fattened by the project. Critical investigations or revelations concerning the lies involved would be firmly suppressed. Everything would freeze into a nice, comforting, predictable stasis into the foreseeable future...

It need hardly be spelled-out that in addition to chilling information-providers directly, the terms of the 'Violent Radicalization And Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act' will enlist the voluntary censorship of information and opinions susceptible to the attentions of the commission established by the legislation by otherwise disinterested telecomm service-providers, as well. It will escape no one that being the ISP or telecomm by which targeted information is disseminated could itself serve as a pretext for those same attentions, and these businesses, even when they don't consider their interests aligned with the statist quo, will be readily swayed by what has become a standard calculation in recent years:

"Now, let's see. Leviathan has made clear its disfavor of this customer's material, and its willingness to completely disregard all principles of due process, honesty and fairness in seeking to have its way. My customer has no legal means of forcing me to keep him, and he's only worth \$XX to me. Leviathan, on the other hand, can and will impose huge costs on me for defying it-- heck, it even put that Qwest guy in prison for refusing to do illegal spying for it! What should I do..."

I think the agonizing indecision will be short-lived.

Clearly then, the VRHTPA is a multi-faceted end-run around the First Amendment, intended to silence dissent and criticism of the government and its policies without overt state

infringement of speech rights. But it's also much worse than just that...

IT HAS BEEN WELL SAID that those who permit themselves to be made ignorant of history are doomed to repeat the harsh lessons of the past. The VRHTPA will furnish a perfect example of this wisdom.

Americans ARE grossly ignorant of history-- vast numbers of American parents have blindly turned the education of their children over to the state for several generations now, and the state has (unsurprisingly) been lax at educating those children as to its own predispositions and past offenses against the citizenry. Happy to take advantage, our homegrown Leviathan and its clients-- who are feeling VERY threatened by the free exchange of ideas and information right now-- are reviving one of the worst of those past offenses, and appear likely to succeed with little notice being paid by the general public.

The fact is, the 'Violent Radicalization and Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act' is actually a just the last step in a modern revival of the obscene 'Alien and Sedition' acts suffered by early Americans of the late 18th century until overwhelmingly rejected with the election of Thomas Jefferson. (See 'Strolling Down Memory Lane' in 'Upholding the Law And Other Observations' to learn more about these previous offenses, and the cold-eyed and deadly-serious reactions they prompted from Jefferson and James Madison.)

But this is a "revival" on steroids. This modern version of criminal state censorship and practical prior restraint will not only silence dissenters and other troublesome voices. It will be used to permanently "disappear" Americans who refuse to be silent, do what they're told, and believe what they're told, while their betters do what they wish and operate the "memory hole" unhindered whenever political expediency suggests its use.

Was Grandpa Really a Moron?

Understand: the VRHTPA equates challenging the state in any way-- ranging from merely questioning its approved version of facts, all the way to enforcing the primacy of the people over the government-- with "terrorism". Under the provisions of the 'Military Commissions Act of 2006', those accused of "terrorism" are candidates for simply being black-bagged into the gulag for an indefinite stay without recourse or appeal.

I realize that to some this will all sound quite hyperbolic, of course. This is unavoidable, despite the fact that I am actually being quite dispassionate here. It is impossible to analyze and discuss this very real, immediate, comprehensive and ever-more-unmistakable effort to lock down America without appearing to be exercised. Simply to recite the words of enactments like this 'Homegrown Terrorism' act, the 'Military Commissions Act of 2006', the 'John Warner Defense Reauthorization Act of 2007' and others in this web is to paint a picture which is starkly alarming to anyone with an ounce of active brain tissue. Those to whom such a recitation seems hyperbolic are projecting into my expressions the clanging alarm very appropriately going off in the backs of their own minds.

It is important that what is going on be clearly understood-- because we are on the cusp of transformation, for good or for ill. Beginning in earnest in the late 1990s, the 'information revolution' has suddenly, unexpectedly and very inconveniently (for those who prefer that their machinations remain concealed) allowed us commoners to discover the degree to which we are being (and have been) fed upon by the parasitic kleptocracy that has long since established itself in control of the mechanisms of the state. That kleptocracy is scrambling to close the barn door.

