

“Freedom” of Speech,

Where America’s Suicidal Message Is Read

© 2015 *Cameron Rebigso*

1. Purpose of speech
2. Defending or Trashing
3. On The Benghazi Attack
4. Taboos and Land Mines
5. NBA, Clipper, Sterling
6. “Due Process of Law”? Or Not!
7. Smell of Conspiracy
8. Conclusions

1. Purpose of Speech

With nearly no exception, speech, or expression in any form, is put up to serve one purpose: to influence others. Then, freedom of speech or expression, also serves only one purpose: exerting such influence without risking consequence, particularly the consequence from the government. Almost anyone spending energy to exert influence is expecting to gain something in his favor. Therefore, freedom of speech has one ultimate goal: being able to gain something but at cost that is politically free. America does have law for her citizens to pursue this goal.

“Congress shall make no law... abridging the freedom of speech,” mandates the 1st Amendment. As such, the American government cannot make law to stipulate what kind of speech, or expression, is allowed or disallowed. Strictly speaking, the 1st Amendment makes the government powerless even if someone makes speech threatening the president’s safety or makes sexually vulgar statement to a nine year old girl, so long as the speech maker takes no action to realize what his speech suggests.

However, at where there is influence, there is usually anti-influence. In America, both of the opposite expressions must have equal right to exist if the 1st Amendment and the 1st Amendment only is genuinely applied. It is natural that influence and anti-influence must cause conflict, from slight to sever. Many blood shedding events just starts from “free” speech. To smooth the social disturbance so agitated by speech, government action is imperative.

In most countries, particularly the socialist countries, government taking action for any purpose, including quelling speech, is extremely convenient. All these countries also have law

to “guarantee” free speech, but the priority of such guarantee is proportional to power; such a priority appropriated by power is also stressed by another part of the same law body. No one can have higher power than the few chiefs who have monopolized the government power.

Being aware of the government’s unsurpassed power, our Founding Fathers use the Constitution to clip away the government’s power of speech controlling. In their eyes, the government is merely an employee of the governed, who otherwise have no power if not the Constitution. However, at time that the government takes action to mediate the conflicted pair of speech, suppressing either side based on any reason is in direct violation of the 1st Amendment. A separate power endorsed by the Constitution must be found for the U.S. government to decide which side can retain the freedom while the other side correspondingly cannot. Otherwise, the government would have acted like a despot, determining everything based on personal preference; lawlessness thus naturally begins, and begins from the few oligarchs holding power in the government office.

Does the American Constitution provide the government with such a separate power in question? Yes, it does! Before 1868, only one of such power is found, but it can only be applied to certain issue. Beginning 1868, one more is added and can be universally applied to any issue in American political life. Such a power is enacted in Section 1, Amendment XIV.

Through Section 1, Amendment XIV, the government is given the power to “abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States,” provided that the power of abridging is executed with the satisfaction of the condition of “due process of law”. Of course, the law herein referred to is assumed to have seamlessly conformed to all parts of the Constitution in case it is not a direct text quotation from the Constitution itself. With this power, the government can take away anyone’s privilege of expression if such an expression, either influencing or anti-influencing, is desired to be removed by someone.

Before the adoption of Amendment XIV, what could have given the government the constitutional power to settle the competition between conflicting speeches, particularly after the First Amendment is adopted? Frankly, the resource is very limited although powerful. Its power is only applicable to argument involving religions, in particular, between Christianity and non-Christian beliefs. This power is found in the Supreme Law adopted in 1778, i.e., *The Article of Confederation and Perpetual Union*, which has a special article stressing the protection of Christianity:

The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship....binding themselves to assist each other, against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion...

This statement arbitrarily makes separate due process of law unnecessary if conflict between Christianity and any non-Christianity belief shows up. The status of Supreme Law of the above statement is so affirmed by Article VI of the Constitution of 1787:

All debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof, and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land...

The power so granted to the government, and so mandating the government, to give spiritual privilege to Christianity over any other belief must still steadfastly stands uncompromised today, so long as the Article of Confederation continues to stay as the only document ever to have given the formal name to this Country.

