

But great, great dangers in the wrong hands

The headline repeats the precious words FBI director Wray said at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. He was talking about the FBI involvement with private sector companies. Not for law enforcement but shaping the laws and how they are enforced.

This statement by the FBI director should be sobering to any liberty conscience minded American. And to any American who believes in our Constitution. And to all who believe America is a land ruled by law, and not by men.

Wray was talking about an active FBI policy. A policy where the FBI manipulates private sector communication companies to control “the narrative”. Intentionally done in a way to shape facts and speech. How do you shape speech?

The First Amendment was specific about what was to be protected. Free speech protects the actual “expression of communications” that is associated with speech. Far more than just ideas, thoughts and beliefs. It protects all communications with one another. True you can lose that protection by violating that spirit. Like yelling fire in a crowded theater. BUT, that is a consequence of free speech, not a restriction on speech.

Wray was talking about controlling what is coming out of your mouth and what others hear when you speak. He is talking about *control* not restriction. When your speech is controlled, it is no longer free.

Hate speech. How could hate speech be hateful, if the person who hears it, agrees with it. Now we have coco-for-coconuts in Congress who want “hate speech laws”. A crime for you to communicate a “thought or ideas” to others.

Wray is talking about controlling what others *hear*, not what someone says. So, let’s imagine. You are having a conversation to other like-minded individuals about a certain politician. You talk about your belief that he is a “dirty crook” and give your reasoning for that belief. It just so happens that that the politician in question, is a gay transvestite with one leg. The impediment is never mentioned or implied in the conversation, but Wray believes the speech should be controlled. Controlled and

But great, great dangers in the wrong hands

blocked before it is heard. Controlled and blocked by someone not part of the conversation. Controlled and blocked by an eavesdropper. An official surveillance of your speech by others. But why? Wray thinks what you are saying is hate speech. Hate speech because of his associated belief, not yours. The words spoken were “dirty crook”. None of what was said inferred or suggested a belief against a one-legged gay transvestite, except in Wray’s mind. There is the danger.

OMG! Look back into your eighth-grade history books. Hate by association. Christians and Jew. The slippery slope that Wray sits upon is the determination of what is hate speech. In this example the only determination is “unspoken”. Was the speaker thinking hate when he said what he said? Was the listener thinking hate when he heard what was said? Neither is true but to the thought police, it is true. It is the objective. Create fear that someone else may accuse you of thinking hateful thoughts, even though it may have never entered your mind. The danger is how did the one surveilling the speech know what was in your mind, if you never said it?

The danger has manifested itself further. To actual speech and its interpretation. Many today think if your belief disagrees with a consensus, and you speak about it with others, then it is hate speech. Look at the conversations about abortion. On one side we have those pontificating it is a right, on the other side it is murder. Two hugely diametrically opposing ideas, yet just that. Ideas. Better? A belief being spoken. Beliefs being heard.

There is a growing choir who think “not believing” in climate change is hate speech. Imagine, they are suggesting a “belief” is hateful, and should not be heard.

Conversing with others by free flow of ideas and thoughts, is a protected right in America. So well protected it cannot be abridged or interfered with. Ahh, but the danger. It is a knee jerk reaction with most, that the first amendment protects the one speaking. But does it protect the one listening? Wray thinks it does not.

How can your speech be free if no one is allowed to listen?

TwoSmartFarts – Feb 2023