

1-6-23 jjj...Jeremiah on January 6th discussing January 6th

Tue, Mar 14, 2023 12:31PM 54:15

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

people, trump, committee, january, question, violence, faith, law, highlight, suggesting, destruction, election, argument, address, decision, benny, peaceful, country, pence, institutions

welcome to Healthy perspectives podcast with Jeremiah, where we provide clinical perspectives on current social and cultural issues. And don't forget, you can subscribe at pod bean, Spotify, Apple or anywhere you listen to podcasts, please subscribe at any or all of them. You can follow us on Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, and many other social media sites. Or you can email us at healthy perspectives with an s@protonmail.com.

Hello, hello, welcome back. Thanks for joining us. As always, we appreciate your time. Today we are going to be doing J. J. J. What Jeremiah has to say about January 6, on January 6, that's right, we are going to take a more detailed look at what the January 6 hearing the final one that they put together says about our culture, or I should put it this way, what questions or decision points we have as a culture as a result of the findings on the January 6 committee. Alright, this is probably going to be one of the longer podcasts. So for those of you who like my short versions, hey, I appreciate that. And this one, I gotta tell you, I literally went through moment by moment on the January 6 committee final presentation, because that's what it was. And I'm going to detail it out. Obviously, I'm not going to reiterate all of it, it's not going to take me an hour and 15 minutes or 20 minutes or whatever. But it's not going to be super short either. So hang in there. I hope you enjoy. And let us roll on the very, very beginning. It opens with Benny Thompson, Benny Thompson. For those you who are watching on rumble or or YouTube, you're gonna see me looking down a lot because I've got a bazillion notes today, Bennie Thompson opens up, he highlights a very lost centric viewpoint. Any more or less says two things. We've got to have faith in the law, and we got to be obedient to the law. Okay. Then he throws out the punch line, Trump lost and knew it. He tried to undermine the law by scheming away to remain in office and then summoned a mob to Washington, who was the mob was armed. And he told them to fight like hell. Now, some of those things are true, and we're gonna get into some of the details of it. But right there enters our first decision point of the day, and I've only got six decision, I think six decision points. I'm pretty sure that's what I came up with. So decision point number one. According to Benny Thompson, there is a two pronged assessment just to two pronged assessment. One is obedience to the law. And two, is faith in the law. If there isn't faith in the law, what happens to obedience to the law? That's the first decision point. Right? Like think about these this question? If we have lost in we meaning anybody, if anybody has lost faith in the law, what happens then to the obedience to the law? Well, I think we saw some of that. Unfortunately, this is not new. Back in July of 1776, there was a declaration made about this very topic, the declaration, yes, the Declaration of Independence. And with that, I'm going to move over to that real quick and I'm gonna give you some excerpt from it. When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another like we are talking

about the America separating from what was the king's rule at the time, which connected okay and to assume among the powers of the Earth, the separate and equal station, to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to separation. In other words, they thought it was right to say, This is why we believe we must separate. And then it goes on to what you've all heard many, many times, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which don't take those out of context, you can't, please don't do that. I mean, you can, you can make your own decision. But the pursuit of happiness that they're talking about had a very specific meaning in the time period, it was more or less saying the property and, you know, the anybody that's going to interfere with their relationships, and their belongings, then it goes on to say that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. In other words, my interpretation of that is, it's a people's government, the government works for the people not the other way around, which is what they came from, right? They came from, you know, the, the hierarchical model of there's a king at the top. And if the king says, jump, you jump, period. And then it goes on that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, these inalienable rights. It is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers, in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their safety, and happiness. And then it goes on and on, like, I could read you the whole thing. But let's be real, I brought that up. Because in the event, that people have lost faith in the law, which by the way, is one of the three-legged stool, that's one leg of the three-legged stool? That does beg the question, then, what do we do? Do we obey the law when we have no faith in the law? Just saying that for an example. If that, if that all makes sense, then this will make sense. Then we must ask if we can, should or do have faith in the laws, we have to ask that question. We it's it's not like that's an obligation we have. Because if we don't, then there's a lot of questions we have about obeying the laws. Now, trust me, I'm not going for anarchy here, all of those people out there who are going to try to hate me right away, just be patient, I am not thoughtless, I am not going to just end it here. What I propose, in order to have faith in the law, we have to have faith in the people who created it. And those that enforce it, if we don't have faith in the people who created it, and the people who enforce it, then we're not going to have faith in the law. Hence, January 6, some of these things that have occurred, we've got about roughly a 50/50 split in the country when it comes to political opinion. And again, that's my opinion. And that means there's a lot of people who are losing faith in the functional abilities of the law, or at least the politics, which is the law, the executive branch, so it's the judicial branch, the executive branch, and my brain is going blank or the legislative branch. All right. So my conclusion to decision point number one, all right. If we if the answer to a Have you know the concept of faith in the people and faith in the enforcers? If the answer to that is yes, you have faith in them, then this could be a coup. If the answer is no, you don't have faith in them, then this may not be a coup, it may actually be social responsibility not to do you incite violence not to ransack the Capitol building. No, not like, I'm not suggesting that that was okay. But to stand up, and voice, the displeasure

