

“Trying to Break Us Down”: Mass Protests Hit Israel as 2nd Nationwide Lockdown Takes Effect

[“Trying to Break Us Down”: Mass Protests Hit Israel as 2nd Nationwide Lockdown Takes Effect](#)

by [Tyler Durden](#), [ZeroHedge](#)

September 19, 2020

As Israel’s second nationwide mandatory lockdown went into effect on Friday, hundreds took the streets in Tel Aviv to protest what citizens complain is unnecessary government overreach which will only harm businesses while achieving little positive effect.

Israel’s Health ministry cited a recent spike in COVID-19 cases in making the argument last week that a new national lockdown is warranted; however, government ministers concerned about the **devastating impact on small businesses as well as freedom of worship** clashed with factions pushing the new lockdown.

Tel Aviv bars rebrand as synagogues to protest virus lockdown rules <https://t.co/PfaN9Y8DAK>

– *The Times of Israel (@TimesofIsrael)* [September 16, 2020](#)

The entire country has been [declared](#) a ‘hot zone’ and the lockdown took effect by Friday afternoon, just before the the start of Rosh Hashanah, the two day festive celebration marking the Jewish New Year.

It comes as new infections have risen 5,000 on some days, bringing the country to over 175,000 cases including 1,160 deaths.

Israelis protest against virus lockdown in Tel Aviv <https://t.co/CsIqNzxhME> pic.twitter.com/N7XF2CWwPM

– Yeni Şafak English (@yenisafakEN) [September 18, 2020](#)

The mainstay of the protests [began Thursday night](#):

Hundreds of Israelis protested in Tel Aviv late Thursday against a second nationwide lockdown to combat Israel's surging coronavirus outbreak.

"The economy is in free-fall, people are losing their jobs, they're depressed," said Yael, one of between 300 and 400 demonstrators at Habima Square.

And a recently laid off protester told [The Times of Israel](#):

"And all this for what? For nothing!"

Ironically, though schools and business have been shuttered for at least two weeks starting Friday the government has said demonstrations still remain legal, so it's expected more will pop up especially as the lockdown takes an economic toll, fueling resentment at the entire population being forced into quarantine.

Restaurants especially have been hit hard during the prior pandemic lockdown:

"We've been broken."

Restaurateurs in Tel Aviv smashed plates on Tuesday to protest a second nationwide coronavirus lockdown pic.twitter.com/SaoubMD9QN

– Bloomberg QuickTake (@QuickTake) [September 15, 2020](#)

Protest groups in downtown Tel Aviv decried that it was all a ploy of Prime Minister Netanyahu, designed to ensure his personal political survival by continuing to sell fear, especially as he's still facing serious corruption charges.

“The shutdown is in order to turn us into submissive, suppressed sheep,” one protester told [Russia's RT](#). She argued that ultimately the new measures are “to try to break us down.”

Governments Will Impose New Lockdowns if They Think They Can Get Away With It

[Governments Will Impose New Lockdowns If They Think They Can Get Away With It](#)

by [Ryan McMaken](#), [The Mises Institute](#)

September 16, 2020

This year's stay-at-home orders and lockdowns imposed by governments on their populations represent a watershed moment in the history of the modern state.

Before March 2020, it is unlikely that many politicians – let alone many ordinary people – thought it would be feasible or likely for government officials to force hundreds of millions of human beings to “self-isolate.”

But it turns out governments were indeed able to force a sizable portion of the population to abandon jobs, religious practices, extended families, and community life in the name of “flattening the curve.”

Whether through fear manufactured by the news media or through outright threats of punishment, business owners shuttered their shops and offices, churches closed down, and schools abandoned their students.

Over time, most governments lessened their restrictions, largely out of fear that tax revenues would collapse and out of fear that the public would become unwilling to obey lockdown edicts indefinitely.

Those fears—not scientific objectivity—have been guiding the gradual loosening of lockdowns and lockdown-related restrictions in recent weeks. After all, in many jurisdictions—both in the USA [and in Europe](#)—cases and case growth are far above what they were back in March and April when we were told that high case totals absolutely required strict lockdowns. If case numbers are higher now than during the previous peak, why no new lockdowns?

Make no mistake, many politicians would love to impose lockdowns again, and indefinitely. After all, the power to micromanage the behavior of every business and household in the manner of covid lockdowns is a power undreamed of by even the most despotic emperor of old. It’s not a power a regime would abandon lightly.

But could they get away with it? This is a question every prolockdown politician is asking. For the extent to which lockdowns have been scaled back and lessened, we cannot thank any enlightenment or change of heart on the part of politicians. If lockdowns now seem to be receding, it’s because policymakers fear another round of lockdowns would be greeted with resistance rather than obedience. In short, the

retreat of lockdowns is a result of an uneasy truce between the antilockdown public (which is by no means the whole public) and the prolockdown politicians. The politicians have conceded nothing in terms of their asserted authority, but they nonetheless fear greater resistance in the future.

Regimes Continue to Threaten More Lockdowns

Although they're slowly backing off on full lockdowns for now, governments have been very careful to maintain that they retain the power to reimpose them—including full-on strict and ruthless lockdown—at any time.

In some areas, this has already been done, such as in southern Australia and in New Zealand. In the state of Victoria in Australia, for instance, residents in recent weeks have been subject to strict curfews and even road closures preventing them from traveling more than a few miles from their homes. Those who dissent—such as [a pregnant mother who was arrested for merely discussing an upcoming protest](#)—are brutalized. Meanwhile, military personnel enforce martial law, [dragging people from their cars](#) and demanding they show their “papers.”

[China continues to impose regional and partial lockdowns](#). Belgium, meanwhile, insists it may yet still impose “[total lockdown](#).” Back in July, the UK's Boris Johnson told the nation's residents [to follow the social distancing rules now](#) or face harsher lockdowns in the future. Last week Johnson's government announced strict new social distancing rules, [prohibiting any gatherings of more than six people](#) in most cases.

Nor have American politicians abandoned these newfound powers. In Utah, which did not impose a lockdown in March or April, the authorities [are still threatening](#) a possible future “complete shutdown.” Governors in states including Texas, Pennsylvania, Illinois, New York, and Michigan have all threatened new lockdowns if the residents don't do as they're

told.

(Only two governors, to my knowledge, have said they will not impose future lockdowns. Earlier this month, Governor Ron DeSantis of Florida [vowed](#) “we will never do any of these lockdowns again,” and Governor Kristi Noem of South Dakota, which has never imposed a lockdown at all, has also said lockdowns are not on the table.)

In many cases politicians have substituted face masks and targeted lockdowns (of bars and nightclubs, etc.) in lieu of full stay-at-home orders. This limits public dissent by limiting the number of businesses and industries where people are thrown out of work and business owners are effectively robbed of their property. Fewer destitute or jobless voters likely translates into less active dissent.

This permanent embrace of emergency power is to be expected. Governments have long used crises as an excuse to expand government power, often with the glowing approval of the electorate. After the end of World War II, for example, the party platform of the British Labour Party [explicitly sought to extend wartime economic planning indefinitely](#). The idea was that central planning had won the war and now it would “win the peace.” This meant a host of boards and commissions that would control everything from farming to housing.

But that’s just one example. As Robert Higgs has shown in his book *Crisis and Leviathan*, using wars and other crises to permanently expand state power is just standard operating procedure for countless regimes. It’s what governments do.

Governments Are Limited Only by the Public’s Resistance

On the other hand, governments are limited by how much the public is willing to tolerate. [As Étienne de La Boétie has shown](#), all regimes—even authoritarian ones—are ultimately limited by public approval and obedience. Without public

opinion on their side, regimes become constrained, even in a police state.

Ludwig von Mises built on this notion when he noted in his book *Liberalism*:

“there has never been a political power that voluntarily desisted from impeding the free development and operation of the institution of private ownership of the means of production. Governments tolerate private property when they are compelled to do so, but they do not acknowledge it voluntarily in recognition of its necessity. Even liberal politicians, on gaining power, have usually relegated their liberal principles more or less to the background. The tendency to impose oppressive restraints on private property, to abuse political power, and to refuse to respect or recognize any free sphere outside or beyond the dominion of the state is too deeply ingrained in the mentality of those who control the governmental apparatus of compulsion and coercion for them ever to be able to resist it voluntarily. A liberal government is a contradictio in adjecto. Governments must be forced into adopting liberalism by the power of the unanimous opinion of the people; that they could voluntarily become liberal is not to be expected.”

In other words, governments don't refrain from exercising ever more power unless they are prevented from doing so. But what did he mean by a government being “forced into adopting liberalism by the power of the unanimous opinion of the people”? Mises was very much a man who understood how states work in the real world. So it's a safe bet that he didn't think the public's “unanimous opinion” was somehow magically transformed into a government limiting itself.

Rather, Mises understood that governments are limited by pressures applied by groups external to the state apparatus itself. These could take the form of widespread noncompliance,

peaceful protests, or even armed resistance. But to think that governments will limit themselves without at least the fear of some form of resistance would be fanciful, to say the least.

And this is likely what is limiting governments in their dreams of ever-harsher lockdowns right now. We've already seen this dynamic in action in Serbia, for example, where the regime attempted to reimpose a nationwide lockdown. This proposal was [greeted with both peaceful and violent protests](#). The state partially retreated and opted instead for much weaker regional lockdowns. Protests also [continue to grow in Germany](#), and have even cropped up in London.

In the US, of course, protests of various types have appeared since April, and given the volume of anger over lockdowns and business closures expressed across a wide variety of media, it's easy to see why state and local governments should expect trouble if they try another full-scale lockdown. One need only step out one's front door in many areas to see countless examples of passive noncompliance and resistance to mask orders and social distancing decrees.

Complicating matters is the low state of public approval of police forces. It's true that police tend to receive public support when they are seen battling rioters and thugs. But public support would likely wither quickly were the police unleashed on middle-class suburbanites who fail to follow stay-at-home orders.

If American governors and mayors try a new set of lockdowns, just how far will they willing to go to enforce them? Will they call in the national guard and open fire on middle-class dissenters? If police attempt to break into homes in the manner we have witnessed in Australia, things might turn out quite differently here. In situations like that, at least some residents will defend themselves with firearms.

Ensuring compliance will also become especially difficult as

lockdowns empty the public purse. As the economy weakens, so will tax revenues, and public welfare programs can't subsist on newly printed money forever. As local, state, and federal amenities and free money programs come up short of funds, it will become harder to buy off the voters with yet another government check.

Admittedly, governments can always double down on enforcement by imposing strict police states. This can work in the short term. But then what? Outside of places like China and Australia, it appears many regimes aren't yet prepared to find out. But they're not willing to concede defeat, either. The lockdown state will press the issue as far as the voters and taxpayers are willing to let it go.

Erasing History and Erasing Truth: Censorship and Destroying Records Is the Cornerstone of Tyrants

[Erasing History and Erasing Truth: Censorship and Destroying Records Is the Cornerstone of Tyrants](#)

by [Gary D. Barnett](#)

September 19, 2020

"If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in

silencing mankind."

~ John Stuart Mill, On Liberty ch. 2 (1859)

Tyranny requires that the truth be silenced, that real history be erased and rewritten, that speech be restricted, and that individual thought be silenced. In this time of constant turmoil, false flags, wars, civil unrest, and now internal bio-terrorism and manufactured pandemics, a major agenda of the state apparatus is to silence all dissent, and mandate conformity. It is imperative considering the state's plan for total control that it stifle criticism and retain the power to control the mainstream narrative, while aggressively eliminating all other resistance and questioning. This is the state of the world that we live in today. As things continue to deteriorate, nonconformance cannot be allowed if global governance and a global reset are to be successful.

Current censorship has reached levels not seen in the past, and with all the advanced technology available, this nefarious plot to silence the thinkers and hide the truth could affect all forms of speech. It is getting much more difficult to find truthful information, as those like Google, Amazon, YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, and many other venues are eliminating content and access to content at a blistering pace. A day rarely goes by without something I am reading or researching on these sites being taken down or hidden. This can only lead to a world consumed by propaganda alone, thus guaranteeing that only the state narrative will be presented in any mainstream or easily accessible format. This is a dangerous situation, especially considering the likelihood that through vaccination or other methods, much of the population could soon become subject to transhuman experimentation where injectable nanoparticles and chips could be used to alter human behavior.

This is not a new phenomenon, as tyrants throughout human history have censored writing and speech in order to protect their power structure. Power is always troubled by any that

dare to think, and any that dare to question. In ancient times and not so ancient times, books were burned to keep the populace from having access to any material that was not acceptable by the throne or by the current political authority. In cases of resistance to 'high' authority, many were also killed by the state, and in many cases these 'cleansings' were targeted to the educated class, because they had the capability to think critically and express their ideas publically. Those that held power by force of arms would never allow criticism and dissent, because that could lead to hostility and insurrection by the people.

In this time of Covid and this fake virus pandemic, things have changed in part, but much is as it has always been throughout history. This is one reason that history is so important, because regardless of progress and innovation, the underlying motives of the ruling class have changed little over time. Money, power, and control have always been the key concerns of the ruling class, it is just that the methods to keep that power and control have changed. Instead of the sword and guillotine, propaganda and fear have become the primary tools used to fool the people into compliance. In order for propaganda to work, elimination of dissent is imperative. Censorship plays a huge role in any effort to gain support of the masses, because without the possibility to reach the bulk of the people, the truth tellers become marginalized, and are shunned and ridiculed as troublemakers and conspiracy theorists.