2. Defending or Trashing

Naturally, in mediating the conflict between speeches, the government is inevitably making law abridging the freedom of speech of one party while equivalently giving favor to its opponent. Then, depending on how the favor is granted, the government cannot escape from the responsibility of having had the 1st Amendment defended or trashed; there is no neutral position for the government to dwell in.

Sadly, event after events beginning the early part of the 20th century with the court case of Scopes Trial, the US government has been more and more openly telling the American citizens in their open eyes that it is leading the way to alienate the 1st Amendment. The act of alienation by itself is not that dreadful, although tragic enough, because government chiefs are human beings, and every human being has his moment of making wrong decision. What is dreadful is the intensity of alienation is incessantly escalated, one step at a time, with stronger and stronger smells of conspiracy, either in the name of defending the 1st Amendment, or getting power from it. As such, "freedom of speech" in America has become a powerful political instrument to persecute people whose speech is not found in tune with what the few powerful ones want to hear.

It has been well experienced by Americans today that speech favoring Christianity can entrap a citizen to face serious legal consequence. Simply, a principal in a Texas high school reading a few lines from the Bible to the students is fired by the government. The firing

absolutely has no legal base. The only reason from the principal's boss is that the principal is doing something not matching his responsibility. How is reading Bible to the students not a teaching? Is Bible a forbidden book in schools? But which law says so? How firing him based on what he is reading has not violated "no Religious Test shall ever be required"? Is the 1st Amendment a higher law or the boss's decision a higher law in determining this principal's privilege? Which part of the Constitution says that atheism has higher legal priority over Christianity in this country?

There are more examples flooding in this country about persecution against Christianity speech. Will anyone dare to pledge "One Nation under God," and "In God We Trust" in any public school? A nurse in hospital praying for a patient with Christian wish is a good reason for her to get fired. Merry Christmas is a taboo for a sales clerk to mention to the customers in more and more stores. Today, even Easter Egg Hunt has been prohibited in many schools.

3. On The Benghazi Attack

One most typical example of persecution against Christianity can be seen from the incident of Benghazi attack. Before we go into more details about this incident, let's review one Islam message.

"We will decimate this Christian empire of capitalism," declared at a big assembly by a renowned Muslim, who leads the major mosques in Boston and Harlem. That a message so offensive to the Constitution and so threatening to the sovereignty of America suffers no consequence from our government is a typical signal showing that our government has chosen to be religiously oriented—but in the direction against Christianity.

Of course, one may say that the 1st Amendment is in his protection. Really? Then, can the same person explain why the film maker of "Innocence of Muslim" is not protected by this amendment but immediately arrested when the Benghazi terror incident occurs? "We have arrested the film maker for your son," the government told the mother of one of the four American citizens murdered in this incident. With this message, the US government has further delivered to the world the following messages: (1) The Islamic world cannot be offended by our people in any way, even only in words. (2) He who so offends must be punished without hesitation. (3) This country has made itself ready to sacrifice Christianity as the number one scapegoat if doing so can please the Islamic world. (4) In the name of religious freedom, Christianity has been made subjected to the approval of Islam by the American government. (5) Most critically, the US Constitution has lower sovereignty compared to that of the Islamic world in resolving the conflict between the U.S. and the Islamic world.

It is true that the film maker of “Innocence of Muslims” did commit some crimes before the arrest, but none of the crimes is related to what his film advocates, and these few crimes are not the purpose of the arrest. They are just some ‘by-products” serving as fig leaf to cover the ridiculousness of the arrest. Ironically, indeed, he is not charged with a crime of making such a film upon the arrest although the arrest is directly motivated to punish such film making. What if the government cannot find these few criminal by-products from the film maker but just the film? Then, what else would legitimize the government’s action to “have arrested the film maker for your son”? How could the punishment of the few crimes irrelevant to the film be justified to the arrest and compensate the loss of the mother who lost the son to this country’s enemy? Does it mean that if the government making random arrest of anyone else can also serve the purpose to compensate this mother’s loss?