is a social responsibility. So, again, I'm not condoning the violence or the destruction, just clarifying the decision point. All right, then Benny Thompson goes on, to state that the committee will release the bulk of the records before the end of the year. So that the American his quote was the the bulk of the records before the end of the year. That was his quote, that he also said, the American people can see it for themselves. That's what he wanted to do, or supposedly wanted to do. Which brings us already to our second decision point, do we or should we have faith in our political system and politicians who lead the January 6 committee? Well, that's a good question. I propose that faith in the January 6 committee and the politicians starts with transparency or truth and follow through, which is

authenticity. I get these from the clinical realities. And okay, this is not a for me, at least this is not a political statement. It's a clinical statement, a clinical statement, because the clinical realities are that trust is built on truth and authenticity, not about perfection, truth and authenticity, and effective communication if I'm being real. And did they tell the truth? That's a great question. And did they follow through? Do we have access to all the records? Or the vast majority of the records? Nearly, he said, the bulk of the records? Those are questions we should be asking, do we have those records? We're in 2020, we're in 2023. Now 2023. What does that mean? That means it's now the new year. And he said, by the end of the year, using Benny Thompson's own conclusion, the single most important factor for preventing another January 6, was accountability. That's what Bennie Thompson said. This begs the question, why don't we have the records? Now? If we're talking about accountability, being such a critical component, then why don't we have the records? Benny Thompson, I would love an answer. Because you are going against what you said, was the the most important factor your quote, not mine? Why, also, is anyone trying to seal them for 50 years or something, supposedly, why are they trying to seal the records? Those seem to be very reasonable questions. Considering that Bennie Thompson himself said the most important factor for preventing another January 6, is accountability. So Benny Thompson released the records, it's that simple. Be accountable to yourself. Alright, now, we move on my conclusion for this person, particular decision point. Number, I've got three parts to it. Number one, is this truth and transparency that we are witnessing? Number two, will this instill faith in the political system and politicians? And number three, is the rule of law independent of those that created it and enforce it? Think about those questions. Those are tough questions. I know All? I know I'm asking a lot of you. But I really encourage you to think them through is what we are seeing truth and transparency. Will this instill faith in the political system and politicians? And is the rule of law independent of those that created it and enforce it? Those are very important questions to ask when it comes to decision point number two. So then the committee goes on. Liz Cheney takes the floor highlights, unity, and perpetuity of institutions. So I did a little bit of extra research here, because I was trying to figure out like, What could she be meaning about unity, and perpetuity of institutions? I mean, unity is pretty simple to understand. We got to draw the people together. Great. I love it. That's called leadership. I mean, be a leader. And you often attract people. Okay, good perpetuity of institutions. What did she mean by that? perpetuity Is it of institutions means, or at least it suggests an endless, eternal existence of institutions, meaning it's going to be endless. It goes on and on and on. Hmm. Simply put, she is suggesting that our institutions should remain even if they fail the people, because unity is more important. Go back and listen to her. I'm telling you that is in there, you can see it for yourself.