The biggest censorship push in history is taking place today, which means that the biggest propaganda push is also underway. This false flag event called the coronavirus pandemic is not about one king seeking control over his subjects, but is about the few attempting to take over the entire planet. This is a global effort that is run by the few top claimed elites, with their tentacles of power reaching almost every country on earth through control of the banks, corporations, foundations,

and the entire political class system.

Many have fought and died in order to protect free speech, but all speech is now under attack by the forces of evil. If the globalists have their way, free speech will be lost forever. This is the world of the Internet and computerized system saturation. Censorship today takes on a new look meant to accomplish the same goals as in the past. Blacklisting users, blocking content, and algorithmic manipulation allow for the state to control information, and with that control of information, it stands to reason that the general public will then be easier to manipulate and keep in check. The acceptance of tracking and tracing technology, continued isolation, vaccines capable of altering the DNA structure of individuals, chips and dyes mimicking the mark of the beast, and a continued state of fear will lead to an end of normalcy. The result sought is a new order, a "new normal," that will be totally controlled by ruling 'experts' claiming to be able to sustain you, protect you, appease you, meet all your needs, and eliminate your worries. This system is called technocracy, and is dependent on a societal class fully controlled by an upper class. Does this sound familiar? It should, as that is the want of all tyrants, but in this day and age, it will look much different.

All of this relies on a willing public, and in order to achieve that total compliance on a scale this large, the human spirit must be broken, and love, family, emotion, responsibility, open communication, mass gatherings, and debate must be squelched. Once the pathetic masses accept this ruse, and acquiesce to the mandates coming, they will be transformed into a machine-like state through technological manipulation said to make life easier and more convenient. A totally digitized system is necessary in order to retain constant control. This may sound outlandish, and something akin to a dystopian science fiction novel, but that is because that is exactly what it is. The new world is coming, and by

eliminating truth, eliminating our historical roots, and hiding all that is real and honest, what is left is a fantasy, but this fantasy will be deadly.

Seek the truth, seek honesty, ask questions, and believe nothing unless it can be personally verified. Do not allow the takeover of your lives by these monsters claiming to be your saviors.

“There is more than one way to burn a book. And the world is full of people running about with lit matches”.

~ Ray Bradbury – “Fahrenheit 451: A Novel,” (1953). p. 209, Simon and Schuster

Sourced from www.GaryDBarnett.com. Reprinted with permission from LewRockwell.com

Freedom in the Heartland Rally w/ Del Bigtree & Robert F. Kennedy Jr.

[Freedom in the Heartland Rally w/ Del Bigtree & Robert F. Kennedy Jr.](#)

by **[The HighWire with Del Bigtree](#)**

September 18, 2020

Original video is available at **[The HighWire Bitchute](#)** channel.

[Mirrored copies of this video are available at Truth Comes to Light [BitChute](#), [LBRY](#) & [Brighteon](#) channels. All credit goes to the original source of this video.]

Overturning COVID Restrictions and States of Emergency

[Overturning COVID Restrictions and States of Emergency](#)

“You think you got the horses for that? Well, good luck and God bless, but I tell you this...the last place you want to see me is in court.” (attorney Arthur Edens, in the film, Michael Clayton, 2007)

Memo to lawyers: What are you waiting for? File big cases now.

by [Jon Rappoport](#), [No More Fake News](#)

September 16, 2020

[I've been covering the decision](#) in the Pennsylvania COVID case and the court filing in Ohio. They give us the templates for potential victories in other states and countries.

[In Pennsylvania \(ruling\)](#), a federal judge just ruled that Governor Wolf's COVID containment measures are unconstitutional. The judge went further. NO emergency cancels the Constitution. There is a line that cannot be crossed. The

right to assemble, to have freedom of movement, to earn a living—they can't be wiped off the board by lockdowns for ANY reason.

This is, indeed, a heroic ruling. It affirms the unmistakable rays of light emanating from the basis of the American Republic.

In Tom Renz's gigantic Ohio filing against Governor Mike DeWine, both the Constitution and issues of fact/science are asserted. Facts mean something. A declaration of emergency must undergo scrutiny, to determine whether a clear and present danger justifies the declaration.

Otherwise, a government can destroy the Constitution, the rule of law, and human rights by falsely claiming danger when there is none. We would be back in the time of Royal Edict, with the king's army as the "rationale."

(Attorney press release posted [here](#); Attorney plaintiff document filed with court posted [here](#).)

In 2020, lunatic cultural proclivities, media propaganda, political jockeying, pretensions of science, scare tactics, rigging of "facts," and profit motives are in the mix. They produce amnesia about basic principles.

The law, when correctly applied, refreshes memory and sweeps away a blizzard of claims and counter-claims. The law comes to the point.

Using the law, one can say to governors and their public health advisors, "You've been going on for months now about the COVID spread and the emergency and the containment measures, but we want to reduce this to basics: do you have the Constitutional right to strip away our freedoms, and is there a factual reason to believe a state of emergency is necessary—so we're going to court."

Or, putting it another way: “Sir, you’re holding a gun to my head while you’re explaining at length why I can’t move. But you see, nothing has happened in court yet. Meet my lawyer. Are you going to shoot us both? Is that where you really want to go?”

In Ohio, attorney Tom Renz, on behalf of his clients, and against the governor, is asking for a jury trial. He wants citizens to hear the complex arguments about COVID SCIENCE. He wants citizens to understand the con and the game that is being played, in great detail. This is impressive. Renz believes The People deserve to know and they are capable of understanding.

From my nearly 40 years working as a reporter, experience tells me attorney Renz is correct. When the truth is laid out step by step, The People come to their senses. They cut through their own malaise. They cut through media indoctrination. As if they once took a voyage to an island called Logic, they suddenly remember that voyage.

After all, the COVID lockdowns and the economic destruction are being visited on the population at large, so let a dozen of their members (OUR members) hear the case and adjudicate it.

I’m not naïve about courts and judges and lawyers and juries. But I do know that, among the denizens of that system, there are keen minds and persons of good will. Persons who know that the Law, as it was once enshrined by the Founders, is a beacon and a breakthrough.

It is a culmination, after centuries of struggle, which places freedom at the head of the table.

Freedom—not edicts, not lockdowns.

What is COVID science? Has the virus actually been defined? Have case and death numbers been drastically inflated? Is

there a pandemic? Why is a diagnostic test that has so many holes, that has never been properly validated, being deployed? How many obfuscations has the CDC planted to hide official secrets?

Let's go to court and turn on the lights and explore the rabbit hole.

Virtual School Dangers: The Hazards of a Police State Education During COVID-19

[Virtual School Dangers: The Hazards of a Police State Education During COVID-19](#)

by [John W. Whitehead](#), [The Rutherford Institute](#)

September 15, 2020

“There was of course no way of knowing whether you were being watched at any given moment. How often, or on what system, the Thought Police plugged in on any individual wire was guesswork. It was even conceivable that they watched everybody all the time. But at any rate they could plug in your wire whenever they wanted to. You had to live—did live, from habit that became instinct—in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard, and, except in darkness, every movement scrutinized.”—George Orwell, 1984

Once upon a time in America, parents breathed a sigh of relief when their kids went back to school after a summer's hiatus,

content in the knowledge that for a good portion of the day, their kids would be gainfully occupied, out of harm's way, and out of trouble.

Back then, if you talked back to a teacher, or played a prank on a classmate, or just failed to do your homework, you might find yourself in detention or doing an extra writing assignment after school or suffering through a parent-teacher conference about your shortcomings.

Of course, that was before school shootings became a part of our national lexicon.

As a result, over the course of the past 30 years, the need to keep the schools "safe" from drugs and weapons has become a thinly disguised, profit-driven campaign to transform them into quasi-prisons, complete with surveillance cameras, metal detectors, police patrols, zero tolerance policies, lock downs, drug sniffing dogs, school resource officers, strip searches, and active shooter drills.

Suddenly, under school zero tolerance policies, students were being punished with suspension, expulsion, and even arrest for childish behavior and minor transgressions such as playing cops and robbers on the playground, bringing LEGOs to school, or having a food fight.

Things got even worse once schools started to rely on police (school resource officers) to ["deal with minor rule breaking: sagging pants, disrespectful comments, brief physical skirmishes."](#)

As a result, students are being subjected to police tactics such as handcuffs, leg shackles, tasers and excessive force for "acting up," in addition to being [ticketed, fined and sent to court for behavior perceived as defiant, disruptive or disorderly](#) such as spraying perfume and writing on a desk.

This is what constitutes a police state education these days:

lessons in compliance meted out with aggressive, totalitarian tactics.

The COVID-19 pandemic has added yet another troubling layer to the ways in which students (and their families) can run afoul of a police state education now that school (virtual or in-person) is back in session.

Significant numbers of schools within the nation's 13,000 school districts have opted to hold their classes online, in-person or a hybrid of the two, fearing further outbreaks of the virus. Yet this unprecedented foray into the virtual world carries its own unique risks.

Apart from the technological logistics of ensuring that millions of students across the country have adequate computer and internet access, consider the Fourth Amendment ramifications of having students attend school online via video classes from the privacy of their homes.

Suddenly, you've got government officials (in this case, teachers or anyone at the school on the other end of that virtual connection) being allowed *carte blanche* visual access to the inside of one's private home *without a warrant*.

Anything those school officials see—anything they hear—anything they photograph or record—during that virtual visit becomes fair game for scrutiny and investigation not just by school officials but by every interconnected government agency to which that information can be relayed: the police, social services, animal control, the Department of Homeland Security, you name it.

After all, this is the age of overcriminalization, when the federal criminal code is so vast that the average American unknowingly commits about three federal felonies per day, [a U.S. Attorney can find a way to charge just about anyone with violating federal law.](#)

It's a train wreck just waiting to happen.

In fact, we're already seeing this play out across the country. For instance, a 12-year-old Colorado boy was [suspended for flashing a toy gun across his computer screen during an online art class](#). Without bothering to notify or consult with the boy's parents, police carried out a welfare check on Isaiah Elliott, who suffers from ADHD and learning disabilities.

An 11-year-old Maryland boy had [police descend on his home in search of weapons after school officials spied a BB gun on the boy's bedroom wall during a Google Meet class](#) on his laptop. School officials reported the sighting to the school resource officer, who then called the police.

And in New York and Massachusetts, [growing numbers of parents are being visited by social services after being reported to the state child neglect and abuse hotline](#), all because their kids failed to sign in for some of their online classes. Charges of neglect, in some instances, can lead to children being removed from their homes.

You see what this is, don't you?

This is how a seemingly well-meaning program (virtual classrooms) becomes another means by which the government can intrude into our private lives, further normalizing the idea of constant surveillance and desensitizing us to the dangers of an existence in which we are never safe from the all-seeing eyes of Big Brother.

This is how the police sidestep the Fourth Amendment's requirement for probable cause and a court-issued warrant in order to spy on us in the privacy of our homes: by putting school officials in a position to serve as spies and snitches via online portals and virtual classrooms, and by establishing open virtual doorways into our homes through which the police can enter uninvited and poke around.

Welfare checks. Police searches for weapons. Reports to Social Services.

It's only a matter of time before the self-righteous Nanny State uses this COVID-19 pandemic as yet another means by which it can dictate every aspect of our lives.

At the moment, it's America's young people who are the guinea pigs for the police state's experiment in virtual authoritarianism. Already, school administrators are wrestling with how to handle student discipline for in-person classes and online learning in the midst of COVID-19.

Mark my words, this will take school zero tolerance policies—and their associated harsh disciplinary penalties—to a whole new level once you have teachers empowered to act as the Thought Police.

As Kalyn Belsha [reports](#) for *Chalkbeat*, “In Jacksonville, Florida, students who don't wear a mask repeatedly could be removed from school and made to learn online. In some Texas districts, intentionally coughing on someone can be classified as assault. In Memphis, minor misbehaviors could land students in an online ‘supervised study.’”

Depending on the state and the school district, failing to wear a face mask could constitute a dress code violation. In Utah, not wearing a face mask at school constitutes a criminal misdemeanor. In Texas, it's [considered an assault to intentionally spit, sneeze, or cough on someone else](#). Anyone removing their mask before spitting or coughing could be given a suspension from school.

Virtual learning presents its own challenges with educators warning dire consequences for students who violate school standards for dress code and work spaces, even while “learning” at home. According to *Chalkbeat*, “In Shelby County, Tennessee, which includes Memphis, that means [no pajamas, hats, or hoods on screen, and students' shirts must have](#)

[sleeves](#). (The district is providing 'flexibility' on clothing bottoms and footwear when a student's full body won't be seen on video.) Other rules might be even tougher to follow: The district is also requiring students' work stations to be clear of 'foreign objects' and says students shouldn't eat or drink during virtual classes."

See how quickly the Nanny State a.k.a. Police State takes over?

All it takes for you to cease being the master of your own home is to have a child engaged in virtual learning. Suddenly, the government gets to have a say in how you order your space and when those in your home can eat and drink and what clothes they wear.

If you think the schools won't overreact in a virtual forum, you should think again.

These are the same schools that have been plagued by a lack of common sense when it comes to enforcing zero tolerance policies for weapons, violence and drugs.

These are the very same schools that have exposed students to a steady diet of draconian zero tolerance policies that criminalize childish behavior, overreaching anti-bullying statutes that criminalize speech, school resource officers (police) tasked with disciplining and/or arresting so-called "disorderly" students, standardized testing that emphasizes rote answers over critical thinking, politically correct mindsets that teach young people to censor themselves and those around them, and extensive biometric and surveillance systems that, coupled with the rest, acclimate young people to a world in which they have no freedom of thought, speech or movement.

