

v5k2c2.com

news about cooze that's always fit to print

A Tale, Told By An Idiot



Alex Jones: Male Feminist and Snake-Oil Peddler

I am always in favor of free expression, of the [type](#) intended by the revolutionary theorists who founded the United States. Thanks to patriarchal heroes like James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, John Jay, and Benjamin Franklin, it is perfectly legal to be a neo-Nazi, a member of ANTIFA, or to worship Satan. Granted, I think all such people are risible kooks, but I wouldn't want them silenced. (I'd have no one to laugh at, otherwise.) Thanks to our forefathers, they can't be.

Recently in the news is my old friend Alex Jones, of Austin Texas. Jones has made a career out of selling phony herbs-n-spices, and peddling kooky conspiracy theories. One of the things he used to tell people was that the Federal Emergency

Management Agency would soon be rounding us all up, and shipping us off to crematoria, to meet our final demise. He was yapping this way some fifteen years ago, but he doesn't spread that meme any longer, because his spook story never came to pass. Another thing he used to tell his gullible listeners was that Barack Obama was a communist. This was silly on its face. Ya boy Boxer knows actual communists, and if they ever came to power, the first thing they'd do is throw Barack Obama in prison, along with all his rich friends.

Alex Jones was just [censored](#) by Facebook, Spotify, iTunes and YouTube. Surprisingly, Twitter is allowing him to remain on their platform. (Full disclosure: Twitter banned Boxer at the IP level in 2017). Jack Dorsey is currently being [lambasted](#) in the establishment press, for respecting Jones' right to be as goony as possible.

I don't like Alex Jones, and I'll get to the reasons at the end. Even so, I like censorship less. It is truly strange to see journalists rush to excuse the censorship of a man who has made himself their own canary in the coal mine.



I talked to my own lawyer this evening, and his take on this surprised me. In the first place, YouTube likely is infringing on Jones' first amendment rights. The case of Marsh v. Alabama, which was brought to the U.S. Supreme Court by a woman named (you guessed it) Grace Marsh, affirmed the right of lunatics to use privately owned property to express themselves, if the general public was granted access to the same property.

In an opinion by Justice Hugo L. Black, the majority ruled in Marsh's favor. The Court reasoned that a company town does not have the same rights as a private homeowner in preventing unwanted religious

expression. While the town was owned by a private entity, it was open for use by the public, who are entitled to the freedoms of speech and religion. The Court employed a balancing test, weighing Chickasaw's private property rights against Marsh's right to free speech. The Court stressed that conflicts between property rights and constitutional rights should typically be resolved in favor of the latter.

Justice Frankfurter concurred.

Justices Reed, Burton, and Stone dissented.

([oyez dot org](http://oyez.org))

The typical tired retort from anti-free speech corporate rent-boys is that people like Jones are suffering the “natural consequences” of exercising their free speech. This is but one example, from, laughably enough, the [corporate media](#) themselves.

Freedom of Speech, Not Freedom From Consequences



Yousef Munayyer is a Palestinian-American writer and analyst.

JANUARY 10, 2015

Freedom of speech does not mean freedom from its consequences. The ideal of freedom of speech is one well worth defending but it can only be guaranteed in a perfect world and sadly, as we have seen throughout 2014 and in the early days of 2015, our world is far from perfect.

It apparently escapes the geniuses at the New York Times that it is a very short hop from silencing kooks like Alex Jones, to silencing their own employer, the minute that newspaper falls afoul of whatever regime gets elected to power. I suppose those guys can afford to be stupid. I can't. I spent part of my life in Canada, which has no first amendment. I like speaking my mind, and I don't have millions of dollars to throw at a lobbyist to keep that privilege intact.

Like Black and Frankfurter, we must all realize that free expression is meaningless if it does not entail freedom from consequences. Human rights tribunals, corporate shutdowns, fines by the feminist state, and imprisonment for “hate speech” are all ways that free expression is infringed. Corporate power, which is beginning to selectively restrict access to the expressors of opinion, is an intolerable breach of the first amendment. Our own society is lapsing into a morass, where ideological apparati have the power to sanction expression. This marks the end of America as we have always known it.

Personally, I consider Alex Jones a miserable faggot. He is a man who [had his children stolen by the family courts](#), and when he had the chance to stand up for other men, similarly railroaded, he [refused to do so](#). Make no mistake. He was in the perfect position to lead a large protest, and mobilize thousands of people against the criminals in the divorce racket. He did nothing. Thus he has proven himself to be an agent of the same state he pretends to criticize, and in the process has shown himself to be more loyal to feminism than to his own kids. A more loathsome example of manhood is difficult to find. Even so, I like being able to run this blog, and I like to read Jason, Gunner and Dalrock. I don't want those outlets to disappear. The clock is ticking.