Mere manipulation of the education establishment and the wholly-owned (or co-opted) "mainstream media", which used to suffice in dealing with the occasional penetration of disquieting sunlight into the barn, isn't good enough anymore. We now have our own media and our own teachers, and we're discovering things that have been carefully kept from us for many years.

To put it simply, we're discovering the degree to which our consent has been "engineered", and that the engineering was NOT benevolently done because we're just too dumb to look out for our own interests, and would have made bad choices if fairly left to make them. It was done for the purpose of viciously exploiting us.

Thanks to our unique and still fragile access to uncontrolled information, we're awake now, we're angry, and we're withdrawing our consent. Millions of us. We will now-- right now-- either seize and defend this opportunity, or we will go down into a long, dark night.

"I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

-Thomas Jefferson

I stand with Jefferson on this one. How about you?

The kleptocracy has one thing going for it, for a while, having successfully conditioned a lot of Americans to just ask, "How high?" when its institutionally-embedded tools say, "Jump!". Thus, at this point, if some institutional actor-- that is, a member of the governmental apparatus-- orders the suppression of inconvenient speech by one means or another under the alleged authority of one of the unconstitutional (and therefore entirely illegitimate) acts discussed above, it is likely to enjoy mindless cooperation.

Therefore, one of the important tasks before the rest of us is to relentlessly educate our fellows. I suggest that it is

Was Grandpa Really a Moron?

enough, and perhaps best, if the focus of that education effort be confined to these two simple lessons: Unquestioning obedience to "authority", and acceptance of its pronouncements, is inherently un-American-- indeed, un-human-- (and pathetically stupid, to boot); and any act or command by government that conflicts with what YOU find in the relevant state or federal Constitution-- not what the government says is there, or is meant by what is there, but what you personally read there yourself-- is entirely without authority.

Constitutions are the laws WE write, and they mean what WE intend them to mean-- nothing more and nothing less. But they don't mean anything if we don't stand up and enforce them.

Another important task for each of us, and one that requires the cooperation of no one, is taking control of our own contributions to Leviathan's health, and thus making use of one of the key mechanisms of provided by the Founders for the preservation of our liberties. Toward that end, please visit www.losthorizons.com/It'sTime.htm and view (and share) the film you'll find there. Then act.

It is the eleventh hour, people. It's time to get up.

And when at last this rebellion compelled the British Government to use the only power that any Government has -- force, used with general consent -- and British troops moved into Boston to restore order, Americans did not consent. They stood up and fought the British Regulars.

One man began that war. And who knows his name?

He was a farmer, asleep in his bed, when someone pounded on his door and shouted in the night, 'The troops are coming!'

What could he do against the King's troops? One man. If he had been the King, that would have been different; then he could have done great things. Then he could have set everything to rights, he could have made everyone good and prosperous and happy, he could have changed the course of history. But he was not a King, not a Royal Governor, not a rich man, not even prosperous, not important at all, not even known outside the neighborhood. What could he do? What was the use of his trying to do anything? One man, even a few men, can not stand against the King's troops. He had a wife and children to think of; what would become of them, if he acted like a fool?

Most men had better sense; most men knew they could do nothing and they stayed in bed, that night in Lexington. But one man got up. He put on his clothes and took his gun and went out to meet the King's troops. He was one man who did not consent to a control which he knew did not exist.

The fight on the road to Lexington did not defeat the British troops. What that man did was to fire a shot heard around the world, and still heard...

That shot was the first sound of a common man's voice that the Old World ever heard. For the first time in all history, an individual spoke, an ordinary man, unknown, unimportant, disregarded, without rank, without power, without influence.

Not acting under orders, not led, but standing on his own feet, acting from his own will, responsible, self-controlling, he fired on the King's troops. He defied a world-empire.

The sound of that shot said: Government has no power but force; it can not control any man.

No one knows who began the American Revolution. Only his neighbors ever knew him, and no one now remembers any of them. He was an unknown man, an individual, the only force that can ever defend freedom."

-Rose Wilder Lane, 'THE DISCOVERY OF FREEDOM: Man's Struggle Against Authority'