Zero tolerance policies that were intended to make schools safer by discouraging the use of actual drugs and weapons by students have turned students into suspects to be treated as

criminals by school officials and law enforcement alike, while criminalizing childish behavior.

For instance, 9-year-old Patrick Timoney was sent to the principal's office and threatened with suspension after school officials discovered that one of his LEGOs was holding a 2-inch toy gun. David Morales, an 8-year-old Rhode Island student, ran afoul of his school's zero tolerance policies after he wore a hat to school decorated with an American flag and tiny plastic Army figures in honor of American troops. School officials declared the hat out of bounds because the toy soldiers were carrying miniature guns.

A high school sophomore was suspended for violating the school's no-cell-phone policy after he took a call from his father, a master sergeant in the U.S. Army who was serving in Iraq at the time. In Houston, an 8th grader was suspended for wearing rosary beads to school in memory of her grandmother (the school has a zero tolerance policy against the rosary, which the school insists can be interpreted as a sign of gang involvement).

Even imaginary weapons (hand-drawn pictures of guns, [pencils twirled](#) in a "threatening" manner, imaginary bows and arrows, even fingers positioned like guns) can also land a student in detention. Equally outrageous was the case in New Jersey where several kindergartners were suspended from school for three days for playing a make-believe game of "cops and robbers" during recess and *using their fingers* as guns.

With the distinctions between student offenses erased, and *all* offenses expellable, we now find ourselves in the midst of what *Time* magazine described as a "national crackdown on Alka-Seltzer." Students have actually been suspended from school for possession of the fizzy tablets in violation of zero tolerance drug policies. Students have also been penalized for such inane "crimes" as bringing nail clippers to school, using Listerine or Scope, and carrying fold-out combs

that resemble switchblades.

A 13-year-old boy in Manassas, Virginia, who accepted a Certs breath mint from a classmate, was actually suspended and required to attend drug-awareness classes, while a 12-year-old boy who said he brought powdered sugar to school for a science project was charged with a felony for possessing a look-alike drug.

Acts of kindness, concern, basic manners or just engaging in childish behavior can also result in suspensions.

One 13-year-old was given detention for exposing the school to “liability” by [sharing his lunch](#) with a hungry friend. A third grader was [suspended for shaving her head](#) in sympathy for a friend who had lost her hair to chemotherapy. And then there was the high school senior who was [suspended for saying “bless you”](#) after a fellow classmate sneezed.

In South Carolina, where it’s against the law to disturb a school, more than a thousand students a year—some as young as 7 years old—“face criminal charges for not [following directions, loitering, cursing, or the vague allegation of acting ‘obnoxiously.’](#) If charged as adults, they can be held in jail for up to 90 days.”

Things get even worse when you add police to the mix.

Thanks to a combination of media hype, political pandering and financial incentives, the use of armed police officers (a.k.a. school resource officers) to patrol school hallways has risen dramatically in the years since the Columbine school shooting ([nearly 20,000 by 2003](#)). What this means, notes *Mother Jones*, is [greater police “involvement in routine discipline matters](#) that principals and parents used to address without involvement from law enforcement officers.”

Funded by the U.S. Department of Justice, these school resource officers (SROs) have become de facto wardens in the

elementary, middle and high schools, doling out their own brand of justice to the so-called “criminals” in their midst with the help of [tasers, pepperspray, batons and brute force](#).

The horror stories are legion.

One SRO is accused of punching a 13-year-old student in the face [for cutting in the cafeteria line](#). That [same cop put another student in a chokehold](#) a week later, allegedly knocking the student unconscious and causing a brain injury.

In Pennsylvania, a student was tased after [ignoring an order to put his cell phone away](#).

A 12-year-old New York student was hauled out of school in handcuffs for doodling on her desk with an erasable marker. Another 12-year-old was handcuffed and jailed after he stomped in a puddle, splashing classmates.

[On any given day when school is in session](#), kids who “act up” in class are pinned facedown on the floor, locked in dark closets, tied up with straps, bungee cords and duct tape, handcuffed, leg shackled, tasered or otherwise restrained, immobilized or placed in solitary confinement in order to bring them under “control.”

In almost every case, these undeniably harsh methods are used to punish kids for simply failing to follow directions or throwing tantrums.

Very rarely do the kids pose any credible danger to themselves or others.

For example, a [4-year-old Virginia preschooler was handcuffed, leg shackled](#) and transported to the sheriff’s office after reportedly throwing blocks and climbing on top of the furniture. School officials claim the restraints were necessary to protect the adults from injury.

A [6-year-old kindergarten student in a Georgia public school](#)

[was handcuffed](#), transported to the police station, and charged with simple battery of a schoolteacher and criminal damage to property for throwing a temper tantrum at school.

This is the end product of all those so-called school “safety” policies, which run the gamut from zero tolerance policies that punish all infractions harshly to surveillance cameras, metal detectors, random searches, drug-sniffing dogs, school-wide lockdowns, active-shooter drills and militarized police officers.

Yet these police state tactics did not made the schools any safer.

As I point out in my book [Battlefield America: The War on the American People](#), police state tactics never make anyone safer so much as they present the illusion of safety and indoctrinate the populace to comply, fear and march in lockstep with the government’s dictates.

Now with virtual learning in the midst of this COVID-19 pandemic, the stakes are even higher.

It won’t be long before you start to see police carrying out [knock-and-talk investigations](#) based on whatever speculative information is gleaned from those daily virtual classroom sessions that allow government officials entry to your homes in violation of the Fourth Amendment.

It won’t take much at all for [SWAT teams to start crashing through doors based on erroneous assumptions](#) about whatever mistaken “contraband” someone may have glimpsed in the background of a virtual classroom session: a maple leaf that looks like marijuana, a jar of sugar that looks like cocaine, a toy gun, someone playfully shouting for help in the distance.

This may sound far-fetched now, but it’s only a matter of time before this slippery slope becomes yet another mile marker on

the one-way road to tyranny.

COVID Update: The Grand Ohio Legal Case for Our Time, Against Kings on Their Thrones

[COVID Update: The Grand Ohio Legal Case for Our Time, Against Kings on Their Thrones](#)

–You can hate the law until it's not there anymore–

by [Jon Rappoport](#), [No More Fake News](#)

September 15, 2020

The news is coming fast, the implications are titanic.

[On Monday](#), I wrote about Thomas Renz, the Ohio lawyer who is taking on a case for a set of plaintiffs, against Ohio Governor Mike DeWine and the state of Ohio.

The charge: DeWine has created massive damage through lockdowns and other “containment measures” designed to stop the spread of the purported coronavirus.

Against DeWine, attorney Renz has mounted a legal case to defeat both Constitutional violations AND gross scientific fraud.

(Attorney press release posted [here](#); Attorney plaintiff

document filed with court posted [here.](#))

Update: A crucial part of this case is the DISCOVERY process. Attorney Renz and his colleagues would have the opportunity to sit down with key players in the COVID operation and grill them, in great detail, on matters of fact and science.

Imagine Fauci, Birx, Redfield in the room having to answer very probing questions UNDER OATH.

And the discovery proceedings would be made public, as they happen. Renz would be filing periodic reports with the court.

Another factor. The Ohio court, as part of its verdict, could grant PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE RELIEF. This means it could order the governor of Ohio to cancel the State of Emergency—thereby ending all orders and “containment measures” connected with the Emergency. No lockdowns, no mandatory masks, no mandatory distancing.

Yes, I’m aware that nothing is a slam-dunk in the judicial system. Fingers crossed. But this is a chance, an opportunity, a ray of light, a practical and real possibility.

Further, attorney Renz’s case is a model and a template for other lawyers, in other states and countries, who want to file similar cases.

When a government declares an Emergency, it must explain and justify it on the facts, not on lies and deceptions. Otherwise...

The Constitution no longer exists.

The Law no longer exists.

In their place, there is a reversion to a time of arbitrary edicts, handed down from kings and their wise ones who must not be doubted or challenged.

On what rational basis has Governor Mike DeWine taken away the freedom of citizens? Where is his evidence? What is the quality of that evidence, beyond the mere claim that “experts are always right”?

In his law suit against Governor DeWine, attorney Renz takes up big questions:

What are the REAL COVID case and death numbers?

How much flim-flam has been deployed to cook those numbers?

What is the underhanded definition of a COVID case?

Why is the PCR test useless?

Can a strip of RNA stand in for a virus that isn't defined?

Is this a pandemic or is it just “another flu season?”

These are just a few of the many questions attorney Renz raises in his lengthy Ohio court filing. He has shocking answers. They do not depend on the news or the assumed primacy of the Coronavirus Task Force or a sitting president or a presidential candidate or a political party or governors. The answers don't depend on what Governor DeWine thinks or what he has been told.

You could compare this case to a proceeding in which the evidence of a law-enforcement lab is challenged purely on the merits of its findings. The name of the lab doesn't matter. The government agency which houses the lab doesn't matter. The so-called reputation of the lab doesn't matter. What matters is a searchlight centering on fact and truth.

The serious nature of the Ohio proceeding is magnified, because at stake is the freedom of many, many citizens. Their liberty, as enshrined in basic Law, is on the line.

We're at a crossroads. This case and what happens to it are of

vital importance.

Attorney Renz is asking for a jury trial. Citizens would be empaneled to listen to a profound and detailed UNCOVERING of evidentiary fraud, on a truly massive scale. And then this jury would hear how the fraud is leveraging the lockdowns and the destruction of businesses and lives, and the removal of freedom.

This case puts its arms around the immediate future of the country, the Constitution, the basic concept of Law, the difference between a jury and a King, and whatever still remains of 1776.

This case dives into the difference between claims of science, and science, and who controls the distinction.

Winning this one would expose a scientific fraud so solid, so dense, the whole world would see an iron curtain of a century's duration exploding in front of their eyes.

Victory requires one imperative: follow the Law.

CODA...BREAKING... More good news: federal judge declares Pennsylvania governor's COVID restrictions unconstitutional.

Bricks are falling out of the walls of the American imprisonment—

[CBS News, Pittsburgh](#): "U.S. District Judge William Stickman IV, an appointee of President Donald Trump, sided with the plaintiffs. Stickman wrote in his ruling that the [Pennsylvania] Wolf administration's pandemic policies have been overreaching, arbitrary and violated citizens' constitutional rights..."

FOX News: "The ruling found that [Pennsylvania Governor] Wolf's restrictions that required people to stay at home,

placed size limits on gatherings and ordered 'non-life-sustaining' businesses to shut down were unconstitutional."

In this case, [the judge made his ruling](#) strictly on Constitutional grounds. His conclusion is worth reading:

"...even in an emergency, the authority of the government is not unfettered. The liberties protected by the Constitution are not fair-weather freedoms – in place when times are good but able to be cast aside in times of trouble. There is no question that this Country has faced, and will face, emergencies of every sort. But the solution to a national crisis can never be permitted to supersede the commitment to individual liberty that stands as the foundation of the American experiment. The Constitution cannot accept the concept of a 'new normal' where the basic liberties of the people can be subordinated to open-ended emergency mitigation measures. Rather, the Constitution sets certain lines that may not be crossed, even in an emergency. Action taken by Defendants [Governor Wolf] crossed those lines. It is the duty of the Court to declare those actions unconstitutional. Thus, consistent with the reasons set forth above, the Court will enter judgement in favor of Plaintiffs."

United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, US District Judge William S Stickman IV, County of Butler et al v. [Governor] Thomas W Wolf et al.

NO emergency is so great that it supersedes individual liberty and freedom.

Even if the science underlying the official response to COVID were true (which it decidedly is NOT), it wouldn't justify tearing away Constitutional and natural freedoms.

The resistance to tyranny is alive.

A million peaceful protestors in Berlin; 460,000 bikers riding into Sturgis, South Dakota, where Governor Kristi Noem has

never locked down; numerous other protests the mainstream press refuses to cover; the new groundbreaking Ohio lawsuit filing I've been covering; untold millions of people who know what a sham and a crime the whole COVID operation really is...

Lights are coming on and the wind has changed direction.

Prime Minister & CMO of Canada Sued For Extreme & Unnecessary COVID-19 Measures

[Prime Minister & CMO of Canada Sued For Extreme & Unnecessary COVID-19 Measures](#)

by [Arjun Walla](#), [Collective Evolution](#)

September 14, 2020

Renowned Canadian constitutional lawyer, Rocco Galati, has filed a claim with the Superior court of justice in Canada on behalf of his client and 7 other plaintiffs. They are suing the Prime Minister of Canada, Justin Trudeau, Canada's Chief Medical Officer Dr. Theresa Tam, Premier of Ontario Doug Ford, and many more. You can view the 196 page statement of claim [here](#). The names and stories of some of the individual plaintiffs have been redacted on the documents by the plaintiffs themselves. Social media posts from Rocco Galati, the lawyer representing the plaintiffs, said it was done out of precaution to protect the individuals from harassment.

The plaintiffs include academics, doctors, people with

disabilities and more.

Complaints include business closures, the mandating of masks and social distancing rules which the group argues are “extreme, unwarranted and unjustified” responses to the pandemic were “not scientific, nor medically-based, nor proven.” They also bring forth evidence stating that government mask mandates can cause “physical and psychological harm.”

The group accuses the WHO, mainstream media and the federal government of spreading false alarm during the COVID-19 pandemic

Galati recently sat down for an interview with journalist [Rajie Kabli](#) for a two part interview. Below is part one, you can watch part 2 [here](#) if interested.