Currently the government admitted that it knew the Benghazi attack was not a consequence of the film even at the time the arrest was made. This is a pointblank manifestation of our government that some Christians must be punished so long as the Islamic world feels unhappy about America, regardless of whether or not such Christians are the source inciting the Muslims’ unhappiness. Let’s suppose that the Benghazi attack did have been agitated by the film. So what? The theme of the film is making some foreigners hostile to this country unhappy. Is making them unhappy with words a crime in this country? Whom is our government chosen to align with? In history, many U.S. presidents have statements making the Islamic world unhappy, should we arrest all these presidents? It is true that many of those foreigners attacking our embassy may have relatives or associates in this country holding the same belief. Making those foreigners feel hurt may make these relatives or associates feel hurt, too. Is that a good reason for this country unable to say anything offensive to those foreigners? Then, Dwight Eisenhower, a German decedent, must be prosecuted for having led the ally troops crushing Germany in WWII; many of those German military people must have relatives or associates in America during the war.

Compared to what the above renowned Muslim is allowed to advocate without consequence, the arrest of the film maker shows that our government has naked cruelty against Christianity. What is truly incredibly puzzling people’s intelligence, however, is that the American Christian world is silent in front of the government’s naked anti-Christian stance. After extensively long time of Christianity being demonized by atheists and the corresponding brainwashing and persecution promoted by our government in various ways, many Christians have chosen apathy toward the persecution against the belief they hold. Many of them even have developed the Stockholm syndrome, giving full sympathy to those who mudsling at their belief and persecute them. Many in the Christian population are also very successful in their professional fields, and this makes them too busy making living other than protest. To them, so long as they feel they still can go to church next Sunday, persecution is some reality too remote

from them. We have heard flooding complain like “the liberals have endangered our country.” Can these apathetic Christians resign themselves from having taking the role of providing collaboration to the endangerment?

4. Taboos and Land Mines

Aside from religion, that “someone feels hurt” can be a law to arbitrate how much one’s freedom of speech would be protected by the 1st Amendment. As such, a collection of taboo expressions has been created by someone and adopted by our government in arbitrating persecution. Be careful, though, all these expressions are not necessary legally black and white to your awareness for you to avoid, it is more in the form of land mine. When you use them, you may feel they are legally neutral enough, but when they explode, it may cost your arm and leg. Here is a glossary of a few of those taboo expressions.

Negro (Comment: To avoid this term, color-people is once used. It has quickly become an unwelcome expression, then, African American is used—even the word “black” is to be avoided as much as possible. However, how someone with African trait must be an American? Should this country someday specify people with Asian American, Hispanic American, European American, Polynesian American, West-Indian American, Arabic American, Australian American...? But we are in a country that is said to be against racial division or ethnic division.)

Redskin (Comment: Is it a crime or sin for any skin carrying color?)

Oriental (as a person) (Comment: It seems so far a taboo only in Washington State. But why a word related to location or direction has law significance?)

Queer, dike (Comment: Someone has the pride to do what these words denotes but rejects to be labeled with what these words describe. What a contradiction!)

Male, female (Comment: In some universities, the professors stipulate that using words of gender distinction would lead to failing grade point. But then, the traditional usage of the word “he” in referring human beings in general is offensive to women. For example, “He who has enough votes can be the president” must be replaced with “He or she who has enough votes can be a president.” How could the students avoid the gender reference? Are you puzzled how “he” and “she” have not been “male” and “female”? Maybe common core education can give you some answer. Of course, the sentence “He who commits murder must be sentenced to death” does not have to be governed by this “rule”—Relax, women will not protest.)

Illegal immigrants (Comment: In its place are the so called undocumented immigrants. However, currently even undocumented immigrants are not allowed to be used by some

reporters—Just say “immigrants”, period. So far, the illegal immigrants still only invade this country unarmed. Someday, someone can invade this country openly armed, and Americans would have lost any legitimacy to say even a damn—all invaders are just immigrants.)

Anchor baby (Comment: The best comment is given by Jeb Bush: “If you can give me another term to mean the same thing, I used it.” Why is the term so neutral in every sense hurting people, but creating the existence of what this term means not hurting the same people? Why must we care how people creating anchor people get hurt, but not how Americans having been hurt by the anchor baby creators?)