**Author: Boxer**

Sinister All-Male Dancer. Secret King of all Gamma Males. Member of Frankfurt School. Your Fave Contrarian! [View all posts by Boxer](#)



Boxer / 2018-08-08 / General Nonsense

18 thoughts on “A Tale, Told By An Idiot”

**Derek Ramsey**

2018-08-08 at 22:21

“The clock is ticking.”

I agree with the advice repeated often on the Dark Brightness blog: own your data, keep backups, and host your own blog if possible.



earl

2018-08-08 at 22:40

‘Freedom of speech, not freedom from consequences’

I’m sure if it was a NYT article it was meant for those who speech opposes the politics of the NYT.

However overall...true freedom is not doing whatever you want, it’s doing what you ought. Hence people should have the freedom to speak the truth.



Sharkly

2018-08-09 at 01:42

earl,

I think the word you were looking for was “liberty” not “freedom”. Freedom is being free to do whatever. Liberty is the extent of latitude allowed in doing all things that are lawful.



Sharkly

2018-08-09 at 02:20

So, if we are not allowed to yell “fire” in a crowded theater, then we don’t have complete freedom of speech. We have a limited liberty to speak what is lawfully protected speech. Fraud, slander, criminal threats, and many other types of speech are against the law already. However just to be a linguistic ass, I’ll point out that

freedom of expression covers websites like this, but freedom of speech not so much, this is more under freedom of the press, since it is the “printed” word. Thankfully independent media mavens like Boxer are ready to defend against the onslaught of censorious bureaucrats & “Orwellian” corporate enforcers, in any realm of expression. However, Boxer publishing a topless photos of Alex Jones, is clearly taking our liberties too far. My eyes!



Major Styles

2018-08-09 at 07:36

Alex Jones was able to talk about international finance/the media/federal reserve (etc. ad nauseum) and he never mentioned Jewish interest. That’s kind of like being an expert on Sushi and never mentioning Japan.

They call that controlled opposition. Much like Rush Limbaugh, Glenn Beck, etc. did the same for years, until the internet provided a new form of Samzidat.



Gunner Q

2018-08-09 at 15:44

Sharkly @ 02:20:

“So, if we are not allowed to yell “fire” in a crowded theater, then we don’t have complete freedom of speech.”

The purpose of the Bill of Rights was to limit government authority, not provide entitlements. As the Founders envisioned the concept, freedom of speech is protection from gov’t retaliation for peaceful dissent and criticism of the gov’t. Nothing more.

Movie theaters, social media and your local newspaper can all restrict or ban your speech. They did nothing unconstitutional by shutting down Alex Jones’ use of their facilities and forums. Market collusion/ monopolistic practices is the better story

here. This was very stupid of the Faceborg; the harder they silence us, the bigger the market will be for an alternative to them. This will be true for as long as we own guns in meatspace.

I don't know if I'll link to Infowars for long; my motivation is simply throwing the bird at the Goolag; but Infowars does seem like a good source of interesting stories.



Boxer 

2018-08-09 at 19:00

The purpose of the Bill of Rights was to limit government authority, not provide entitlements. As the Founders envisioned the concept, freedom of speech is protection from gov't retaliation for peaceful dissent and criticism of the gov't. Nothing more.

Which founder envisioned what you're describing? Can you cite a source supporting this narrow interpretation?



Derek Ramsey

2018-08-09 at 20:18

@Sharkly – “So, if we are not allowed to yell “fire” in a crowded theater, then we don't have complete freedom of speech. “

No legal expert worth anything would defend this. A simple google search will inform you of how this is misquoted and misunderstood. Simply put, if you defend this, you're either (1) advocating broad censorship; or (2) not saying anything persuasive. Regarding the latter, no one denies that *some* speech is not protected, but this does not provide any insight at all into *what* speech is not protected.

Educate yourself with [this required listening](#) (or read the transcript).



Derek Ramsey

2018-08-09 at 20:42

“*Marsh v. Alabama*”

As you pointed out, the first amendment provides broad legal protections, including public use of private property. This even includes privately-owned public online forums. For example, a federal judge ruled in May that Twitter is a public forum, despite being privately owned.

But there is another issue that the Brothers may not have considered. The first amendment provides certain legal rights, but that is not the only thing we are concerned about as citizens. The American ethos has long held to a spirit of openness and freedom of expression. Americans have long abhorred censorship, even if it was legal. So while private citizens and companies can engage in censorship, they are not immune to criticism.

For example, in the absence of government and/or corporate internet neutrality policies, any privately held ISP could prevent access to whatever they wanted. Should we defend an ISP from censoring just because they can legally get away with it? Of course not. Censorship is wrong, even if it is legal. This is just as true for the Great Firewall as it is for V5K2C2.