The sentiments shared by the plaintiffs in this case seem to be on part with many professionals across the world. For example,

More than 500 German doctors & scientists have signed on as representatives of an organization called the “Corona Extra-Parliamentary Inquiry Committee” to investigate what’s happening on our planet with regards to COVID-19, expressing the same sentiment. They came together to investigate the severity of the virus, and whether or not the actions taken by governments around the world, and in this case the German government, are justified and not causing more harm than good. You can more on the [organizations website](#) if interested, they’ve repeatedly shared their opinion that what is happening is completely unnecessary and harmful in many different ways. They have referred to the pandemic as “fake story all over the world.” You can read more about that [here](#).

Dr. Michael Palmer, a chemistry professor at the University of Waterloo, Canada, who also has a medical degree with a

specialization in microbiology is making headlines for for distributing a course outline to his students saying his in-class exams aren't mandatory "because of the COVID fake emergency," according to [CBC news](#). The course outline was posted on social media after it was recently distributed to students. You can read more about that story [here](#).

An article published in the British Medical Journal has suggested that quarantine measures in the United Kingdom as a result of the new coronavirus may have already killed more UK seniors than the coronavirus has during the peak of the virus. You can access that report and read more about it [here](#).

The Physicians For Informed Consent (PIC) recently published a report titled "Physicians for Informed Consent (PIC) Compares COVID-19 to Previous Seasonal and Pandemic Flu Periods." According to them, the infection/fatality rate of COVID-19 is 0.26%. You can read more about that and access their resources and reasoning [here](#).

John P. A. Ioannidis, a professor of medicine and epidemiology at Stanford University has said that the infection fatality rate is close to 0 percent for people under the age of 45 years old. You can read more about that story [here](#).

Dr. Sucharit Bhakdi, a specialist in microbiology and one of the most cited research scientists in German history is also part of Corona Extra-Parliamentary Inquiry Committee mentioned above and has also expressed the same thing, multiple times early on in the pandemic all the way up to today.

Implementation of the current draconian measures that are so extremely restrict fundamental rights can only be justified if there is reason to fear that a truly, exceptionally dangerous virus is threatening us. Do any scientifically sound data exist to support this contention for COVID-19? I assert that the answer is simply, no. – Bhakdi. You can read more about him [here](#).

Michael Levitt, a Biophysicist and a professor of structural biology at Stanford University, criticized the WHO as well as Facebook for censoring different information and informed perspectives regarding the Coronavirus. He said that “The level of stupidity going on here is amazing.” You can read more about that [here](#).

The examples listed above aren't even the tip of the ice-berg.

There is also the issue of deaths being attributed to covid when they're not really a result of covid. You can read more about that and see some more examples [here](#).

The point is, citizens scientists and doctors do not feel heard when it comes to what they want to see done by governments when it comes to the current state of our world, so they are becoming frustrated. Taking legal action seems to be the only way to get attention these days.

U.S. Federal Judge Strikes Down Pennsylvania's COVID Mandates as Unconstitutional

[U.S. Federal Judge Strikes Down Pennsylvania's COVID Mandates as Unconstitutional](#)

by [Brian Shilhavy](#), [Health Impact News](#)

September 14, 2020

A federal judge ruled on Monday that Pennsylvania Gov. Tom Wolf's and Secretary of Health Rachel Levine's coronavirus

orders, which shut down the state, closed businesses and limited gatherings, were unconstitutional.

U.S. District Judge William Stickman IV agreed with the plaintiffs claim that Wolf's business shutdown and stay-at-home orders violated certain constitutional rights.

The plaintiffs include Butler, Fayette, Greene and Washington counties, four Republican lawmakers and several small businesses in those counties.

Stickman [said in his opinion](#) that COVID-19 orders from Wolf and Pennsylvania Secretary of Health Rachel Levine violated and continue to violate the First Amendment right to freedom of assembly and the due process and equal protection clauses of the 14th Amendment.

Stickman wrote that he believes Wolf and state Secretary of Health Rachel Levine:

“undertook their actions in a well-intentioned effort to protect Pennsylvania from the virus. However, good intentions toward a laudable end are not alone enough to uphold governmental action against a constitutional challenge.”

Stickman also wrote that the government engaged in a dangerous strategy where rights were taken away.

“In an emergency, even a vigilant public may let down its guard over its constitutional liberties only to find that liberties, once relinquished, are hard to recoup and the restrictions ... may persist long after immediate danger has passed.”

Sources

[The Hill](#)

[Butler Eagle](#)

Dr. Graeme MacQueen: Recognizing & Pushing Back the Post 9/11 Police State

[Dr. Graeme MacQueen at Lawyers' Committee 9/11 Anniversary Event 2020](#)

by [Lawyers' Committee for 9/11 Inquiry](#)

September 14 2020

[Original video available at Lawyers' Committee for 9/11 Inquiry YouTube channel.](#)

[As a service to protect truth from censorship, mirrored copies of this video are available at Truth Comes to Light [BitChute](#), [LBRY](#) & [Brighteon](#) channels. All credit goes to the original source of this video.]

Visit the Lawyers' Committee website <http://lcfor911.org>

Dr. Graeme MacQueen is a retired professor of religious studies at McMaster University, Ontario where he taught from 1974 to 2003.

He was also the founder and director of the Centre for Peace Studies at McMaster, which was active in several war zones.

He has served as a co-editor of the Journal of 9/11 Studies, an organizer of the Toronto Hearings on 9/11, and a member of

the 9/11 Consensus Panel.

[Donate to Lawyers' Committee 501\(c\)\(3\) nonprofit organization.](#)

People Worldwide Say No to Medical Mandates, Unsafe Vaccines, & Totalitarian Government

[Community and Countries United! We Say NO!](#)

by [Children's Health Defense](#)

September 14, 2020

Original video available at Children's Health Defense [YouTube](#) channel.

[As a service to protect truth from censorship, mirrored copies of this video are available at Truth Comes to Light [BitChute](#), [LBRY](#) & [Brighteon](#) channels. All credit goes to the original source of this video.]

Children's Health Defense is proud to stand with organizations and countries as we work together to pushback on medical mandates, unsafe vaccines, and increasingly totalitarian governments.

In the coming months, these issues will be front and center in

discussions around the world as people decide whether to cling tightly to their freedoms or blindly follow whatever edicts are put in place by corrupt government officials and profit-driven corporations.

The making of this video was accomplished through the teamwork of organizations and individuals who will not stand by and watch liberty be stripped away from citizens little by little until total tyranny reigns.

Please join us in standing up and demanding that our individual and medical freedom rights are forever protected. The time to be courageous is now.

Please share this video far and wide.

COVID: Major Case Filed Against Ohio Governor and the State of Ohio for Restricting Freedom Without Legitimate Justification

[COVID: Major Case Filed Against Ohio Governor and the State of Ohio for Restricting Freedom Without Legitimate Justification](#)

by [Jon Rappoport](#), [No More Fake News](#)

September 14 2020

Ohio attorney, Thomas Renz, on behalf of plaintiffs, has filed a case against the state of Ohio and Governor Mike DeWine. Renz is asking for a jury trial.

(Press release posted [here](#); plaintiff's document submitted to the court posted [here](#))

This case, in the current climate, should provoke intense interest from the public, and from every lawyer within hailing distance.

Here is the impressive opening salvo in the court filing:

"In recent months, entire states have been imprisoned without due process and with the clear threat to impose such lockdowns again, interstate travel has been severely restricted, privacy rights have been devastated, numerous business takings without compensation, and many regulations being implemented without statutory process requirements under the guise of a health emergency that is roughly as dangerous as a seasonal influenza outbreak. The plaintiffs in this case have all been injured in various capacities by these unconstitutional actions, and without action by the Court, will be left without redress. More terrifying, without action by the Court, the Court will be setting future precedent that will allow states to withhold fundamental Constitutional rights, in violation of US Supreme Court precedent, circumventing the various levels of scrutiny applied to such rights, and justify such actions under public health emergency orders without subjecting those orders to any real review—just trust the bureaucrats because they are the experts."

Here is the most important point: "We humbly ask the Court in this case to...Recognize that the political process and operative orders are invalid if based on false or misleading information... and recognize the criticality that all future emergency orders be based and maintained on clear, honest facts—particularly when such orders are infringing on

Constitutional rights.”

In other words, a declared State of Emergency cannot stand on the mere basis of arbitrary edict.

Facts matter. Actual science matters. Reasons why an Emergency is declared matter.

People can't be locked down and restrained from earning a living and having contact with other humans simply because a state authority decides to issue such orders.

If this case goes to trial, the door will open to the presentation of fact and science.

Attorney Renz, for the plaintiffs, is well aware of this, and his filing is studded with bold and accurate claims of fact:

“According to recent data from the Ohio COVID-19 Dashboard, we can see that the ‘spike’ in cases is actually just a spike in testing. The State went from a few thousand tests per day to 25,000 tests plus per day. The positivity rate for COVID-19 has remained fairly steady but there have been more tests.”

“When the Emergency was declared we heard a daily drumbeat about the danger and deaths related to COVID-19. Now that the case fatality rate has been shown to be roughly the same as the yearly flu...those [death] numbers are simply not scary to the public. As a result, the State sees no impact from talking about fatalities and has instead begun testing more so they could tell us there are more cases.”

“The PCR tests are generally viewed as the means of determining if a patient has COVID-19. The problem is that the inventor of the PCR test, who won a Nobel Prize in chemistry for the invention, specifically stated that the test was not well-suited to and never designed to diagnose disease. Much has been made about this in the press and elsewhere but the reason there are issues with PCR testing in relation to COVID

is that PCR testing cannot detect how much of a virus exists in a person. Exposure of the existence of incomplete traces of a virus do not mean a person is infected with a disease [,] which is part of the reason the PCR tests have an elevated rate of false positives.”

“...there is not even a true standard for testing...Instead we have numerous tests from numerous vendors that may or may not have a similar standard for what it means to ‘have’ COVID-19. The CDC, governor, and ODH [Ohio Department of Health] know this so they have allowed for the diagnosis of cases based on as meaningless criteria as a cough in a community in which COVID supposedly exists.”

Plow through this quote and then receive the translation below: “Another document also came to light that is critical in demonstrating the egregiously misleading nature of the public COVID-19 data. On the final paragraph of page 39 of a document published by the FDA regarding instructions for a COVID-19 test is the following quote: ‘Since no quantified virus isolates of the 2019-nCoV are currently available, assays designed for detection of the 2019-nCoV RNA were tested with characterized stocks of in vitro transcribed full length RNA (N gene; GenBank accession: MN908947.2) of known titer (RNA copies/ μ L) spiked into a diluent consisting of a suspension of human A549 cells and viral transport medium (VTM) to mimic clinical specimen’.”

“In plain English this means that there are no available pure 2019-nCoVvirus isolates to test against so instead an educated best guess is being used. The question this leads us to is how accurate can a test be for a virus that has not been defined...? If our freedoms are to be abridged under an emergency declaration related to a disease, should it not be a requirement that the disease at least be defined?”

As you can see, this case is being argued not only on Constitutional grounds, but on major and deep issues of

science. The plaintiffs are not accepting “the Word from the experts.”

There is no reason why they, or anyone, should surrender and accept.

In Ohio, a bright light is shining in the darkness.

From 9/11 to Covid-19: Nineteen Years of Permanent “Emergency”

[From 9/11 to Covid-19: Nineteen Years of Permanent “Emergency”](#)

by [Ryan McMaken](#), [Mises Institute](#)

September 11, 2020

During March and April of this year—during the early days of the covid-19 panic—each day came to be accompanied by a general feeling of dread. As new emergency orders and decrees rained down from governors, mayors, and faceless health bureaucrats, I wondered, What new awful thing will governments think up today? As business and churches were closed by government edict, politicians increasingly were threatening to arrest and jail ordinary citizens for doing things that were perfectly legal mere days before.

Even worse was the new orthodoxy that seemed to immediately spring up. All dissent from the new regime of lockdowns and business seizures was denounced and mocked. We were now all

expected to chant new slogans. "We're all in this together. Flatten the curve."

There was no sign of any sizable opposition. The courts were silent. So-called due process was abandoned.

But for those of us who are old enough to remember the dark times that followed the 9/11 attacks, the feelings of dread had a familiarity to them.

The blind sloganeering, the anger toward dissent, and the obeisance toward politicians who were credited with "keeping us safe" brought back bad old memories.

They were memories of the days and months and years that followed the 9/11 attacks. These were the days of so many new assaults on basic human freedoms and human rights. They were days when the public was bullied into accepting whatever new scheme politicians were dreaming up in the name of keeping us "safe."

In many ways, the current hysteria is even worse than that of the early years of the twenty-first century. It affects the everyday lives of countless Americans in ways the 9/11 panic did not. But the current crisis is nonetheless very much a continuation of the attitudes and paranoia that surged nineteen years ago.

Trust the Experts!

Then, as now, the public was repeatedly instructed to trust the experts and not question government officials in any way. This manifested itself in a couple of ways. First of all, there was new legislation like the so-called Patriot Act, a smorgasbord of new freedom-destroying federal initiatives that would authorize all sorts of new spying and search powers by the federal government. Soon after, of course, came new additional powers, such as the president's power to declare anyone an "enemy combatant" and subject to torture,

imprisonment, and forfeiture of all legal rights.

Those who objected were denounced as reckless and naïve, and unconcerned for human life. Torture, we were told, was absolutely necessary for public safety. The opposition was said to be unfit to comment on the matter or question federal powers because the “experts”—i.e., CIA personnel, etc.—understood the real dangers.