Hussein (Comment: This is the middle name of Barack Hussein Obama II. However, the Texas high schools disallow it from appearing in their textbooks in order to avoid “confusion” with Saddam Hussein. In case Obama is the first person ever having this name but someone notorious in the future also takes this name, what should people do? Tell Obama to give up this name? Or forbid this future person from using this name? Or burn all the textbooks?)

Islamic Terrorist (Comment: Using these two words separately is OK, so far, but putting them together is forbidden in media practice and in government document. Equivalently, “Islamic extremists” has the same arbitrating power in determining the fate of someone who uses these two words. What is strange is that those terrorists must exclusively choose the label Islam to identify themselves. Are these terrorists actually some kind of secret agents from some Christian sects but using the label of Muslim to defame Islam? But why do they only show uncompromised determination in destructing the world where Christianity roots?)

Alien (Comment: Currently a bill is proposed in the Congress to forbid using this word to mean illegal immigrant. He who proposed this bill openly trashed “Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech”. Even worse, if this bill is passed, it will begin an era that American citizens are subjected to the dominance of non-American citizens. Besides, if some Americans can call the policemen pigs, why the illegal immigrants cannot be called aliens?)

One general question from us is why “someone feeling hurt” can be above our Constitution. Should we remove all of our laws so that no one can feel hurt? Isn’t “making someone feel hurt” exactly one of the way for law to maintain its authority as well as one of the purposes of law enactment everywhere in the world? One can rest assure that any law not allowing anyone to get hurt must end up hurting everyone.

A government worker in San Francisco calling an unfamiliar customer Mr. or Miss/Mrs. may risk his (Oops, should this author herein include “or her”?) job if the customer feels the gender so implied has been “disrespectfully” forced on this customer. So greeting a drag queen is a risky business over there. If you call the “queen” Mr., the queen can sue you, as the queen has

robed “her”self with an apparent female appearance. If you call the queen Miss/Mrs., the queen can sue you, too, as the queen may have some business depending on being recognized as possessing a human male body—makeup has never been standardized by law for male or female. Those drag queens have the freedom of forcing you to lose your common sense but you do not have the freedom to express what your common sense guides you to express.

Even just color usage may entrap a business with danger. In 2008, a newspaper publishing the portrait of Barack Obama who had secured the presidency was splashed with accusation of racism. The reason was that, according to all those accusers, the portrait had been printed too dark. It is certainly puzzling what may happen if the color happened to be felt too light. What is in your expression, Americans? During the Cultural Revolution of the 1960’s in China, an artist was accused of portraying the flags in a propaganda picture with red colors that was too light. He was then sent to jail. In those days, red is a sacred color in China.

We all know that the teaching of evolution has been enthroned with all the legitimacy to crush the teaching of Christianity in all public schools. However, while evolution is madly promoted, no person is allowed to carry the study of evolution into the exploration concerning how natural selection has resulted in different innate quality for each race. While the same group of people insisting education of evolution holds that racism exists everywhere in the political society, they also forbid anyone from distinguishing races in the biological society. “There is only one race among human beings,” say they. Can they answer how racism would exist within only one race? With the idea of only one race, are they going to thaw the “black lives matter” movement?

To the same group of people, mentioning statistic facts related to race is a crime. Therefore, for example, the size of brain of the African origin is not allowed to be mentioned. Instead of actual size, only the word elongate can be used. Any scholar publishing such data must prepare to risk his job and his academic future is ruined. The same treatment extends to the publishing of statistic description, such as crime rate, about a community where certain race is concentrated. For example, if a property own wants to put an ad for his rental property with a statement that “the major population in the neighborhood is white (or black, or Asians...)”, he is asking for legal punishment, let alone that he may even want to limit the prospective tenants to a certain race. It is also because of racial concern, red-line practice in the real estate loan business is forbidden by the government, while red-line was originally drawn based on income statistics other than racial statistics. “Someone getting hurt” can be above any law. So, people must learn when to recognize there is only one race and when there are multiple races. Failing to do so can lead one into serious trouble. If contradicting “facts” can be positively affirmed and endorsed by the same mouth, the citizens’ freedom of speech has

been dictated by some liars. The 1st Amendment they entrust with for their protection has been made a zombie by the liars and commanded by the liars.