That is a big leap. That is a really big leap. Huge. So discussion, or decision point? Number three, is what in the heck are we doing? If we put perpetuity of institutions before the people? That's a really interesting thing for her to say. So, in conclusion, on discussion, point, number three, or decision point, are we sacrificing for unity of the people or for the institutions? Look, somebody's going to come along, and they're going to say, well, it doesn't have to be one or the other. I'm not talking about in real life, it has to be one or the other. The January 6 committee, Liz Cheney made the argument.

And so what I am suggesting is, are we willing to sacrifice the unity of the people to have perpetuity of institutions? That's an really fair question. Another question, that's fair. If it's for the people, which was the constitutional foundation of our culture, could there come a time to eliminate failing institutions? That's an interesting question. And number three, what do we do if the day comes, that a transfer of power is from people to the institutions as opposed to to the people? I don't know if these things will ever come to be. But they are very fair questions based on the way that the January 6

committee has addressed this issue. I gotta tell you, for me, I was trying to leave out my my own opinions and bias, although some of them sneak in here, and I can feel a little bit of it happening. I'm gonna go ahead and just give you an opinion here. This is an opinion. I could be right. I could be wrong. But I don't like any scenario where we we defer power to the institutions, that the institutions become the dominant in the culture. And unfortunately, we've kind of seems to we seem to have migrated in that direction. Then Liz Cheney goes on to summarize how Trump did not accept the results. Unfortunately, she does not At that point, address the reality that nearly half of the country questions the reliability of the results. She's purely focused on Trump, which makes sense because, you know, Trump is the one who, who has the loudest voice in the room. Ignoring this completely is like putting lipstick on a pig. I mean, it's, it's, we shouldn't, it shouldn't be done. It's just weird. But the truth is almost 50% of the country questions, the results, unfortunately. And ignoring it doesn't help. Instead, she suggests that Trump should have told the people to ignore the reliability of the results and leave the capital area. That's what she thinks Trump should have done. Why would he do that? If he doesn't have faith in the results. Now, maybe he did have faith in the results. And maybe he was just trying to stage a coup. I'm not suggesting that I know, one way or the other at this point, because, you know, that's got to go through the court systems to be determined, and then we will know. But to suggest that he should stand up for something he doesn't believe. That's kind of a problem. That's like, it's like saying, I'm going to force you to think what I want you to think. Like, that's, that's not okay, that we don't do that. That's not something we do in our country. On a sidenote, though, I believe it should have been a peaceful protest, I think that it was it got way out of control, like way out of control this violence and destruction are just too extreme, especially when you've got a 5050 split in the country. Look, if you, I'm not saying it's right or wrong, but if you if 98% of the country believed something and 2% did, and the 2%, you know, tried to show up and create violence, that 2% is going to be put, like metaphorically in their place really, really fast, because the rest of the country is going to but that's not what we have, we have the potential for a really devastating, problematic situation, because we are close to a 5050 split. So, you know, to not encourage a peaceful protest would be a really big problem. I mean, that's we should be encouraging peaceful gatherings. We don't want to exacerbate the split. But unfortunately, what happens at a 5050? If you had violence, it exacerbates the split. We've seen it over and over. Then she proceeds to say that the rule of law is the foundation of the country. I propose this question. Is that accurate? Is it accurate that the rule of law is the foundation of the country?