The trust-the-experts claim was trotted out again when the Bush administration and the CIA began to collaborate to “prove” that Saddam Hussein was somehow responsible for the 9/11 attacks and was harboring “weapons of mass destruction” (WMDs) to use on Americans. Politicians and bureaucrats went into high gear, creating countless reports, studies, and claims from alleged witnesses showing that the Iraqi regime was just itching to launch its WMDs at innocents around the world.

The experts, of course, were wrong. Moreover, many were simply lying. There were no WMDs, and Saddam had nothing to do with 9/11. But millions of Americans believed the experts, and thus believed the lies.

And now we see the same thing today. We’re repeatedly ordered to trust the official arbiters of scientific truth. Never mind the fact, however, that many other experts have dissented on a wide variety of topics, from the lethality of covid-19 to [the wisdom of lockdowns](#). [But they’re not the real experts](#), we’re told. Then as now, it’s only acceptable to believe the experts who support untrammelled growth in state power.

Support the Troops!

Any outbreak of panic, fear, and uncritical support for despotism requires its own vocabulary. Nowadays we have all sorts of new slogans. These include “we’re all in this together,” “flatten the curve,” “this is the new normal,” “#stayhome,” and “sixfeetapart.”

Many of the slogans are delivered in a cheerful tone, but they're really joyless commands, issued to communicate to the hearer that obedience to these declarations is not really optional. Either you obey, or you are essentially a murderer.

The world of post-9/11 hysteria was similar. We had slogans like "support the troops," "thank you for your service," and "if you see something, say something."

Other catchphrases weren't quite at the level of slogans, but they were invoked repeatedly to encourage uncritical acceptance of the official government line. Examples include "they hate us because we're free," "you're with us or your with the terrorists," and "we're fighting them over there so we don't have to fight them here."

Due to the lack of social media back then, we didn't have quite the proliferation of slogans we have now. Had we had hashtags in 2003, it's likely we would have regularly encountered ones like #globalwaronterror, #wmds, and #supportthetroops.

The use of these phrases also functioned as a means to "virtue signal." In 2002, putting a yellow ribbon magnet on one's car or sporting an American flag lapel pin were ways to publicly show one's loyalty to the cause and show opposition to one's less enthusiastic neighbors and relatives who "hate America."

The real message behind these phrases and signals, of course, was that we are required to support the regime and its "new normal" whatever it may be. In 2001, that meant supporting new wars while ignoring the Bill of Rights, and turning a blind eye to abuses like CIA torture programs. Today it means calling the cops on your neighbor for not social distancing. It means screaming at people for not wearing a mask. It means blindly trusting the "experts" so long as those experts support unlimited government power.

Be Always Afraid!

The “if you see something, say something” slogan was part of a larger effort to remind the public that it should live in a state of constant fear. Maybe your neighbor is plotting to blow you up. It’s better to be safe than sorry: spy on your neighbors for the FBI.

Many people now forget that in the days immediately following 9/11, Americans were buying gas masks and planning backyard bunkers. The then new Department of Homeland Security in February 2003 advised Americans to [prepare for a chemical attack from terrorists](#):

Stash away duct tape and pre-measured plastic sheeting for future use. Experts tell us that a safe room inside your house or apartment can help protect you from airborne contaminants for approximately five hours – that could be just enough time for a chemical agent to blow away.

For those who wanted all the “best” new information on how to prepare, the federal government created the website ready.gov, complete with a section for children called Ready Kids, where kids could learn—[in the spirit of the old Duck and Cover videos from the Cold War](#)—how to prepare for an attack from terrorists.

And then there was the color-coded Homeland Security Advisory System. This was a visual aid which allowed the federal government to let us know just how much we should fear terrorism on any given day. Of course, the government always kept the warning level at “elevated” or “high.” It never dropped down to “low,” of course, lest some form of terrorism take place on that day and the “experts” look like they were asleep at the switch.



Today, of course, we have countless websites, models, and news stories devoted to reminding the public that it must constantly fear covid-19 infection. Were there a color-coded alert system for the current crisis, we can be quite confident it would be set each day to “high” or “severe.” As with the 9/11 panic, this all serves to encourage unquestioning obedience to government authorities and to send the message there is no time for political debate, dissent, or even due process. Our “leaders” keep us safe and we must defer to their judgment completely.

The media itself remains an accomplice in this. Then, as now, media pundits and “journalists” side reflexively with officials promoting fear and obedience to the state.

Living with the Aftermath

It takes many years for a society to recover from fits of panic and paranoia such as these. Nineteen years after 9/11, the federal government still has the power to spy on law-abiding Americans with impunity. It still has the power to simply [assassinate](#) [American citizens](#)—including [children](#)—without any due process. [American police have been militarized with “surplus” military](#)

[hardware](#) from various failed and failing wars. The taxpayers will still be paying interest on the trillions of dollars spent on disastrous wars in Iraq and Afghanistan decades from now. Thousands of American troops died for nothing in conflicts that have done nothing to make any American safer. (Hundreds of thousands of innocent foreigners have died in those same conflicts.)

Thanks to the reaction to 9/11, governments in the US are now far larger, far more expensive, and far less limited by laws and constitutions than in the past. This is what happens when a country believes itself to be in a constant state of emergency. Due process is out the window. Governments get away with far more than would have been the case otherwise.

This process, which was so greatly accelerated after 9/11, has now been supercharged by the current panic of covid-19. Government officials issue “laws” and decrees without any debate and without any due process. Americans are ruined, arrested, destroyed, and humiliated in the name of “safety.” Those who dissent and seek to limit the regime’s powers are silenced, threatened, arrested, shouted down, and ignored.

This is America in a state of permanent emergency. The justification for the regime’s ever growing power changes over time. But the results are the same.

COVID-911: From Homeland Security to Biosecurity

[COVID-911: From Homeland Security to Biosecurity](#)

by [James Corbett](#), [The Corbett Report](#)

September 11, 2020

9/11, as we were told repeatedly in the days, weeks, and months after the attack, was the day that changed everything. And now a new event has come along to once again throw the world into chaos. But whereas the post-9/11 era introduced America to the concept of homeland security, the COVID-19 era is introducing the world to an altogether more abstract concept: biosecurity. This is the story of the COVID-911 security state.

Watch

on [Archive](#) / [BitChute](#) / [LBRY](#) / [Minds](#) / [YouTube](#) or [Download the mp4](#)

TRANSCRIPT

9/11, as we were told repeatedly in the days, weeks, and months after the attack, was the day that changed everything.

***NARRATOR:** In the span of one devastating morning, America changed forever.*

SOURCE: [Remembering 9/11: Never Quit](#)

***KATIE COURIC:** Good morning. America may never be the same and this is why.*

SOURCE: [Today Show – September 12, 2001](#)

***LOU WATERS:** American life will change forever as a result of this attack.*

SOURCE: [CNN on September 12, 2001](#)

***REPORTER:** Nothing will ever be the same again.*

SOURCE: [Inside Edition – A Look Back at 9/11](#)

JAMES ROBBINS: *Nothing will ever be quite the same again.*

SOURCE: [9/11 the day after – BBC1 Nightly News](#)

TOM BROKAW: *Life will never be quite the same.*

SOURCE: [Dateline NBC – Sept. 18, 2001](#)

These were no empty words. They were plain statements of fact. The world *did* change on that day.

9/11 was the carte blanche for a Great Reset, the institution of a new normal in international relations and domestic affairs. From the creation of the Department of Homeland Security and the militarization of the police to the multi-trillion dollar wars of aggression to reshape the Middle East, our lives today are drastically different than they were before that fateful Tuesday in September 2001.

GEORGE W. BUSH: *On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country. [. . .] All of this was brought upon us in a single day – and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack.*

SOURCE: [Sept. 20, 2001 – Bush Declares War on Terror](#)

TONY BLAIR: *If September the 11th hadn't happened, our assessment of the risk of allowing Saddam—any possibility of him reconstituting his programs—would not have been the same.*

SOURCE: [IRAQ INQUIRY / TONY BLAIR / 9 11 CHANGED EVERYTHING](#)

BUSH: *For the first time, airport security will become a direct federal responsibility.*

SOURCE: [Bush signs aviation security legislation](#)

JOHN TYNER: I don't understand how a sexual assault can be made a condition of my flying.

TSA AGENT: This is not considered a sexual assault

TYNER: It would be if you were not the government.

SOURCE: [Airport Body Scans Debated](#)

CENK UYGUR: The old fact sheet said the primary function of the FBI is law enforcement. That makes sense. That's what we grew up with. The new fact sheet says the primary function of the FBI is national security.

SOURCE: [Think The FBI Is About 'Law Enforcement'? Guess Again](#)

JANET NAPOLITANO: If you see something suspicious in the parking lot or in the store, say something immediately. Report suspicious activity to your local police or sheriff. If you need help, ask a Wal-mart manager for assistance.

SOURCE: [Walmart Public Service Announcement](#)

BUSH: All of this was brought upon us in a single day – and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack.

SOURCE: [Sept. 20, 2001 – Bush Declares War on Terror](#)

NERMEEN SHAIKH: The Obama administration's internal legal justification for assassinating US citizens without charge has been revealed for the first time.

SOURCE: [Kill List Exposed: Leaked Obama Memo Shows Assassination of U.S. Citizens "Has No Geographic Limit"](#)

RAND PAUL: *I don't know. If the president's going to kill these people, he needs to let them know. Some of the people [who] might be terrorists are people who are missing fingers. Some people have stains on their clothing. Some people have changed the color of their hair. [. . .] People who might like to pay in cash or people who have seven days of food on hand.*

SOURCE: [Senator Rand Paul exposes scary definition of 'possible terrorist'](#)

DEIRDRE BOLTON: *NYPD Commissioner Bill Bratton is warning that terrorists are using cellphone encryption and literally getting away with murder.*

SOURCE: [Social media, encryption and the spread of terrorism](#)

BUSH: *Every nation in every region now has a decision to make: either you are with us or you are with the terrorists.*

SOURCE: [Either With Us Or With The Terrorists – Bush](#)

But, nearly two decades later, 9/11 has gone from a touchstone event shaping all of the Western world's national security decisions to a fading cultural memory of a trauma that took place before the newest generation of high school graduates were even born.

9/11 is no longer a driving political issue.

But, as if on cue, a new event has come along to throw the world into chaos.

Once again we are being told that the world has changed forever.

REPORTER: *This is not normal. At least it wasn't until a few weeks ago when everything we take for granted, everything*

moved just beyond our grasp.

SOURCE: [Coronavirus outbreak: Can we ever return to normal during or after the COVID-19 pandemic?](#)

REPORTER: As a global community we've experienced a once-in-a-lifetime event that will shift and reshape our behaviors and perceptions for quite some time.

SOURCE: [Say Hello to The New Normal Consumer](#)

JUSTIN TRUDEAU: This will be the new normal until a vaccine is developed.

REPORTER: . . . Meaning the new normal could last for months, even years.

SOURCE: [The National: COVID-19 'new normal' to last over 1M, jobs lost](#)

NICOLA STURGEON: So return to normal as we knew it is not on the cards in the near future.

SOURCE: [Scotland publishes framework for coping with 'new normal' of Covid-19](#)

And, once again, this is no empty rhetoric. Governments, businesses and NGOs are now coordinating at the international level on a "Great Reset" to once again completely reshape the world we are living in.

KRISTALINA GEORGIEVA: History would look at this crisis as the great opportunity for reset.

ANTÓNIO GUTERRES: The great reset is a welcome recognition that this human tragedy must be a wake-up call. It is imperative that we re-imagine, rebuild, redesign,

reinvigorate and rebalance our world.

SOURCE: [The Great Reset Launch | Highlights](#)

JOHN KERRY: *Reset cannot mean—we can't think of it in terms of sort of “pushing a button” and going back to the way things were. [. . .] And the normal was a crisis. The normal was itself not working.*

SOURCE: [The Great Reset Initiative | 24.06.2020](#)

CHRYSTIA FREELAND: *I think all Canadians understand that the restart of our economy needs to be green. It also needs to be equitable. It needs to be inclusive.*

SOURCE: [“It's about time”: Freeland speaks on being Canada's first female finance minister](#)

MARIA VAN KERKHOVE: *What we're going to have to figure out, and I think what we're all going to have to figure out together, is what our new normal looks like. Our new normal includes physical distancing from others. Our new normal includes wearing masks where appropriate. Our new normal includes us knowing where this virus is each and every day, where we live, where we work, where we want to travel.*

SOURCE: [What the New Normal Looks Like After Covid-19](#)

ALLEY WILSON: *In parts of Europe, immunity passports are being considered for people who are believed to be immune to the coronavirus. While in China, some cities have already implemented QR codes that generate a color in order for officials to enable how freely an individual may move around outdoors.*

SOURCE: [Coronavirus outbreak: Could immunity passports become the new normal?](#)

Those paying attention will have already noted the parallels between the “War on Terror” declared after 9/11 and the “War on the Invisible Enemy” that has been declared on COVID-19. In fact, the security imperatives imposed by this pandemic crisis are so similar to those imposed by the terror crisis that, in many cases, the “new” security screening tools that are being put into place to combat COVID-19 are openly acknowledged to be mere upgrades of screening tools deployed after 9/11.