5. NBA, Clipper, Sterling

No more disrespectfulness to the 1st Amendment by American law workers can be seen in the event centered on the owner of the Los Angeles Clippers professional basketball franchise in 2014. Based on a remark made by Mr. Sterling in some private environment but recorded and published by somebody else without the permission of Mr. Sterling, NBA banned him from the league for life, punished him with the maximum fine, and pressured him to sell the team. The entire development conducted by NBA is not seen having referred to any part of the Constitution, but a “higher” law—someone feeling hurt.

It has been well known that recording someone’s private activity without the consent of this person is a crime, and that publishing such activity without corresponding consent is an even more serious crime. It has also been well known that evidence illegally obtained cannot be used to support allegation in court. However, NBA’s attention has not been focusing on the legality of the recordation of the remark and the corresponding Constitution application, but on who feels hurt.

Frankly, if law is genuinely applied, even if Mr. Sterling made the same remark openly in public, other than boycott, no one, not any governmental officer or private citizen, has the right to punish him based only on this remark. Honestly, racial discrimination, for or against, has never been a specific concern in the US Constitution. Therefore, no law, for or against racial discrimination, conforms to the U.S Constitution. As a matter of fact, it is exactly because language from someone may make someone else feel offensive that the 1st Amendment is established. Should law forbid all expressions across the board to guarantee no one getting hurt? Why should someone’s feeling be given the privilege to dictate whether or not a speech giver is entitled to the protection of the 1st Amendment?

It has been obvious that the action taken by NBA is not based on satisfying the US Constitution but to satisfy a racial sentiment overwhelming in the league. How has this practice conducted by NBA not been motivated by racial discrimination against Mr. Sterling, who looks white? If the punishment from NBA against Mr. Sterling is based on racial discrimination, Mr. Sterling can use the same reason to fight back. The catch is how much chance Mr. Sterling will win if he does fight back. Reality has told us that (1) racial discrimination as a law has never been congressionally and precisely enacted; its application is very subjective and thus very arbitrary, (2) racial discrimination as a law works one way, with black people being the major beneficiary of this undefined law, enjoying higher priority over others most of the time. Facts

supporting this view are overwhelming in America. The flexibility in the application of racial discrimination in law practice shows that blacks have been a preferred race in America, if not a supreme race. If not having been confident of the existence of certain sanctuary in their favor, no people of any group or race would and could rally with shouting such as “Goddamn America,” “We want a dead cop, now!” All this kind of expressions is of insurrection nature.

Currently and repeatedly, the “black life matters” movement sends hecklers to various rallies or assemblies held by non-blacks. There is no action from the government to stop this kind of actions that have obvious violated the right of other citizens. Can we imagine the same government being equally idle if it is the black assembly but being interrupted by non-black hecklers? If law has stipulated that black people have privilege over any others, fine, we must all abide by the law until the law is overturned. However, this is the country whose government vows to disallow racial discrimination. Disallowing? Really? Or whether it is just promoting discrimination in the reverse direction but under the veil of disallowing?

6. “Due Process of Law”? Or Not!

Law workers are human beings. So law application and the decision following it cannot be guaranteed to be free of prejudice in every case. This is normal and understandable, although not desirable. However, if the prejudice can be seen with a pattern case after case, people can have full legitimacy to draw conclusion that deliberate discrimination is in the making and enforced. To maximally prevent the prejudice or even discrimination from dominating the law application, our Constitution, specifically through Amendment XIV, stipulates that legal decision made between groups of people of different background competing for law protection must satisfy due process of law.

Unfortunately, through the incompetent Congress, which has become an arena where only party interest is diligently pursued, Americans have given the Court the power of granting “equal protection” while due process of law is nakedly stripped of. Due process of law eliminated, equal protection becomes an instrument of persecution, as the Court can grant protection to anyone but strip of the protection of someone else and tell people that the granting has been motivated by equality and balanced with equality.