Interesting question. And in this case, I'm going to answer it for you. If you said, Yes, you would be wrong. The rule of law

is not the foundation. It is not the foundation of our country. Our culture in America is the rule of the people. And laws are made to put boundaries around things where people have significant disagreements, or safety issues. The rule of law is just one leg, one leg by the way, I gave you this answer earlier. It's one leg. The judicial system is one leg, the legislative system, which creates laws, yes, but they do lots of other things. And the number one thing that they do is represent their constituents. You Me, my brother, your brother or sister, your mother, father, your aunt, your uncle. They represent the people first. And they use laws to help people understand what the people they're representing what laws is just, it's just a way of expressing it. It is not. It is not the foundation. And then you've got the executive branch. Okay, so those three legged stool, that three legged stool, sorry, is is proof that the law is not the foundation, that the people are the foundation. And it will always be that way under a constitutional government that we have. The people are the foundation. All right. Okay. She proceeds to say it was a constitutional crisis, it constitutional crisis at the Capitol building, when in reality, it was a crisis of faith. That's a very different thing. Now, did it become a law

breaking crisis? Yeah. But it wasn't a constitutional crisis. It was a crisis of faith. And it was a crisis of faith by Trump, by many politicians. And well, almost 50% of the American voters that voted. That, my friends, is not a constitutional crisis. That is a constant as a crisis of faith. She commends the efforts of the law, you know, the the the law enforcement, the ones who attempted to minimize the violence, and in destruction, I super appreciated that, that I think is something like these people put their life on the line to protect the Capitol Building and the people within it. And I think that that is commendable. I know that we have lost some some of the people who were there, either via later on committing suicide or, you know, people who were harmed and hurt in that. And I get it, that there's a lot of tragic things that have occurred in that the January 6 and the aftermath. And, you know, my my hat's off to the people who did serve to protect both the Capitol building, but more importantly, the people within it. I wish you all well, of course, as well. She yields back to Benny Thompson, who highlights the violence. As I've said many times, this isn't the way to assemble, you don't assemble for violence, please don't do that. Okay. My question, however, is no different than the one that they as a committee were tasked to ask. And that is this. As a therapist, I get curious about distorted puzzle pieces. In other words, once that we minimize, exaggerate. Once we lie about we keep secrets about and areas where we're deceptive. I'm asking the questions from a therapeutic lens, that the committee was tasked to ask, Where are the exaggerations? The minimizations? Where are the lies, the secrets and the deceptions? And if the January 6 committee is doing any of those things, then my question, which is very reasonable is what's missing from their argument?

What's missing from the scene? Well, I can tell you what's missing from the scene. Like there was there was no military folks there. Having served, I would honestly I would have expected the military to be present. Now. I've heard the reasons in the January 6 committee made that very clear that the military was not on standby. And I'm very disappointed in that. You know, the commander in chief does have the ability to activate the military. And he did not do that. That is true. So the military is missing. Other things from the scene that are missing. security mission measures, sometimes as simple as locking doors. You can see that in some of the videos, announced announcements to remain peaceful from a lot of people, like a lot of people did not announce remain peaceful and some did, which is good. Trump was one of the people who did not announce after He left his speech he did not say again. Keep it peaceful. And could he have done that? Absolutely. And in my opinion, he should have done that. Right. Like that's an opinion, again, an opinion. What's missing from the January 6 committee highlights at this point in their argument, acknowledgement of the bomb. There was a bomb threat, there was a bomb threat. And I didn't hear anything about it in the January 6, committee finale, nothing, they left it completely out. What's what else is missing? More info about instigators of violence and destruction. Those people who maybe they gave us some statistics, there's been this many people who have been incarcerated or whatever. Well, we want the details because there's a difference between people acting on the behalf of somebody else, or on behalf of themselves. They threw around names. The they threw around proud boys a lot in this one, not just in the finale. But even in the finale, they did throw that around. And maybe, but we're not connecting the names and the people to the group. They didn't they did not do that that's missing from their argument. They, what else is missing? They minimized exaggerated at best. That's what they were doing. They were not what's missing. But based on these things, the bomb not being talked about. And the instigators of the violence not and the destruction not being discussed. At best, they minimized or, or exaggerated, like depends on how you look at it. But we definitely should have gotten that information. At worst. They just straight up avoided it so that they didn't have to lie. Or because they were keeping secrets, or because they're being deceptive. And any of those things destroy relationships, as you've heard from me many, many times, from a therapeutic lens, my secrets and deceptions, destroy relationships. You're always a moment away from destruction of a relationship. If you're lying, keeping secrets and being deceptive, you're a moment away. You're just