***ANDREW ROSS SORKIN:** Most people know CLEAR by going to the airport. It was born after 9/11. This is another crisis with a new component that’s being born. Explain what this product is in terms of how it’s going to work relating to COVID.*

***CARYN SEIDMAN BECKER:** So, you’re right: CLEAR was born out of 9/11 and it was about a public-private partnership leveraging innovation to enhance homeland security and delight customers. And that was really the beginning of screening 1.0. And just like screening was forever changed post-9/11, in a post-COVID environment you’re going to see screening and public safety significantly shift.*

But this time it’s beyond airports, right? It’s sports stadiums. It’s retail, as Dana talked about. It’s office buildings. It’s restaurants.

And so, while we started with travel, at our core we’re a biometric-secure identity platform, where it’s always been about attaching your identity to your boarding pass at the airport, or your ticket to get into a sports stadium, or your credit card to buy a beer. And so now with the launch of CLEAR Health Pass, it’s about attaching your identity to your COVID-related health insights for employers, for employees, for customers.

Everybody wants to know that each other is safe to start to reopen businesses and get America moving.

SOURCE: [CLEAR’s new Health Pass service to help screen for](#)

[coronavirus: CEO](#)

Yes, in some ways the coronavirus security state is merely an extension of the 9/11 security state. But even more disturbing parallels between 9/11 and COVID-19 are to be found at a deeper level of analysis.

It is true that, just like the response to the 9/11 attacks, the response to the COVID-19 “crisis” is being framed in terms of “security.” But whereas the post-9/11 era introduced America to the concept of “Homeland Security”—security from “terrorists,” individuals with identifiable intentions belonging to groups with stated political goals—the COVID-19 era is introducing the world to an altogether more abstract concept: biosecurity.

Originally employed to describe threats to the environment—the introduction of invasive species to a habitat, for instance, or the transmission of infectious diseases among crops and livestock—the term “biosecurity” was injected into mainstream political discourse when the 2001 anthrax attacks linked bioterrorism to the global war on terror. Suddenly, “biosecurity” was a pressing national security threat, and an entire architecture of national and international legislation was introduced to institute procedures for implementing medical martial law.

In the US, the [Model State Emergency Health Powers Act](#) was passed in multiple state legislatures, giving governors the power to forcibly quarantine and even force vaccinate their populations in the event of a declared public health emergency.

On the international level, the World Health Organization adopted the International Health Regulations in 2005, obligating all 196 WHO member nations to recognize declared “Public Health Emergencies of International Concern” like pandemic disease outbreaks as a global threat requiring

international cooperation. Some have even [argued](#) that the legislation is broad enough to allow organizations like NATO leeway to enter countries in the interest of “controlling the outbreak.”

Once again, the tie between this biosecurity paradigm and the war on terror paradigm is openly acknowledged. In a [2002 paper](#) on the emerging biosecurity field, two US environmental researchers noted the way that 9/11 had opened the door for biosecurity research and legislation.

“The events of September 11 and subsequent anthrax assaults have made US policymakers and the public more aware of our vulnerability to organisms released with the intent to cause significant harm,” they wrote.

In 2010, the World Health Organization issued its own [information note](#) on biosecurity, stating that “The overarching goal of biosecurity is to prevent, control and/or manage risks to life and health,” and—echoing post-9/11 declarations about the need for global cooperation in the War on Terror—that this goal can only be reached through “a harmonized and integrated biosecurity approach” based on “international standards.”

What this predictably bland language obscures is the way that “biosecurity” is used to invoke emergency powers and install new security procedures. Just as the Homeland Security paradigm used the presumed threat of terrorism as an excuse to curtail civil liberties, so, too, does the biosecurity paradigm use presumed threats to public health as an excuse to curtail civil liberties.

***NARRATOR:** Chinese police officers are also seen in another disturbing video nailing in wooden planks to block the front door of an apartment with people inside who had just returned home from Wuhan. Afterwards, officials are seen staking a red sign beside the front door which reads: “The people in this*

house have just returned from Wuhan. Don't be in contact with them. The poor people inside are heard desperately screaming, "Open the door!"

SOURCE: [China is sealing people in their homes – TomoNews](#)

MIKE AMOR: Melbourne is in full lockdown tonight as historic stage four restrictions take effect, forcing entire industries and shopping precincts to close. Health officials say it's the only option to stop the second wave and we'd be looking at twenty thousand cases if we hadn't shut down.

SOURCE: [Coronavirus: Melbourne left desolate as stage 4 lockdown begins | 7NEWS](#)

WOMAN: Can you, like, record this? I'm in my pajamas. I have an ultrasound in an hour.

MAN: Yeah, she's pregnant, so . . .

POLICE OFFICER: Take it easy.

MAN: What's this about?

WOMAN: But I have an ultrasound in an hour.

POLICE OFFICER: Let me finish and I'll explain. It's in relation to a facebook post, in relation to lockdown protests you put on for Saturday.

WOMAN: Yeah, and I wasn't breaking any laws by doing that.

POLICE OFFICER: You are, actually. You are breaking the law. That's why I'm arresting you.

WOMAN: In front of my children?

MAN: How can you arrest her? That's—

SOURCE: [Andrews 'must go tonight' after horrible example of](#)

[‘inexcusable powers’: Jones](#)

PETER MITCHELL: Police are preparing to launch their aerial arsenal as part of a crackdown on covert rule breakers. High-powered drones will be used to find people not wearing masks and cars too far from home.

SOURCE: [CLIP](#)

CAMERON CHELL: Dragonfly’s public health and safety system uses standard 4k cameras to provide anonymized data on social distancing, heart rate, respiratory rate and fever detection.

SOURCE: [‘Pandemic Drone’ Conducts Initial Flights Near NYC to Detect COVID-19 Symptoms](#)

RODRIGO DUTERTE: My orders are for the police, the military and the villages: Shoot them dead!

SOURCE: [‘Shoot them dead’: extreme Covid-19 lockdown policing around the world](#)

MAN: Why are you surrounding my children? Please step away from my children. Please. Step away. From my children.

POLICE OFFICER: I’m just gonna take care of them, alright? Calming down, yeah?

MAN: My children are fine.

CHILD: Can we just go home?

MAN: But I’ve got cuffs that are too tight on my arms. All I was doing was shopping. I explained to you that I don’t have to have a mask on for health reasons and then three people come up to me and start twisting my arms up. For what? Can you tell me why I’m under arrest.

POLICE OFFICER: You’re not under arrest. You’re detained.

MAN: You can't just detain me. Under what law?

SOURCE: [Detained and Handcuffed for no MASK! White Rose Shopping Centre](#)

CRESSIDA DICK: Well at the moment we don't have specific powers, but they will come very shortly, I'm sure. But in the British policing model, we always start by talking to people. We always start by advising people. We can talk even more firmly to people.

SOURCE: [Met Police's Cressida Dick promises to crackdown on people ignoring coronavirus lockdown rules](#)

MAN: Who the f*** do you think you're grabbing? Hey, who you grabbing?

POLICE OFFICER: Off the train now!

MAN: Who the f*** are you grabbing? Get off me! I told you no!

POLICE OFFICER: Get off the train or I'll get you off.

MAN: Now get off me. Now you've been told. Get the f*** off me. Oi. Who the f*** are you grabbing, mate?

POLICE OFFICER: I'll spray you, mate.

MAN: What? You're not spraying me for nothing.

PASSENGER: He hasn't done nothing wrong.

SOURCE: [This is tyranny. It's so f*cking depressing](#)

ELIAS CLURE: There's a significant police presence there. A number of these protesters chanting "freedom."

PROTESTERS: Freedom! Freedom! Freedom!

CLURE: We can also see that crowd. Just the size of that crowd and the number of police that have gathered. There's public order response, there's mounted police as well. Also riot police have mobilized to try and manage this crowd.

SOURCE: [Anti-lockdown protests met with heavy police presence in Melbourne | ABC News](#)

The nightmarish police state that is coming into view on the back of this pandemic panic is not a temporary state of affairs, nor is it a haphazard set of measures thrown together on an ad hoc basis; it is the creation of a new form of governance. This new form of governance relies on the perceived sense of crisis—in this case, a public health crisis—to justify constant surveillance of the public and new powers to inhibit the travel of anyone deemed a health risk.

Famed Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben has [documented](#) how this biosecurity state is being erected on the back of the panic that 9/11 and the war on terror helped induce in the public.

“We might say that once terrorism was exhausted as a justification for exceptional measures, the invention of an epidemic could offer the ideal pretext for broadening such measures beyond any limitation.

*“The other factor, no less disquieting, is the state of fear, which in recent years has diffused into individual consciousnesses and which translates into a real need for **states of collective panic**, for which the epidemic once again offers the ideal pretext.*

“Therefore, in a perverse vicious circle, the limitation of freedom imposed by governments is accepted in the name of a desire for safety, which has been created by the same governments who now intervene to satisfy it.”

The parallel nature of 9/11 and COVID-19 as catalyzing events ushering in states of collective panic and, ultimately, new forms of governance, is seen most clearly in the area where these two paradigms overlap: bioterrorism.

The molten steel on the Ground Zero pile had not even cooled before the American public and the people of the world were confronted with the specter of bioterrorism. Beginning a week after 9/11 and continuing for weeks thereafter, a series of letters containing anthrax spores were mailed to media personalities and government officials in an apparent continuation of the terrorist attack on the US. The letters were quickly tied to both Al Qaeda and Iraq in the mainstream media:

***BRIAN ROSS:** Peter, from three well-placed but separate sources tonight ABC News has been told that initial tests on the anthrax sent to Senator Daschle have found a tell-tale chemical additive whose name means a lot to weapons experts. It is called bentonite. It's possible other countries may be using it, too, but it is a trademark of Saddam Hussein's biological weapons program.*

***TIM TREVAN:** It does mean for me that Iraq becomes the prime suspect as the source for the anthrax used in these letters.*

***SOURCE:** [ABC Evening News for Friday, Oct 26, 2001](#)*

The 24/7 coverage of the event in the media ceased abruptly, however, when it was discovered that the strain of anthrax used in the attacks sourced not to Iraq but to the US military's own bioweapons laboratory at Fort Detrick, Maryland.

But this convergence of terrorism and biosecurity did not start with the anthrax attacks. It began in June of 2001, a full three months before 9/11 and the declaration of the war on terror itself. That was when a number of ranking US

military and intelligence officials took part in "[Dark Winter](#)," a high-level exercise that simulated the US' response to a smallpox attack on the homeland by bioterrorists. The drill, co-hosted by the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, took place at Andrews Air Force Base on the 22nd and 23rd of June, 2001, and even involved fake news reports that were broadcast to the participants as the simulation unfolded.

ANGIE MILES: On day six of the smallpox epidemic, the White House confirmed that federal government officials and military personnel are being vaccinated 300 people have died at least 2,000 are infected with smallpox. Still no group claims responsibility for unleashing the deadly smallpox virus, but ncn has learned that Iraq may have provided the technology behind the attack to terrorist groups based in Afghanistan.

SOURCE: ['operation dark winter' 3](#)

In an incredible parallel, the same Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security that co-hosted Dark Winter also co-hosted "[Event 201](#)," a simulation of a globally spreading novel coronavirus pandemic that was held in New York just months before the declaration of the globally spreading novel coronavirus pandemic that hailed the advent of the era of biosecurity. *This exercise similarly involved fake news broadcasts:*

FAKE NEWS REPORTER: It began in healthy looking pigs months, perhaps years ago. A new coronavirus spread silently within herds. Gradually, farmers started getting sick. Infected people got a respiratory illness with symptoms ranging from mild, flu-like signs to severe pneumonia. The sickest required intensive care. Many died.

SOURCE: [Event 201 Pandemic Exercise: Highlights Reel](#)

Unsurprisingly, many of the same characters that were involved in the promotion of the bioterror scare under the old “homeland security” paradigm have been influential in promoting the COVID-19 scare under the new “biosecurity” paradigm.

The phrase “homeland security” itself was popularized in Washington in the late 1990s and [capitalized on by the ANSER Institute](#), which formed an Institute for Homeland Security in 1999 led by Randall Larsen, a professor and department chair at the National War College. The Institute prepared a course on “Homeland Security” which was to be co-taught by Larsen and his National War College colleague, Robert Kadlec. Coincidentally, the course was [slated to begin on September 11, 2001](#). Part of the course syllabus included a review of the Dark Winter exercise, which the Institute for Homeland Security co-created.

The name “Dark Winter” derives from a statement made by Larsen’s colleague, [Robert Kadlec](#), credited as a “Bio-Warfare Defense Expert” during the exercise’s fake news broadcast.

ROBERT KADLEC: . . . and the problem is we don’t have enough vaccine to go around.

MILES: Meaning we don’t have enough vaccine for the United States?

KADLEC: Well, I would like to think that. But we don’t have sufficient stockpiles for the people in Oklahoma, Georgia or Pennsylvania, much less for the entire United States population.

MILES: Well, that certainly doesn’t sound encouraging. What do you mean, exactly?

KADLEC: Angie, it means it could be a very dark winter for America.

MILES: Sobering. Thank you very much for joining us, Dr. Kadlec.

SOURCE: [operation dark winter' 2](#)

A career officer and physician in the United States Air Force, Kadlec would go on to contribute to the FBI's investigation of the 2001 anthrax attacks, and then serve in [several key biosecurity-related roles](#) in the George W. Bush White House. During this time, Kadlec [helped draft](#) the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act. Passed by Congress in 2006, the act greatly expanded federal power during public health emergencies and consolidated many of these powers in a new office, the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response (ASPR). Then, in what Kadlec has called "[just a coincidence](#)," Trump appointed Kadlec himself to that position in 2017.

