

“Freedom FROM”—the Forgotten Bombshell

[“Freedom FROM”—the Forgotten Bombshell](#)

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

February 14, 2022

This article covers a subject most people don't want to think about.

Even worse, most people can't recognize the subject exists—even after it's pointed out to them. They blank out. “Doesn't register” is their bottom line.

That's how successful decades of brainwashing have been.

PART ONE

On February 7, the Department of Homeland Security issued a heinous document with the highly significant title, [“Summary of Terrorism Threats to the Homeland \(February 07, 2022\).”](#)

Terrorism.

Here is a quote. Then I'll reveal breaking news. It's breaking because the education system is an abject failure.

“The United States remains in a heightened threat environment fueled by several factors, including an online environment filled with false or misleading narratives and conspiracy theories, and other forms of mis- dis- and mal-information (MDM) introduced and/or amplified by foreign and domestic threat actors. These threat actors seek to exacerbate societal friction to sow discord and undermine public trust in government institutions to encourage unrest, which could

potentially inspire acts of violence.”

UNDERMINE PUBLIC TRUST IN GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS.

Here is the news.

The whole purpose of the Constitution was to undermine trust in government institutions.

THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF THE CONSTITUTION WAS TO UNDERMINE TRUST IN GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS.

That’s why separation of powers and checks and balances were created.

That’s why the new central government was limited.

That’s why the Bill of Rights was explicitly stated. Read the Rights; they all involve freedom from criminal impositions by government.

The Founders held a massive suspicion of top-down power. They knew the history of Europe.

The Constitution had nothing to do with unexamined trust in government institutions.

The Founders foresaw exactly the sort of grotesque power the federal government just asserted in the February 7 Homeland Security bulletin.

That bulletin is designed to abridge and censor free speech, under the pretext that such speech might motivate unnamed persons to commit violence.

That tired pretext has been used for centuries, whenever people holding the reins of power perceived a threat to their criminal syndicate.

The current rubric is “misinformation.” As if they, the central government, are in charge of defining what the “mis”

is.

But regardless of who defines it, the whole notion is absurd. Implicit in free speech is every possible brand of information. Spoken or written by anyone.

And “exacerbating societal friction” and “sowing discord”—which are now considered part and parcel of terrorist acts—are actually DUTIES of private citizens in a society DESIGNED to be mistrustful of centralized authority.

Yes, that’s right.

If you want to put it in a slightly different way, you could say societal friction and discord are inevitable effects of free and thoughtful speech.

What else would you expect?

For the past 20 years, in particular, the people of this country have been subjected to, and brainwashed by, truly repellent calls for Unity. From wretchedly disgusting public figures.

The Unity being promoted is a gelatinous ooze of agreement and consensus around social and political and scientific issues; the true aim is, as usual, mind control.

Whereas the Unity under the Constitution—however flawed the document and the men who created it might be—was something else entirely. That call for unity was formed around the idea of freedom with accountability.

And once that cat was out of the bag, citizens were expected to remain vigilant for signs of abuses of power, from above.

Vigilance leads to bold criticism of the institutions of government, vis-à-vis what those institutions are morphing into, what they are becoming beyond their intentionally hamstrung limits.

And that criticism creates discord and distrust—which are POSITIVE FORCES.

The civilization of the United States wasn't empowered by the Constitution to be harmonious; it was empowered to be asymmetrical and unresolved.

The Unity is THAT. Unity on behalf of freedom is THAT.

Unity isn't the towering wave of demands and preachings for social uniformity that have been launched at the people.

The departure from false Unity isn't a terrorist act.

Undermining, for example, the runaway rogue criminal agency called the FDA is a responsibility. It is to be taken seriously.

Those citizens who have regressed into some sort of dreamland of infantilism need to regain their minds. Their unity is a farce.

Alive and electric debate is dying because the adult infants can only summon up Cancellation of what they don't favor; that's their only strategy. At the core, they yearn for rule through coercion.

Cancellation as censorship also happens to be against the law of the land.

PART TWO

Consider the 1858 Abraham Lincoln-Stephen Douglas face-off—when apparently citizens still had a semblance of attention span. Both men were running for a US Senate seat in Illinois. In those days, state legislatures chose US Senators.

The issue in the debates was slavery, so the interest was intense and it was national. Here was the agreed-upon format: seven debates in seven Illinois towns over the course of three

weeks; in each debate, the opening candidate would speak for 60 minutes, his opponent would speak for 90 minutes, and then the first candidate would return for 30 minutes.

The debates drew large crowds. Chicago newspapers had stenographers in each town. The stenos took down every word, and newspapers across the nation printed, in full, the texts.

Those were debates. No one with sprayed hair was present asking questions. The men talked. And talked.

If you could transport a current presidential debate back in time to one of those Illinois towns, the audience would conclude, in short order, that the candidates were insane, possibly suffering from brain damage.

“These people are running for...what did you say? President??!!?? You’re joking. This a joke, yes?”

I’d really like to see a current presidential candidate take the podium and speak coherently for 90 minutes about a single issue. You’d have to have support teams standing by to administer oxygen and possibly methamphetamines, just to keep him upright.

We’re talking about a candidate staying on point, on one topic.

As opposed to: “I remember my grandmother telling me, when I was nine, you can do it, you can be anything you want to be. I remember Mrs. Gallbladder, my third-grade teacher, spending time with me when I—people say we should have a balanced budget, but they just don’t understand how economics—a single purpose for all of us in this great—I care about each and every—there weren’t any emails, well there were but none of them— attacking terrorists by insulting them isn’t—equality isn’t just for—this isn’t the first time a woman has tried to win the Presidency but—”

Goo and more goo running everywhere.

How about Donald Trump and Joe Biden, in the Lincoln-Douglas format, debating the issue: "Describe a workable COVID policy for America." As their seven events turn into a Niagara of opposing non-sequiturs and self-inflating jive and sheer insanity, it's on parade for all to see.

And maybe, in a future presidential campaign, someone emerges from the shadows, someone most people have never heard of, and he can pass the test with flying colors. He can make sense, he can make a case, he can present details and specifics, he can inspire confidence, and he can also paint a picture of what America and freedom and responsibility and inherent mistrust of institutions are all about.

Because he has the time. Because he has the courage and the intelligence. Because he makes people remember what they really want.

Would that be terrible? Would that be treasonous? Would that be dangerous?

Would that be terrorism?

No.

That would be waking up out of amnesia.

CODA: Someone will say, "What about the truckers? Isn't that an example of a Unity you're opposing?"

"No. That's an example of unity on behalf of freedom with responsibility; an effort to convince criminal institutions to stop acting as the freedom-hating fascists they've become."

"But the leaders you call fascists are just trying to protect the safety and health of all of us with their COVID restrictions on liberty."

“No. If ‘just trying’ were true, they would open the halls of government to wide-ranging and honest public debate, from all quarters, about their COVID policies. They’ve proved they refuse to do that. They’re absolutists. Otherwise known as tyrants.”

[Connect with Jon Rappoport](#)

cover image credit: [ahkeemhopkins](#) / pixabay