one, one moment that you get caught in the middle of the lie, the secret of deception, and that that whole relationship could just be gone. Okay, so the therapy note, I have a quick therapy know for you here. This is a little bit of a disclaimer. Confirmation bias can create the minimization and the exaggeration. So we should have a little bit of grace for the January 6 committee. They were definitely bias which is fine, like do your thing. But they were trying to confirm their bias. I mean, let's be real. That's what they were doing. If you watched it, you know that they were confirming their bias. They weren't fact gathering and trying to come up with a conclusion. They started with a conclusion, and then attempted to prove that conclusion. That's a very different process. And what we also know is that evil creates lies, secrets and deception. So in the event that they were lying, keeping secrets or being deceptive on purpose, intentionally. That's just that's a sign of evil. That's terrible. That that creates, that's intentionally destroying relationships. Bad idea. That's not That's not good. From a therapeutic lens. It's not good from a political lens. So I would pose this, why then might so many be losing faith in the elections? Stuff like this doesn't help. I can tell you that for sure. What the committee did highlight, I look I'm going to be fair, I gotta be fair. Trump was skeptical of the election. Okay, he violence did happen. Yep. Destruction did happen. Yep. Many people thought and stated that Trump's skepticism was not warranted. Yep, that happened. That's they did highlight that, that Pence did not and would not stop the transfer of power. I'm not sure why they highlighted that. It did paint Pence in a pretty good light, to be honest. And you know that that gave them the persona at least in part of being fair. The they refer to it as the mob. The mob turned focus on defense. They highlighted that. They also highlighted that Rudy Giuliani and Donald Trump were responsible. They They stated this as fact, even though it's an opinion, because they one provoked it, which they were trying to prove all along. I don't know that they prove that we're going to find out because it's, it's been handed over to the judicial system. And number two, there's a dereliction of duty by not stopping it. Now, I gotta say, I think it would have been very easy for, you know, some somebody like Donald Trump to just put out a tweet, like, keep it peaceful. I mean, anything like that, put out an announcement, keep it peaceful. And then it would have been a lot clearer. So I Yeah, I'm a little disappointed by a little meaning a lot. I mean, that seems like a pretty reasonable thing to do is keep it peaceful. Like that's, that's a pretty, it's a pretty good, you know, simple thing to do. So we come now to decision point number four. Do we want violence and destruction? Like we just heard how they exaggerated they they not exaggerated, they emphasized. They emphasized the violence and the destruction. And they emphasize responsibility to the violence and destruction to people who were not there. Do we want to be a people of violence and destruction? Violence has almost no place. I say almost. Because there's, you know, there are some exceptions. Is this one of them? I don't believe so. Do we want destruction? Destruction absolutely has a place. I'm not talking about destruction isn't like destroying property. But destruction of things like non violent destruction? Absolutely. We should have non violent destruction. What does that mean? Anything that's not healthy, should be destroyed. We do it with cancer. We try to destroy ignorance. You know, if you got asbestos in your home, you you try to destroy the asbestos lies, we try to destroy lies. oppression, we should be destroying oppression. Right. Like there's things that we definitely want to destroy. Do we want to destroy the property of the Capitol building? No. No, that's terrible. So in conclusion to this decision, point number four, the question that remains is how to destroy with the least amount of residual damage. And when is violence actually acceptable? Okay. Then, of course, if you answer those questions, then the question might become was January 6, one of those times? I don't think it was. But some people will think it was. And I can understand the argument. I don't like it. I don't agree with it. I think it was an extreme behavior. But I also, if I'm empathizing, I understand that people have lost faith in our cultural way. At least in part, at times. The committee proceeded to describe these were like I got 14 things. Hold on. Let me double check. Yeah, 14 things. Number one, the big

lie, which was it was a stolen election. Then they they described, the evidence presented showed that votes were for Biden, they wanted to emphasize that the votes did in fact go in favor of Biden, which