In his role as ASPR, Kadlec oversaw a joint exercise in 2019 named "[Crimson Contagion](#)." The drill included the National Security Council, the Pentagon, the Department of Homeland Security and a raft of other government agencies and simulated the US government's response to a viral pandemic originating in China and spreading around the globe. Like Dark Winter, the "Crimson Contagion" exercise took place just months before the events it was simulating began to play out in real life. And, like Dark Winter, it gave participants like Kadlec the chance to argue that biosecurity was a pressing national security challenge that the country was ill-prepared to meet—an argument that he made to Congress with Dr. Anthony Fauci by his side just one week before the first reports of the novel coronavirus spreading in China.

DIANA DEGETTE: Dr. Kadlec, what keeps you up at night when you think about preparedness for the next big flu outbreak.

KADLEC: I mean, thank you, ma'am, I appreciate the question. I mean, I sleep like a baby: I wake up every two hours screaming.

DEGETTE: Much like me.

KADLEC: Yeah. But I think the key thing here is a pandemic. Quite frankly I have a unique background on this committee or this dais. I have served two years on the Senate Intelligence Committee and looked at the many threats that face the United States, but there is no singular threat that could devastate our country through our health and our economy and our social institutions then pandemic influenza.

DEGETTE: Yeah.

KADLEC: And we had four during the last century. And even though we've had a mild one in this first century, I think the risk is that we'll have another severe one and that would devastate our country.

SOURCE: [Pandemic Preparedness – testimony of ASPR's Robert Kadlec – December 4, 2019](#)

Then there's Donald Rumsfeld. As Secretary of Defense in the first term of the George W. Bush administration, there are few people more closely associated with the "War on Terror." Rumsfeld, too, has been intimately associated with the emerging biosecurity state for decades. In the 1980s he personally [participated in secret meetings](#) with Saddam Hussein that resulted in anthrax, botulism, and other chemical weapons being sent from the US to Iraq. In the 1990s he was [named chairman](#) of Gilead Sciences, a California biotech company that [profited handsomely](#) from the scramble for Tamiflu during the bird flu scare of 2005 and which is currently profiting handsomely from Remdesivir as a result of the COVID-19 scare.

ANTHONY FAUCI: The data shows that Remdesivir has a clear-cut, significant, positive effect in diminishing the time to recovery.

SOURCE: [Fauci announces good news about coronavirus drug](#)

There are many others whose careers blaze the same trail, transitioning seamlessly from the homeland security state to the biosecurity state. People like [Dr. Richard Hatchett](#), who served as Director for Biodefense Policy under George W. Bush, then as acting Director of the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA), and acting Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response within HHS before becoming the [CEO of CEPI](#), the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation co-founded Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations. In his position as “global health expert,” Hatchett made waves back in March for his alarmist pronouncements about the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

RICHARD HATCHETT: It's the most frightening disease I've ever encountered in my career, and that includes Ebola, it includes MERS, it includes SARS. And it's frightening because of the combination of infectiousness and a lethality that appears to be manyfold higher than flu.

SOURCE: Coronavirus researcher accused of scaremongering for calling it 'most frightening disease I've ever encountered' [https://www.indy100.com/article/coronavirus-doctor-scaremongering-risk-spanish-flu-death-rate-9384561]

That so many of the people who were there at the birth of the war on terror are currently acting as midwives to the biosecurity state should come as no surprise. After all, the biosecurity paradigm is not a *replacement* for the terror paradigm; it is its *fulfillment*.

The war on terror imagined a covert army of foreign invaders slipping through the defenses of the Homeland and commandeering the resources of the body politic to wreak internal havoc. The biosecurity state posits largely the same scenario, but now those foreign invaders are not “terrorists” possessed with a “hatred of freedom,” they are “asymptomatic

carriers" possessed by a pathogen.

Just as the Homeland Security forces and border security agents were entrusted to protect us from the terrorists, now the "front line heroes," doctors and nurses armed with the tools of the technocratic priest class, can protect us from the invisible enemy.

This speaks to an important aspect of the biosecurity state: ultimately, it is not about health. It is about politics.

Once again we find insight on this turn of events from Giorgio Agamben, who has [noted](#) that viral epidemics are

"above all a political concept, which is preparing to become the new terrain of world politics—or non-politics. It is possible, however, that the epidemic that we are living through will be the actualization of the global civil war that, according to the most attentive political theorists, has taken the place of traditional world wars. All nations and all peoples are now in an enduring war with themselves, because the invisible and elusive enemy with which they are struggling is within us."

Governments are banning gatherings and events. Instituting new screening procedures. Quarantining healthy, functioning people against their will. Tracking and surveilling every individual. Controlling their movements. Monitoring their transactions. Make no mistake: the "War on Terror" is not over. It has just greatly expanded.

The proponents of 9/11 truth have warned for 19 years that the "War on Terror" was always a war on the public. Long pushed to the margins of the political debate, that viewpoint has been vindicated as the "terrorist" label is replaced by the "asymptomatic carrier" label and all the machinery of the police state is wielded against everyone who opposes the biosecurity takeover.

Given that those once derided as “conspiracy theorists” have turned out to be the most prescient political observers of all, perhaps it is time to learn the *real* lessons from 9/11 that mainstream discourse has always excluded:

- That 9/11 and the “War on Terror” was not a war at all, but a power grab;
- That the “temporary” measures brought in to deal with an alleged “emergency” will never be relinquished;
- And, most importantly, that unless everyone who cares about this—the most blatant power grab in history—rises up, refuses to cower in fear of the invisible enemy, and reclaims their inalienable rights to freedom of movement, freedom of association and freedom of assembly, then those freedoms will be gone for good.

This is the message of 9/11 truth: that the world was tricked into giving up their rights in the name of an endless parade of bogeymen. In reality, it was the very politicians and officials claiming to protect us from these bogeymen—the ones donning the mantle of “homeland security”—who were the greatest threat to the public. And now they are claiming *we* are the bogeymen, “asymptomatic carriers” of an invisible enemy,” walking and talking weapons of mass destruction who must be caged in fear forever lest the virus kills us all.

This is a lie, and it exposes what the fearmogers are themselves afraid of: free humanity. Gathering. Talking. Working. Playing. Living.

It is no small irony that this year’s 9/11 memorials have been disrupted by the COVID scare. The torch has well and truly passed, and the annual injunctions to “Never Forget” have been replaced by a litany of “Always Remembers.” Remember to wear your mask. Remember to stay 6 feet apart. Remember to avoid large groups. Remember to stay home.

After 19 years, perhaps it is time to admit that 9/11 truth failed to expose the “War on Terror” lie in time to derail the homeland security agenda. But we are entering a new era, and we have a new chance to wake from this nightmare.

Knowing this, the only question is: Will we reject the “War on the Invisible Enemy” before it’s too late?

Whatever our choice, we better make it quickly. A Great Reset is coming.

***BUSH:** Great harm has been done to us. We have suffered great loss. And in our grief and anger we have found our mission and our moment.*

Freedom and fear are at war. The advance of human freedom, the great achievement of our time and the great hope of every time, now depends on us.

SOURCE: [George W. Bush: Address to Congress, September 20, 2001](#)

***DONALD TRUMP:** I want to assure the American people that we’re doing everything we can each day to confront and ultimately defeat this horrible, invisible enemy. We’re at war. In a true sense, we’re at war and we’re fighting an invisible enemy. Think of that.*

SOURCE: [President Trump says he is a ‘wartime president’ battling an ‘invisible enemy’ over coronavirus](#)

From Terrorists to Viruses: Dystopian Progress

[From Terrorists to Viruses: Dystopian Progress](#)

by [Edward Curtin](#), EdwardCurtin.com

September 7, 2020

For anyone old enough to have been alive and aware of the attacks of September 11, 2001 and of so-called COVID-19 in 2020, memory may serve to remind one of an eerie parallel between the two operations. However, if memory has been expunged by the work of one's forgettery or deleted by the corporate media flushing it down the memory hole, or if knowledge is lacking, or maybe fear or cognitive dissonance is blocking awareness, I would like to point out some similarities that might perk one up to consider some parallels and connections between these two operations.

The fundamental tie that binds them is that both events aroused the human fear of death. Underlying all fears is the fear of death. A fear that has both biological and cultural roots. On the biological level, we all react to death threats in a fight or flight manner. Culturally, there are multiple ways that fear can be allayed or exacerbated, purposely or not. Usually, culture serves to ease the fear of death, which can traumatize people, through its symbols and myths. Religion has for a long time served that purpose, but when religion loses its hold on people's imaginations, especially in regard to the belief in immortality, as Orwell pointed out in the mid-1940s, a huge void is left. Without that consolation, fear is usually tranquilized by trivial pursuits.

In the cases of the attacks of September 11, 2001 and the

current corona virus operation, the fear of death has been used by the power elites in order to control populations and institute long-planned agendas. There is a red thread that connects the two events.

Both events were clearly anticipated and planned.

In the case of September 11, 2001, as [I have argued before](#), linguistic mind-control was carefully crafted in advance to conjure fear at the deepest levels with the use of such repeated terms as Pearl Harbor, Homeland, Ground Zero, the Unthinkable, and 9/11. Each in its turns served to raise the fear level dramatically. Each drew on past meetings, documents, events, speeches, and deep associations of dread. This language was conjured from the chief sorcerer's playbook, not from that of an apprentice out of control.

And as David Ray Griffin, the seminal 9/11 researcher (and others), has pointed out in a dozen meticulously argued and documented [books](#), the events of that day had to be carefully planned in advance, and the post hoc official explanations can only be described as scientific miracles, not scientific explanations. These miracles include: massive steel-framed high-rise buildings for the first time in history coming down without explosives or incendiaries in free fall speed; one of them being WTC-7 that was not even hit by a plane; an alleged hijacker pilot, Hani Hanjour, who could barely fly a Piper Cub, flying a massive Boeing 757 in a most difficult maneuver into the Pentagon; airport security at four airports failing at the same moment on the same day; all sixteen U.S. intelligence agencies failing; air traffic control failing, etc. The list goes on and on. And all this controlled by Osama bin Laden. It's a fairy tale.

Then we had the crucially important anthrax attacks that are linked to 9/11. Graeme MacQueen, in [The 2001 Anthrax Deception](#), brilliantly shows that these too were a domestic conspiracy.

These planned events led to the invasion of Afghanistan, the Patriot Act, the U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, the invasion of Iraq , the ongoing war on terror, etc.

Let us not forget years of those fraudulent color-coded warnings of the terrorist levels and the government admonition to use duct tape around your windows to protect against a massive chemical and biological attack.

Jump to 2020. Let me start in reverse while color-coded designs are fresh in our minds. As the COVID-19 lockdowns were under way, a funny thing happened as people were wishing that life could return to normal and they could be let out of their cages. Similar color-coded designs popped up everywhere at the same time. They showed the step-by-step schedule of possible loosening of government controls if things went according to plan. Red to yellow to green. Eye catching. Red orange yellow blue green. As with the terrorist warnings following September 11, 2001. In Massachusetts, a so-called blue state where I live, it's color chart ends in blue, not green, with Phase 4 blue termed "the new normal: Development of vaccines and/or treatments enable the resumption of 'the new normal.'" Interesting wording. A resumption that takes us back to the future.

As with the duct tape admonitions after 9/11, now everyone is advised to wear a mask. It's interesting to note that the 3 M Company, a major seller of duct tape, is also one of the world's major sellers of face masks. The company was [expected](#) to be producing 50 million N95 respirator masks per month by June 2020 and 2 billion globally within the coming year. Then there is 3 M's masking tape...but this is a sticky topic.

After the attacks of September 11, 2001, we were told repeatedly that the world was changed forever. Now we are told that after COVID 19, life will never be the same. This is the "new normal," while the post-9/11-pre-Covid-19 world must have

been the old new normal. So everything is different but normal also. So as the Massachusetts government website puts it, in the days to come we may be enabled to enact “the resumption of ‘the new normal.’” This new old normal will no doubt be a form of techno-fascist transhumanism enacted for our own good.

As with 9/11, there is ample evidence that the corona virus outbreak was expected and planned; that people have been the victims of a propaganda campaign to use an invisible virus to scare us into submission and shut down the world’s economy for the global elites. It is a clear case, as Peter Koenig tells Michel Chossudovsky in this must-see [interview](#), that is not a conspiracy theory but a blatant factual plan spelled out in the [2010 Rockefeller Report](#), the October 18, 2019 [Event 201](#), and [Agenda 21](#), among other places.

Like amorphous terrorists and a war against “terrorism,” which is a tactic and therefore not something you can fight, a virus is invisible except when the media presents it as a pale, orange-spiked bunch of floating weird balls that are everywhere and nowhere. Watch your back, watch your face, mask up, wash your hands, keep your distance – you never know when those orange spiked balls may get you.

As with 9/11, whenever anyone questions the official narrative of Covid-19, the official statistics, the validity of the tests, [the effectiveness of masks](#), the powers behind the heralded vaccine to come, and the horrible consequences of the lockdowns that are destroying economies, killing people, forcing people to despair and to commit suicide, creating traumatized children, bankrupting small and middle-sized businesses for the sake of enriching the richest, etc., the corporate media mock the dissidents as conspiracy nuts, aiding the viral enemy. This is so even when the dissenters are highly respected doctors, scientists, intellectuals, et al., who are regularly disappeared from the internet. With September 11, there were initially far fewer dissenters than now, and so the censorship of opposing viewpoints didn’t need

the blatant censorship that is now growing daily. This censorship happens all across the internet now, quickly and stealthily, the same internet that is being forced on everyone as the new normal as presented in the [Great Global Reset](#), the digital lie, where, as Anthony Fauci put it, no one should ever shake hands again. A world of abstract images and beings in which, as Arthur Jensen tells Howard Beal in the film, *Network*, "All necessities [will be] provided, all anxieties tranquilized, all boredom amused." A digital dystopia that is fast approaching as perhaps the end of that red thread that runs from 9/11 to today.