Only through the measurement of “due process of law” can people find out whether or not two social components competing against each other deserve equal protection. To earn equal protection, both components must possess equal social value. Suppose that a heckler bursts out with protest during a president’s addressing and the heckler is removed from the auditorium. Can the heckler apply the 1st Amendment as well as the “equal protection” clause from the Amendment XIV to defend his action? Yes, as a citizen he has this right to apply both.

But “due process of law” must find him deserving protection of neither; the social value of this heckler and his speech of protest are far lower than what the president processes.

By the same token, one can tell how absurd the Court has been in granting marriage license to homosexual couple in the name of equal protection. Due process of law can immediately find that heterosexual couple and homosexual couple possess absolutely different social value, no matter from the point of view of social law or natural law. Natural law must reveal the homosexual couple’s barren nature that can only discontinue offspring. Social law subsequently reveals that their behavior must result in the elimination of “posterity” in our Constitution, thus the termination of the nation. So, if due process of law is ever applied, the Court must find itself to have lost any ground to grant marriage license to homosexual couple. Issuing marriage license to the homosexual couple just legalizes the most fundamental destruction of the U. S. Constitution and subsequently the nation.

Forcing the issuance of marriage license to homosexual couples, the Supreme Court wreck our Constitution in two folds: (1) dethroning the spiritual privilege of Christianity that is emboldened in the Constitution—Christianity cannot tolerate homosexual, (2) dethroning the sacredness of the condition of due process of law.

Tossing away due process of law, the Supreme Court begins the era of oligarchy politics in America—“we the few are the law!” Of course, granting the same-sex marriage license is not even the first example of the beginning of this oligarchy politics. As early as in the 1960s, the Supreme Court already abused this power when mediating the arguments between Christianity and atheist/secularists regarding the education of evolution in public schools. Again, the reason the Supreme Court can be so spoiled is because of the incompetence of the Congress in controlling the power of law-making.

If the Founding Fathers are still alive today, they must regret not to have had the First Amendment written to read as “Congress and the Supreme Court shall make no law...” Why they have not so done is understandable for several reasons. First, in their days, because of the heavy soaking of Christianity teaching in people’s daily life, people’s minds are more law and moral abiding. Second, party politics in their days is not yet in shaped. So the Founding Fathers confidently assume that he who serves in the government will place national interest as the top most consideration in policy making. Third, in their vision, the way the Constitution drawn has stipulated that the Congress is the strongest branch of the three while the Court is the weakest. Not only the power of law making is denied to the Court, but any decision from the Court is subjected to the appellate power of the Congress that is so stressed in this statement: “In all the other Cases...the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction...with such **exception**, and under such Regulation **as the Congress shall make.**” Who in more than two hundred years ago can foresee the Congress so succumbs to party interest feud as seen today?

With the appearance of party politics, not only Congress has relinquished the power of law making to the Court without bound, but it is also not even seen to have ever exercised its appellate power over any court's decision. With the Congress being so incompetent in restraining the Court, the Court runs wild, making law after law without ratification by anyone. Progressively, one step at a time, the Court has more and more enforced the oligarchy politics in America, unlawfully forced this nation to be converted into a country worshiping atheism and secularism. Subsequently, Christians are limitlessly persecuted.

To realize one party's interest, which is fundamentally to get maximum votes in power grabbing, more and more anarchy elements are relentlessly unbridled in the society to make "victimized" people happy. Furthermore, no more efficient way can be found to purchase votes than using the unsurpassably formidable government treasure and national resources. Government power in hand, each party competes to satisfy the Socialist demand of the population, leading those who have been "victimized" limitlessly to access the national wealth, including relentless selling out the nation's sovereignty. The cost is from Uncle Sam's pocket, the power benefit so procured is for each "Robin Hood" to secure. Where can anyone find better business than this if not in the Congress? The Court runs wild because the party politics in Congress runs wild. Never in history is America in such a great danger—potentially crumbling from within. If so many pillar components of a nation stipulated in the Constitution, such as posterity, official language, Christianity, and capitalist economy can be sacrificed for party interest, what is freedom of speech?