“It apparently escapes the geniuses at the New York Times that it is a very short hop from silencing kooks like Alex Jones, to silencing their own employer, the minute that newspaper falls afoul of whatever regime gets elected to power.”

Agreed. Consequences are a two way street. If you advocate censorship under the misguided notion that people *should* experience consequences for their speech, it can just as easily come back to bite you. That’s a feature, not a bug. Be careful, or else the standard you hold others to can be used against you. I suspect this is what Jesus had in mind when he instructed us not to judge others.

**Sharkly**

2018-08-10 at 03:17

Educate yourself with this

Sorry, I prefer to remain ignorant, and stick by my former comment. I don't claim to be a lawyer or want to become one. But, I trust you'll alert me when my 1st amendment rights are threatened, and when to use my 2nd amendment rights to get the first back. If we are still able to communicate at that point.

**Kentucky Headhunter**

2018-08-10 at 07:24

“It apparently escapes the geniuses at the New York Times that it is a very short hop from silencing kooks like Alex Jones, to silencing their own employer, ...”

Why would that happen; them being on the “right side of history” and all? 😊

**Boxer** 👤

2018-08-10 at 11:06

But, I trust you'll alert me when my 1st amendment rights are threatened, and when to use my 2nd amendment rights to get the first back. If we are still able to communicate at that point.

Freedom of expression is the fountainhead from which all other privileges flow.

Pingback: [Friday hawt chicks & links – The free my butt edition. – Adam Piggott](#)

**Isa**

2018-08-11 at 10:51

PragerU is in a similar legal battle with youtube as shown here

http://www.bgrfirm.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PRAGER_U-_v_GOOGLE-YOUTUBE_complaint_10-23-2017_FILED.pdf There is also a niggly legal issue with youtube (google, facebook, twitter etc) trying to transform to managed content curation rather than just being a platform. Thus far they have claimed no jurisdiction over what people write, and are not held liable for libel, threats etc. The more they filter, the more dangerous it is for them, as people could sue them for any missed threat posted on their platform. Interesting stuff.

**Gunner Q**

2018-08-11 at 14:40

Excerpt from <https://www.billofrightsinstitute.org/founding-documents/bill-of-rights/>

“One of the many points of contention between Federalists, who advocated a strong national government, and Anti-Federalists, who wanted power to remain with state and local governments, was the Constitution’s lack of a bill of rights that would place specific limits on government power. Federalists argued that the Constitution did not need a bill of rights, because the people and the states kept any powers not given to the federal government. Anti-Federalists held that a bill of rights was necessary to safeguard individual liberty.

“Madison, then a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, altered the Constitution’s text where he thought appropriate. However, several representatives, led by Roger Sherman, objected, saying that Congress had no authority to change the wording of the Constitution. Therefore, Madison’s changes were presented as a list of amendments that would follow Article VII.

“The House approved 17 amendments. Of these, the Senate approved 12, which were sent to the states for approval in August 1789. Ten amendments were approved (or ratified). Virginia’s legislature was the final state legislature to ratify the amendments, approving them on December 15, 1791.”



Boxer 

2018-08-11 at 21:00

Gunner:

Not only is that not a source from one of the founders you alluded to, but it doesn’t even support your original interpretation.



Derek Ramsey

2018-08-13 at 06:12

“we must all realize that free expression is meaningless if it does not entail freedom from consequences.”

Suppressed freedom of expression is **never** justified by the “necessity” of consequences. Every valid case of suppressed expression is where it violates **some other higher priority right**. So murder counts but speaking against war does not.

If you post porn on this site, Boxer will delete your comment and possibly ban you for harming him. He isn’t censoring expression, but preventing violation of his right to have *his* site express what he wants. If Boxer had an “anything goes” comment policy and blocked you for posting porn, that would be censorship. We would criticize him accordingly.

Alex Jones was banned for hate speech: expression that is wrong purely on its own. Even if nobody ever read those expressions, thus not harming no one, it would still be hate speech. The adjective “hate” makes it wrong, that is, the particular type of

expression. It's full-blown censorship and there is no justification for the consequences. Now Twitter is considering banning people for offline activities, truly embracing the role of thought police.

Censorship can only be justified for a reason other than expression. But that's still not enough! The harm must outweigh the right to expression. Except for a few rights and circumstances (e.g. the right to life), the right to free expression outweighs other rights. Note that even violating the right to life implicitly infringes on the right to freedom of expression. Thus "*Freedom of expression is the fountainhead from which all other privileges flow.*"

Pingback: [Why I Don't Vote – Derek L. Ramsey](#)

Comments are closed.

v5k2c2.com / Website Powered by WordPress.com.