

Twitter Thread by T. Greg Doucette



T. Greg Doucette

@greg_doucette



No

@greg_doucette Sedition finally? <https://t.co/34vfNIPTPY>

— grumpy_gator (@jonb13x) [January 2, 2021](#)

No

<https://t.co/9MgwobVvYS>

I know he's a blowhard, @greg_doucette, but this is inciting violence, no?

The audience has been standing by with itchy fingers. <https://t.co/SpZ5XTNn7M>

— ScubaVal #VoteGeorgiaVote (@MajikaZulJin) [January 2, 2021](#)

Incitement is speech that is:

- 1. intended to cause, and
- 2. reasonably likely to cause
- 3. imminent
- 4. lawless action

It needs all 4 elements

If any of those 4 are missing, it's First-Amendment protected speech

And constitutionally protected speech is never sedition

No <https://t.co/yPM5xh4JsB>

Um, this doesn't satisfy all four elements?

— Alex (@arg11) [January 2, 2021](#)

Immediate is imminent

4 minutes from now is imminent

4 hours from now might be imminent but probably is not

4 days from now definitely is not <https://t.co/l0MwTYLCtu>

Overturning the election would be a lawless action, wouldn't it?

And what Trump is trying to get Pence and Congressional Republicans to do on January 6 is imminent, isn't it?

I would think this qualifies. But you're the expert.

— Harley Quinn (@HarleyVicQuinn) [January 2, 2021](#)

The kidnapping plot was different, because there you had actual criminal conduct taking place vs just speech

<https://t.co/QYU8mOyYfd>

It has to look like the group that planned to kidnap the governor of MI? They had the four elements?

— Marquis Lafayette: "Constitutional" "Lawyer" (@RenegadeSci) [January 2, 2021](#)

The fact it's been hours since Gohmert's comments and there hasn't been violence from it conclusively proves that 2■■ and 3■■ don't exist

It's likely 1■■ doesn't exist either <https://t.co/c0sU4sVL2f>

Which part doesn't it meet? My layman's understanding would suggest it does, so I'm wondering where the disconnect is

— Max FKA LastGeeksDying (@Titanmatrix) [January 2, 2021](#)

The zeal with which "progressives" want to prosecute speech is a smidge terrifying tbh

No wonder y'all get caricatured <https://t.co/KUpByOufiU>

This needs to be prosecuted. In any reasonable estimation, statements intended to cause this kind of action any time in the near future should be considered "imminent." I consider the next 3 weeks to be in the "imminent" timeframe.

— GrahamIsThisCat (@GrahamThis) [January 2, 2021](#)

We call this "addition by subtraction"

Bye now ■ <https://t.co/2RqfdWJzei>

I think I'm done following apologists for terrorism.

— GrahamIsThisCat (@GrahamThis) [January 2, 2021](#)

Gohmert's comments aren't even in the same ZIP code as incitement <https://t.co/eI2DYK0FO8>

Can we at least say Gohmert is \u201cflirting\u201d with incitement? We saw how the Proud Boys pounced on Trump saying \u201cstand back and stand by\u201d. I worry Gohmert\u2019s words will lead to violence on the streets. If that happens and they sing his praises will that qualify as incitement? THX!

— Rebel Pony (@Corri_Girl) [January 2, 2021](#)

Correct

If someone has time to think and reflect on what was said, instead of instantly reacting, it's not incitement <https://t.co/TfgJ8GPEs5>

...wait, really? So if I said something that's otherwise incitement, but staple "in 30 days" onto the end, it's no longer incitement because it's not imminent?

— Fen-nic Hartley \U0001f51e (@nichartley) [January 2, 2021](#)

I'm heading to bed, but I'd encourage y'all to give some thought to the people a President Josh Hawley DOJ would lock up if the First Amendment worked the way y'all want it work with Gohmert here ■