Loss of freedom of speech is not yet dreadful enough, because, if you do not want to be punished, you guess you can try to avoid the situation and stay silent. What is dreadful is that today the government, or the few with power, has created situation where a citizen cannot escape but must say what the powerful few wants to hear. **Staying silent can be a crime and thus punishable!** Too many of us have been familiar with this kind of stories: A Christian store owner declines to put up a message that a homosexual person wants him to put up; the content of the message violates the store owner's subconscious. Then the Court orders that the owner either has to express the message in the way the homosexual person desires or risks a hefty penalty—all the way up to closing the business plus heavy monetary fine. Where is the 1st Amendment? It doesn't matter. The Court, quoting "equal protection" while obscuring due process of law, has made the First Amendment not written for everyone, particularly not for Christians, but for the anti-Christians. The cruelty resulted by the obscuration of due process of law has even had the store owner's right to stay silent emphasized in Amendment V altogether scrapped. Hasn't it been too familiar in history that in a big part of the world one must either utter "long live Stalin", or "long live Chairman Mao", or "long live leader Kim" or go to jail, or even get shot? History repeats itself today in America!

7. Smell of Conspiracy

The way how freedom of speech has been jeopardized shows an obvious pattern, a pattern in which all social components that the Constitution once took as pillars for the nation are devalued, such as the white, the Christians, the male, English, the rich... The devaluation serves one purpose: to crumble the authority of the Constitution. As these pillars are so sternly targeted at, and the targeting can be so frequently and more and more intensively escalated, the smell of conspiracy of regime replacement through constitution replacement with someone promoting behind the scene is getting stronger and stronger.

Yes, the world is changing; the value of each component is also gradually shifting. We must all rationally accept the change if we want to have a harmonic world. Our Constitution provides room for amendments to be added. However, the devaluation so done is always unmistakably riding on demonizing the components. Among all these components, the whites as a race are most profusely demonized as if they are all born criminal—all of them are either slave owners or perpetrators promoting genocide. People, if you ever have a heart toward this nation, let's never forget that one white is sacrificed in the American Civil War for every 6 slaves to get liberated. The next pillar placed in the altar to be cursed is Christians. This website has had plenty articles on this topic and will not repeat here. One thing Americans should not forget is that, although relying on these pillars for the success of this country, the Constitution does not have any statement to give them special favor, except it does give Christianity spiritual privilege over any other belief as well as enthrone English with the status of official language. However, Christianity and English are spiritual wealth that any citizen can share. The demonizing snatches every opportunity for its success, not even let go of the opportunity of creating division between men and women, such as the constant reprisal of "War on Women". Who would launch war on women? If not men, who else?

"It is time for a woman president," claimed a president candidate. As far as speech is concerned, nothing can be found wrong in this claim with respect to law. But the political idiocy of this message can be immediately mirrored if someone claimed "it is time for a man to continue the presidency." Sadly, Americans, particularly the women, are fanatical about this "women president" message. National interest, or political principle, is not what is in their consideration. Instead, in the consideration is what sex should control the power. In a country that is said pursuing the elimination of racial discrimination, Americans conduct their voting of the president in 2008 with heavy racial preference. History of president voting relying on physical characteristic other than principle is highly likely repeating in 2016, but his time gender may replace race as the guideline for choice. Sexual equality? Forget it! Any male candidate dares to deliver a man-president message would be immediately disqualified. Governed by the same mentality, a male chancellor in a university is forced to resign because his one message is

found with doubt about women's capability. However, a woman can sail to the position of Justice while openly declaring that minority woman can make better decision than white men. Those who say pursuing equality for people have never so pursued. What they truly pursue is just inequality in which they are the dominant ones. History has never failed this truth, which is particularly made valid by the Socialists, and especially their leaders. Our Founding Fathers also claimed to lead the pursuance of equality. However, they told people the equality is endowed by God, but not something created by them, or any human being.

