

# Janet Napolitano for Supreme Court

With news that former Governor Janet Napolitano is a possible candidate for the Supreme Court, one might wonder just how she would interpret the Constitution of the United States of America. Would she interpret it “loosely?” Or would she actually feel bound by her oath to “support and defend the Constitution against all enemies foreign and domestic?”

Let’s examine her most recent work at the Department of Homeland Security to see if we can divine some wisdom on the matter. She wrote an interesting [Rightwing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment report](#) and even developed her very own [Lexicon](#).

In her “Rightwing Extremism” report, she concludes:

*(U//LES) Rightwing extremists are harnessing this historical election as a recruitment tool. Many rightwing extremists are antagonistic toward the new presidential administration and its perceived stance on a range of issues, including immigration and citizenship, the expansion of social programs to minorities, and restrictions on firearms ownership and use.*

Let’s examine our *perceived dangers* of the *restrictions on firearms ownership and use*. Since we are examining her possible fitness for the Supreme Court, perhaps we should examine the words of a wise Latino woman who recently became a Supreme Court justice. During her confirmation, Sonia Sotomeyer spoke these wise words:

*“The intent of the founders were set forth in the Constitution. They created the words; they created the*

*document. It is their words that is the most important aspect of judging. You follow what they said in their words and you apply it to the facts you're looking at.*—**Sonia Sotomeyer, Senate confirmation hearings, July 2009**

I wonder if she subscribes to the [Davy Crockett](#) school of Constitutional law?

On that basis, we shall examine just what the founding fathers might have thought about, say, the Second Amendment and “militia” duties in America.

*“But though the scheme of disciplining the whole nation must be abandoned as mischievous or impracticable; yet it is a matter of the utmost importance that a well-digested plan should, as soon as possible, be adopted for the proper establishment of the militia. The attention of the government ought particularly to be directed to the formation of a select corps of moderate extent, upon such principles as will really fit them for service in case of need. By thus circumscribing the plan, it will be possible to have an excellent body of well-trained militia, ready to take the field whenever the defense of the State shall require it. This will not only lessen the call for military establishments, but if circumstances should at any time oblige the government to form an army of any magnitude that army can never be formidable to the liberties of the people while there is a large body of citizens, little, if at all, inferior to them in discipline and the use of arms, who stand ready to defend their own rights and those of their fellow-citizens. This appears to me the only substitute that can be devised for a standing army, and the best possible security against it, if it should exist.”*—[Federalist Paper No. 29, Concerning the Militia](#)

Sounds like a rightwing extremist. Imagine. Allowing citizens to be armed in case a tyrannical government is installed that

violates the Bill of Rights of the Constitution and considers the Constitution so much toilet paper. Dang. Recent examples escape my mind.

It does seem interesting that she does not seem to mind torture being used to “find out terrorists.” In line with her *Rightwing Extremist* report, I guess that means torture may be used against people who believe murdering babies is wrong, returning veterans (turn-about is fair play, you understand) and members of the Tea Party movement.

I wonder how she would rule on the [Patriot Act](#), that she now uses as [extended by Obama](#). A Patriot Act that has been [used against American non-terrorists](#). You can see what another unwise *Philistine* thinks about the Patriot Act [here](#).

There are no Leftwing extremists, mind you. The [SEIU](#) only performs the public service of getting the word out for our new President. They are all just following the [rules](#) of their mentor [Saul Alinsky](#).

*\* Rule 1: Power is not only what you have, but what an opponent thinks you have. If your organization is small, hide your numbers in the dark and raise a din that will make everyone think you have many more people than you do.*

*\* Rule 2: Never go outside the experience of your people. The result is confusion, fear, and retreat.*

*\* Rule 3: Whenever possible, go outside the experience of an opponent. Here you want to cause confusion, fear, and retreat.*

*\* Rule 4: Make opponents live up to their own book of rules. “You can kill them with this, for they can no more obey their own rules than the Christian church can live up to Christianity.”*

*\* Rule 5: Ridicule is man’s most potent weapon. It’s hard to counterattack ridicule, and it infuriates the opposition, which then reacts to your advantage.*

*\* Rule 6: A good tactic is one your people enjoy. “If your*

people aren't having a ball doing it, there is something very wrong with the tactic."

\* Rule 7: A tactic that drags on for too long becomes a drag. Commitment may become ritualistic as people turn to other issues.

\* Rule 8: Keep the pressure on. Use different tactics and actions and use all events of the period for your purpose. "The major premise for tactics is the development of operations that will maintain a constant pressure upon the opposition. It is this that will cause the opposition to react to your advantage."

\* Rule 9: The threat is more terrifying than the thing itself. When Alinsky leaked word that large numbers of poor people were going to tie up the washrooms of O'Hare Airport, Chicago city authorities quickly agreed to act on a longstanding commitment to a ghetto organization. They imagined the mayhem as thousands of passengers poured off airplanes to discover every washroom occupied. Then they imagined the international embarrassment and the damage to the city's reputation.

\* Rule 10: The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative. Avoid being trapped by an opponent or an interviewer who says, "Okay, what would you do?"

\* Rule 11: Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, polarize it. Don't try to attack abstract corporations or bureaucracies. Identify a responsible individual. Ignore attempts to shift or spread the blame.

*It's okay if we use violence. But, kids, don't try this at home.*

I don't know. Supposedly, Stevens moved from a moderate conservative to a Communist. I suppose the reverse could occur.