Heidi Evens and Thomas Hackett write in the *New York Daily News*:

With the nation's illusion of safety and security in ruins, Americans begin the slow and fitful process of healing from a trauma that feels deeply, cruelly personal...leaving citizens throughout the country with the frightening knowledge of their vulnerability.

That was written on September 12, 2001.

[Connect with Edward Curtin and view original article](#)

David Icke: Heading Back to Lockdown – Puppets Read Their

Script

[Heading Back to Lockdown – Puppets Read Their Script](#)

by [David Icke](#), davidicke.com

September 10, 2020

[As a service to protect truth from censorship, mirrored copies of this video are available at Truth Comes to Light [BitChute](#), [LBRY](#) & [Brighteon](#) channels. All credit goes to the original source of this video.]

Amazon Bans Int'l Seed Sales: Problem, Reaction, Famine: Technocrats Take Control of Seeds

[Amazon Bans Int'l Seed Sales: Problem, Reaction, Famine: Technocrats Take Control of Seeds](#)

by [Christian Westbrook](#), [Ice Age Farmer](#)

September 8, 2020

Also available at [Ice Age Farmer YouTube](#) channel.

Throughout human history, people have brought seed of their

favorite foods – but no longer.

The technocrats are now banning international sales of SEEDS on Amazon/Wish, due to the “dangerous Chinese Mystery Seeds” false flag – even as parts of the US experience seed shortages!

This “Problem/Reaction/Famine” dialectic is actively being used in many areas to engineer food shortages ahead, in order to further a technocratic, transhumanist rewrite of our food system and takeover of society.

Newtown, CT Resident: Questioning the Sandy Hook Narrative – Mind-Boggling “Coincidences” Connect Mafia- Like Ties Within Key Town Positions

[Newtown, CT Resident: Questioning the Sandy Hook Narrative – Mind-Boggling “Coincidences” Connect Mafia-Like Ties Within Key Town Positions](#)

[Rebecca Carnes, Sandy Hook: Crime Family Structure Key to Control. Right, Sandy Hook Fire Department?](#)

by [Rebecca Carnes](#)

sourced from [James Fetzer](#)

July 12, 2020

[jamesfetzer.org editor's note: For those who want more background about the Sandy Hook event, watch ["Sandy Hook Update: Tracy loses, Wolfgang wins. The Deep State Strikes Back!"](#), where you can see much of the evidence for yourself, including how Shannon Hicks took staged photos of a mock evacuation of children from the school. This may be the most important article ever published on the Sandy Hook hoax.]

Among the Everest-like mountain of unbelievable "facts" and assorted discrepancies that make up the official Sandy Hook story delivered to Newtown residents and the American public, are the many mind-boggling and statistical-shattering "coincidences" that connect family members in key town positions. First up on our list for consideration: The Sandy Hook Fire Department.

Most anyone outside of Newtown (and maybe even those in Newtown who haven't lived here long enough to know the names of certain town leaders and their well-placed family members) – probably wouldn't piece together the mafia-like family ties and otherwise of those in Newtown's power positions during and after the Sandy Hook event. But these local relationships between town, police, fire, church, newspaper, real estate, school and court – are incredibly revealing when taking a good, close-up look at what was delivered as the official Sandy Hook story according to the distorted lens of the controlled media and especially according to the Connecticut State Police (CSP) report on Sandy Hook issued in 2013 by Danbury District Attorney and Newtown resident (coincidence #1) Stephen J. Sedensky III.

For starters, let's take a look at the Sandy Hook Fire

Department who was so hyper-connected to the Sandy Hook terror production they could have hosted it and served refreshments at their fire station (oh yeah, they pretty much did). And let's not neglect to examine the key divorces, marriages and family relations between Sandy Hook firefighters and important power players in our town leadership, the likes of which make the intermingling and intrigue of a 1980s soap opera look mild.

Horrorified citizens of this country who watched the orchestrated terror descend on Newtown that fateful Dec. 14, 2012 morning, likely didn't bat an eyelash when the media reported that Sandy Hook Elementary School secretary Barbara Halstead was one of the first "victims" to call 911 that morning. That's because your average citizen (and maybe even your average Newtown resident) might not have known that among the first five emergency responders that morning, two were directly related to Barbara and all were firefighters from the Sandy Hook fire station located at the bottom of the Sandy Hook Elementary School's driveway. The first to arrive on scene was Barbara Halstead's former husband and long-time Sandy Hook Fire Chief William "Bill" Halstead Sr. (coincidence #2), along with Barbara's Sandy Hook firefighter daughter Karin Halstead who just happened to also be Captain of Newtown's EMS (Emergency Management Services) department in charge of overseeing emergency communications that morning (coincidence #3).

Also in tow as among the first five responders, was former Sandy Hook Fire Captain John Jeltema who was Karin Halstead's boyfriend at the time and now her husband. As head of Newtown's Emergency Management on 12/14, Karin Halstead was therefore in charge of overseeing the 911 system and EMTs – and was likely one of the first to hear her mother Barbara's 911 call from the Sandy Hook school office (coincidence #4).

At 9:46 a.m. that morning, Karin Halstead is also the one who absurdly and shockingly told the first two ambulances and

paramedics responding to the emergency 911 call to NOT drive up the school driveway but rather park and wait in the rear lot of the Sandy Hook fire station. Karin Halstead's husband is Sandy Hook firefighter and former Sandy Hook Fire Captain John Jeltema who is also brother to Connecticut State Trooper Christine Jeltema (coincidence #5) who we just saw give a press conference in May regarding the apparent mental breakdown and killing rampage [reportedly perpetrated by Peter Manfredonia](#). Peter being the Sandy Hook native and UConn student who just happened to grow up on the same Yogananda Street as Adam Lanza (coincidence #6) and whose uncle Chris Manfredonia lived directly behind the Lanza house (coincidence #7) and ... (try and swallow all of these "coincidences" without choking, please) .. arrived at the Sandy Hook school at 9:30 a.m. at about the same time as Adam Lanza (coincidence #8).

Chris Manfredonia was reported as saying he got to the school 15 minutes early with plans to attend a scheduled 9:45 a.m. gingerbread house-making activity with his first-grade daughter in Kaitlin Roig's class. According to news reports in the L.A. Times and elsewhere, Manfredonia reportedly said he heard popping sounds, smelled sulfur and then ran around the outside of the school to try and get to his daughter when he was stopped and handcuffed by police. Chris Manfredonia and an armed, off-duty tactical SWAT officer who just happened to be near the school that morning and was running through the woods away from Sandy Hook Elementary School were both detained by police (as were [three other men](#) who are seen in aerial footage fleeing the school grounds). A troublesome entry on the official Sandy Hook Timeline (Page 1, A 84, Appendix) of the Connecticut State Police (CSP) report, states that a "parent" arrived at SHES at 9:30 a.m. for a gingerbread house project and was "buzzed into" the school at the main doors after which he reports hearing gunfire of about 15 shots.

Here's the excerpt from Page 1 of the CSP Timeline:

09:30:00 Parent arrives at SHES for the gingerbread house

event and has to be buzzed into SHES. At around 9:34, hears gunfire, reports approx 15 shots.

So the official narrative of the Connecticut State Police and Stephen Sedensky's district attorney's office puts Chris Manfredonia INSIDE Sandy Hook Elementary School at 9:30 a.m. at about the same time Adam Lanza reportedly shoots the glass out to the right side of the main entrance doors and begins shooting the teachers and kids. Why would the press report that Chris Manfredonia was running around the outside of the school trying to reach his daughter somehow and then was stopped by police? Who gave them this information? How could there be such a significant discrepancy in the CSP report and what was told to the public? How come nobody in the press ever interviewed Chris Manfredonia to clear up this matter? How come the Newtown police quickly cleared and released Chris Manfredonia that morning, especially if he was IN THE SCHOOL when the shots were reportedly being fired, as the official CSP report attests?

Read the rest of the article, including images and links, [HERE](#).

Larken Rose, Not Just Another Angry White Guy: "I Want a Society With No Masters and No Slaves"

Another Angry White Guy?

by Larken Rose

June 3, 2020

“So you may be wondering which side am I on regarding these protests or riots or police actions or whatever.

Well, I already told you I am on the side of freedom and justice. That means I am on the side of the innocent victim. Always. And I am against the aggressors. Always.

That means that when badge-wearing thugs are harassing, intimidating, assaulting and murdering nonviolent people, I am on the side of the victims, not the aggressors. It also means that when looters and vandals are stealing or destroying private property, I am still on the side of the victims not the thugs and thieves.

Right now a lot of people seem to be arguing over which set of aggressors and thugs they should be cheering for, which is idiotic. And it’s exactly what the ruling class wants to see.”

[...]

“Let me finish this up by saying that, in addition to being a white armed American, I’m also an anarchist. And contrary to the BS that you’ll hear in the mainstream media, no that does not mean that I smash windows and throw molotov cocktails around.

*It means that I think that you own yourself. And that you do not need, and should not have, any ruler stealing the fruits of your labor or controlling your life. It means that I think that **you** and everyone else should be free – free from all thugs and thieves including the ones that wear uniforms and call their thuggery and their thievery “law”.*

*It means that I want a society with **no masters and no slaves.**"*

Just some angry, armed white guy who has some things to say about police abuse, protests, riots, and freedom.



Connect with Larken Rose [BitChute](#) | [Youtube](#)

Why Taxation is Slavery: Words from Frederick Douglass

Source: [The Daily Bell](#)

by [Joe Jarvis](#)

April 26, 2017

What do you call it when someone takes 100% of your labor by force? Slavery.

Slavery is being forced to work against your will for the benefit of your master, your owner. The only reason they own the products of your labor is because they own you. If you had exclusive control over what is done to and with your body, [the](#)

most basic right of self-ownership, you would not owe anybody your labor.

So then a lesser percentage of forced labor is also slavery, though to an obviously lesser degree.

Whether a cent or a million dollars is taken without consent, it is theft. And if someone forces you to work for them 1% of the time, or 100% of a time, that is still slavery.

Frederick Douglass was a slave, by any reckoning. So it is interesting to read his own words, on having his rightfully earned wages taken by force. In his book My Bondage and My Freedom, Douglass laments the state of his servitude, that all his hard work is confiscated from him.

Besides, I was now getting—as I have said—a dollar and fifty cents per day. I contracted for it, worked for it, earned it, collected it; it was paid to me, and it was rightfully my own; and yet, upon every returning Saturday night, this money—my own hard earnings, every cent of it—was demanded of me, and taken from me by Master Hugh. He did not earn it; he had no hand in earning it; why, then, should he have it? I owed him nothing. He had given me no schooling, and I had received from him only my food and raiment; and for these, my services were supposed to pay, from the first. The right to take my earnings, was the right of the robber. He had the power to compel me to give him the fruits of my labor, and this power was his only right in the case. I became more and more dissatisfied with this state of things...

Frederick Douglass sees correctly that the only “right” the government has to take your money, is the right of the robber. Yes, they have enough power to force you to give them money, and that is the only thing that makes it “legitimate”. Certainly no one argues that his slavery was justified by the food and shelter his master provided him.

Douglass then muses about what conditions make slave-masters able to keep men enslaved.

To make a contented slave, you must make a thoughtless one. It is necessary to darken his moral and mental vision, and, as far as possible, to annihilate his power of reason. He must be able to detect no inconsistencies in slavery. The man that takes his earnings, must be able to convince him that he has a perfect right to do so. It must not depend upon mere force; the slave must know no Higher Law than his master's will. The whole relationship must not only demonstrate, to his mind, its necessity, but its absolute rightfulness. If there be one crevice through which a single drop can fall, it will certainly rust off the slave's chain.

And this is the same reason people accept taxation. We revere authority and accept government as necessary, and believe we get some benefit out of our slavery.

How often do you hear people support something because "it is the law." Is there no higher law than that which the government makes up for its own benefit, and then exerts through force? The force of government is the highest law we know.

Is there no higher law than that which the government makes up for its own benefit, and then exerts through force? The force of government is the highest law we know.

But as soon as we realize that it is never okay to be robbed, no matter how small, the injustice is a potent demonstration that we are at the mercy of a thieving gang who has convinced most people that somehow, in *this case*, theft and slavery are acceptable.

In case you are hung up on the *percentage* of stolen labor: it is interesting to note that [Frederick Douglass](#) did not always have 100% of his wages stolen from him by his masters.

I could see no reason why I should, at the end of each week, pour the reward of my toil into the purse of my master. When I carried to him my weekly wages, he would, after counting the money, look me in the face with a robber-like fierceness, and ask, "Is this all?" He was satisfied with nothing less than the last cent. He would, however, when I made him six dollars, sometimes give me six cents, to encourage me. It had the opposite effect. I regarded it as a sort of admission of my right to the whole. The fact that he gave me any part of my wages was proof, to my mind, that he believed me entitled to the whole of them. I always felt worse for having received any thing; for I feared that the giving me a few cents would ease his conscience, and make him feel himself to be a pretty honorable sort of robber.

How often do people squeal that the rich need to pay their ["fair share"](#)? It doesn't matter how much any person earns, the government always wants to steal more. And somehow they have convinced millions of people that the thieves are the good guys, and the wage earners *deserve* to be enslaved and robbed.

[continue reading the rest of this article](#)