Oh, possibly it is an unfair reprisal to accuse the U.S. government of having completely taken away the 1st Amendment from its citizens. The following expressions do enjoy unlimited protection from the government: "we want dead cops"; "we will decimate this Christian empire"; the phrase "have sex" can be heard 24 hours a day on TV by any age group; graphic suggestion of act of intercourse can appear in any movie and any performance platform; complete nudity can be seen in any magazine, near complete nudity can be displayed in any part of any city. Make no mistake, however, any expression objecting the above expression can be immediately strangled in court. If not handling carefully, he who so objects may even get punished as racist, gender discriminator, Christian theocracy promoter, hate crime commiter...

In 1960's, a political joke circulated in the Soviet Union. With pride, an American visiting Moscow told a Russian: "We Americans can go to Time Square in New York anytime and loudly criticize our president in any way we see proper. Can you do the same thing in Russia?" With no less pride, the Russian answered: "Yes, of course! We Russian can go to the Red Square in Moscow anytime and loudly criticize the American president in any way we see proper." Well, the proud Americans of modern days may repeat what this Russian said in an equivalent way: "We Americans can go to Time Square in New York anytime and loudly chant 'death with the white, the Christians, the male, English, the rich, the cop, even the country of America itself.'" But death with anything else? Think twice, fellow Americans!

On the one hand, our government abusively legalizes the destruction of our Constitution such as issuing the same-sex marriage license. On the other hand, the same government does not hesitate one minute to criminalize people who hold view against the country's enemy such as the film maker in the Benghazi incident. **Americans, no more obvious, you have allowed this government noosing you to dig a grave for this nation!**

Many Americans still dream of the world leadership. Forget it, fellow Americans! To be a leader, one must first earn the trust from those to be led. If you cannot even show reasonable integrity in respecting your own Constitution, which is so noble and brilliant in word, how can you make them trust that you would respect their interest when accepting your leadership? In their understanding, what you say and promise as a leader is words only. Can these words

surpass the nobility and brilliance of your Constitution? But look at what has happened to your Constitution that is supposedly so sacred to you? And look at what a disaster Middle East has been resulted today because of your mediation that has been so short sight and incompetent, either viewed from the side of the Israel world or from the Islamic world. To those who you intend to lead, what is seen as valuable is no longer your words or principle that you advocate as lofty, but your wealth. When the wealth is gone, your leadership is also gone. But your wealth has been unrestrictedly running to the ditch but with \$19T of national debt. When your wealth finally drained, even your Constitution would become a piece of worthless paper.

Bye, Uncle Sam! People deserve only the government they shape. For some moments of hedonism abusing, Americans are rephrasing the Declaration of Independence to read as: *“to secure the Rights of the few, Government is instituted above men, forcing just its power to get the Consent from the Governed...”*

8. Conclusions

The forcing of the issuance of same-sex marriage license reveals that the U.S. Court Branch has been sternly taking anti-Christian stance (ever since its promotion of evolution education beginning from the 1960's);

The Benghazi arrest of a Christian film maker reveals that the U. S. Executive Branch steadfastly aims at pleasing anti-Christian force (ever since Jimmy Carter helping Khomeini usurp Iran's state power in the late 1970's);

Anti-Christianity in America means anti-U.S. Constitution because of the spiritual privilege emboldened for Christianity in the Constitution by the Founding Fathers. So, what do the above two findings tell people what kind of job the American government has been doing for her people?

The anti-Christian stance of both of the above government branches is indulged and thus encouraged by the incompetence of the Congress, which is busy fighting for party interest other than national interest. As such, the U.S. Constitution has lost most of its authority in protecting the American citizens. It is why, for example,

- (1) One group of non-governmental citizens can strip of the constitutional protection of another group of citizens constitutional right without due processing of law, as seen in the NBA vs Mr. Sterling case;
- (2) Illegal immigrants can limitlessly filtrate this country without limit and enjoy increasing dominance over the citizens;
- (3) A dreadful national debt of \$19T is hovering above the head of Americans and keeps increasing.

A country model of Socialism in which citizens can be limitlessly persecuted for any reason has been looming closer and closer in this land.

Americans, how much more marginal space do you still have before the verge runs out and you must fall over the cliff of losing your country?