they did. At the end of the day, that was the president we voted for. They addressed Trump's premeditating the election days the denial stuff, like he had premeditated that they they addressed Trump's that Trump may have attempted to prevent the committee from finding truth by having people share a legal strategy to not answer questions. Like you okay. I mean, it's an interesting one. I find that one intriguing personally. They emphasize 61 court cases that declared voter fraud was not the reason for his loss. 61 court cases, that's an overwhelmingly large number. They they also said that, you know, Adam Schiff comes on says he makes the argument that Trump pressured states to change the results. And he they cited Georgia And a call to the, to the state of Georgia to talk about not certifying it and stuff. They, they, the false electoral certificates were created. That was interesting. I actually found that to be really intriguing. I mean, if there's one piece of evidence that I found to be most damaging, I think that was probably in my opinion. And they highlighted that. They also talked about Trump, how Trump was responsible with his targeting of some people. And in one case that led to harassment and even death threats by Trump supporters. I mean, yeah, I get the argument. And is it terrible for that? That individual? Yes. Do I wish that on anybody? Absolutely. Not. 100%? No. And, you know, like, there's, there's a certain level of responsibility we have in leadership that we need to be careful with. And then there's, there's, there's always these unpredictable outliers. And so I don't know what to take of that. At the moment, Trump attempted to corrupt the Department of Justice by pressuring them to say the election was stolen. And then, you know, and then you end up with Pete Aguilar comes on Trump pressured Mike Pence to attempt to reject Biden's electoral votes based on an illegal theory that was presented by John Eastman. This led to Pence is life being threatened. On January 6, at least that's the connection they drew and I it seemed like a reasonable connection to me. Then Trump tweeted about pence after knowing the crowd, or they call it the mob had become violent. That at that point, were shortly after that the surge happened and violence and destruction began at a much more significant and, and difficult level. And then Stephanie Murphy comes on, Trump summoned a crowd mob, to Washington, DC. That's what she's saying the Capitol and galvanize them to do what they what he could not do. Trump dens did not discourage the violence and encourage them to be peaceful. That's what she said he did not discourage the violence or encourage them to be peaceful. This emphasized the the they they emphasize the fight like hell that I talked about earlier. They what they did not do is address the point at which Trump earlier in that day had said, quote, soon you will soon be marching over to the Capitol Building to peacefully and patriotically make your voices heard. So he did call for peace in this, obviously, did he do it again after that? Not until far too, too late in the process. I get that. But they negated that they did not address that in the January 6 committee. And then the 14th item is delayed his response when the violence was imminent? I don't like that he delayed his is response when the violence was imminent. I think that that was honestly I think that was not wise. I think that was very much unwise. He could have could have definitely clarified everything much easier had he put a statement out saying keep it peaceful. And then if the violence still erupted, you know, then you could easily make the argument that this would have been all a giant January 6 waste of time for this committee, which there's still the argument that much of it might have still been a waste of time. And maybe not, I guess we're gonna find out because now it goes to the judicial system. So I'm going to highlight some puzzle pieces that they did not bring up and they did not highlight that I have questions about number one, the Russian Russian interference issues that happened before the election election. And I say that because that could have impacted decision making. at election time. Some people might have switched their votes. Now we can't prove that counter narrative. I'm not I'm not here to prove it. But I think it's a reasonable question. Why did the January 6 committee not address the Russian interference in their finale? It doesn't make sense to me. Number two, social media suppression of information. The January 6 committee did not address that. They did not address the laptop stuff with Biden son. They didn't address the Democrat versus Republican banned discrepancy. The ghosting that happens on the social platform, they didn't address any of that stuff. And I think that was a big miss by the January 6 committee because I think they could have accomplished a lot more. Had they addressed some of the some of these things. I mean, think about the pressure that that would then put on these

