

from

**Was Grandpa Really a Moron?**

**Critical Inquiries for a New American Century**

by

Peter E. Hendrickson

*"They hate our freedoms..."*



...or so we have been endlessly told by George Bush, Dick Cheney, and their various fellow travelers in the think tanks, the munitions industry, Congress and the press. Good sound-bite line, certainly. Also demonstrable nonsense, of course. A brief contemplation of the fact that Switzerland, to pick one example, is not a target of this allegedly ideological hatred will make obvious that the mere enjoyment of freedom is not what enrages those who are enraged against the United States.

Certainly if "freedoms" were the *casus belli*, *someplace* other than America and its fellow-meddlers in Muslim lands would be the target of attacks by the same "extremists". For one thing, even a neocon organization like The Heritage Foundation acknowledges that several countries are more free than the USA; a more objective assessment has the USA even further down the list.

In fact, if "hatred of freedoms" is really the issue, America is not likely to be a target at all. Just as the United States somehow never gets around to actually attacking the really dangerous adversaries like China or Russia even when

### *Was Grandpa Really a Moron?*

supposedly standing in firm *"bear any burden, pay any price"* opposition to evil regimes and instead chooses to pursue considerably softer targets in expressing this ideological commitment, any group actually motivated by a simple "hatred of freedoms" would be guided by the same considerations.

An ideologically-motivated group is one that intends to prevail, not accomplish its own utter destruction. Such a group would express its ire by choosing the nose of someone other than the most overwhelmingly dangerous adversary in human history to punch.

For instance, if the mere "possession of freedoms" by others was the burr under the Muslim extremist saddle, bombing the pot-smoking, prostitute-riddled, assisted-suicide practicing Netherlands would scratch that itch nicely, while making it personal to nothing more fearsome than the Dutch Army (which I presume they have, without ever having actually seen the two words together in the modern era...). Similarly, flying a plane or two into the unquestionably far more economically free-wheeling skyscrapers of Hong Kong or Singapore makes a great deal more sense than targeting the far less free New York, even without consideration of the fact that such an attack on (normally) heavily defended New York would be expected to fail...

And how does attacking the Pentagon fit into this *"They hate our freedoms"* assertion?

The fact is, any animosity harbored by Muslims against the United States has nothing to do with our possession or enjoyment of freedoms. The closest relationship between those two things that could be argued is that some Muslims hate the United States for what it has been able to promiscuously do in their backyards by virtue of the enormous wealth our possession and enjoyment of freedom has made possible (the transfer of which into the hands of the State as a preliminary to the

conduct of these offensive little imperial adventures, has, ironically enough, been managed by a systematic erosion of American freedom...).

Anyway, my point here is not the real cause of animosity toward America, either as it was before the Bush administration and friends began the really serious trashing of the Muslim Middle East that's gone on over the last six years, or since then. I'll leave that to the very capable hands of Ron Paul, the CIA, various public officials not wedded to the neocon agenda, and anyone with more than an eighth-grade education.

What I want to observe here is that IF a hatred of our freedoms IS an explicit motivation for the declared enemies of America, as is claimed by the afore-mentioned loud voices, then any deliberate act or policy by which those freedoms are diminished constitutes the plain and unambiguous *"giving of aid and comfort to our enemies"*. Acts or policies which diminish our freedoms-- such as warrantless searches, the suspension of habeas corpus, the adoption of internal passports, the suppression of speech, efforts to enforce an unapportioned capitation, etc., etc.-- have always been unconstitutional, and have always been solely in the interests of those opposed to the principles of individual sovereignty that define America. But within the context of this war-mongering "they hate our freedoms" contrivance, it is particularly (and ironically) the case that any such act or policy undeniably and unambiguously constitutes TREASON.

\* \* \*

*"Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom.  
It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves."  
-William Pitt*

Needless to say, conducting assaults on our freedoms in the name of "necessity" or "security", or by way of clever or

## ***Was Grandpa Really a Moron?***

obscure legal arguments, changes the practical reality-- and thus the criminal character-- of the offense not one little bit. "I had to do it" is not a viable exculpatory argument for any kind of aggression against the American people (or anyone else), or against the Constitution itself. To say *"I had to gut (or ignore) the Fourth Amendment in order to protect us all from attack!"*, for example, is no different legally than saying *"I had to break into the Jones' house and tie them all up just in case they might decide to smuggle a criminal into the neighborhood!"* Put more plainly, what is being argued is, *"I had to seize and exercise a power over you illegally in order to protect you all from those who might illegally exercise power over you...!"*

Sorry, no.

And how faithless an expression! At its core this argument, in whatever variation it manifests itself (and only to the degree to which it might be imagined to be sincerely meant), is one of fundamental distrust of the principles of liberty and of the Constitution. The making of this argument, in whatever variation and whether in the context of war, or in service to any other State ambition hindered by the restraints of its charter, is an expression of profound disrespect for the instrument to which every federal and state office-holder in this country has sworn an oath of fealty!

Thus, even to the degree that this argument is sincerely meant, it is contemptibly faithless in both senses of the word. To the degree that it is mere mendacity, it is far worse. Either way, it must neither be tolerated nor forgiven.

This puts me in mind of another fatuous and irony-laden sound-bite often heard from the "they hate our freedoms" crew: *"If we don't fight the enemies of freedom over there, we'll have to fight them here!"*

Guess what...