social platforms, I mean, to do the right thing to stop suppressing and allow free speech until it is dangerous speech. Number three, they didn't have the things the puzzle pieces that the committee did not address. Voter Fraud being detected, quote, detected, but rare. What they emphasized was people saying it didn't happen. There was no voter fraud. But the truth is the actual truth, the reality is, there was voter fraud. And it was rare. And I say that, because if we pretend something doesn't exist, that exists, it puts all the other stuff into doubt. Even if it's right. They could have saved themselves a whole bunch by not shadowing the truths with things like ignoring this. They should not have ignored it, they should have said yes, there was voter fraud. That was rare, it was less than one half of 1%. Or at least that's what I've, I've seen suggested. But that what that means is there's cleanup to do. And the January 6 committee could have said, and we need to clean this up. And then they could have probably created a subcommittee to look into how to clean that up. But they didn't do any of that. They just ignored it. They are pretending that it's not a real problem. Now, it may not be a real big problem. But anytime you cast doubt over an election, you're gonna have that crisis of faith. And when you end up with a close to 5050 election, that becomes massively significant. If you know if one of them had won by say, like 12 points. Nobody would be looking at them. They'd be like, whatever. Who cares? Like 1% error still wins. 2% error still wins. 10% Air still wins? Not that I'm suggesting we want that much air. All right. Sorry, I needed a drink of water. I've been talking way too long. Which you probably know, because you've been listening way too long. I'm sure you're ready to go. And we're getting close to wrapping up. So hang in there with me. We're nearing the end. The fourth thing that the committee did not address was the Department of Justice, corruption post election. And you're probably going whoa, what are you talking about corruption? Well, maybe you're not depends on how much you've been paying attention. Look, the Department of Justice has shown to have political bias. Unfortunately, post election, it has become pretty obvious, pretty clear. And I really wish that January 6 committee would have addressed that directly. Because it could have it could have said a couple of things. It could have said one, we we saw it and we are rectifying the problem. Okay, but they didn't do that. It also could have said number two, we are not naive to reality. That would have been really refreshing even if they didn't do anything about it, because it favors them.

The January 6 committee I'm not talking about like a certain group of people, but the January 6 committee their bias was they wanted this to be handled by the Justice Department. And in order to do that, I think they avoided this concept. I don't know this, I'm hypothesizing This is not fact, this is opinion, but I'm hypothesizing that they just didn't want to piss the judicial system off. And, you know, and make it so that it came out on any other way than the the bias that they wanted from it. So I don't know that for sure. That's just my hypothesis. But what I do know is they did not address the post election, department of justice issues. Number five, they ignored that Trump said peacefully and patriotically. That's a fact that was on live television in front of millions of people. He said March peacefully and patriotically to have your voices heard or that that last part wasn't exactly right, but something along those lines and this Lee leads me to decision point number five. Decision Point Number five is a question. It's a very simple question. In, in concept, is it possible that the rioters could have? Or did all of this have their own volition? Is that possible? It's an important question. I mean, they definitely seemed influenced by one another on site. It did seem, at first to be peaceful protest, peaceful gathering, in it did escalate. So I don't know that I have that answer. But is it possible? We should be asking that question. Because if we're going to be fair, and just, we have to ask the question. Then they summarize with their recommendations to the legal system, which is all that they can do. I mean, they can't make a legal decree here. What they can do is say, this is what we're thinking. And now it is officially in the hands of the judicial system. Which leads us to decision point number six, it's our final one. Do you have faith in the legal system to assess and decide based on facts without bias of a political nature? I think that's an important question. And it's one we are

likely to have to face really soon, if not, like, we are facing it. Now. We want the judicial system to be own bias, to political orientation. It's very important in our system, and that three legged stool that I'm talking about, if one of them bleeds into another. Now, they're going to have a lot of overlap. But if it bleeds its power into another. It's a problem. It's a problem. Well, I guess then that brings up this this this other question? What if the executive branch or the legislative branch bleeds into the judicial branch, or you know any of them bleeding into it to to usurp power? I guess that would take me back to when Liz Cheney was talking about perpetuity of institutions. I think at that point, we need to take a real close look at those institutions. And if they're failing institutions, because they're bleeding power into each other in order to manipulate the people of our country to take advantage of the people, then at some point, we may have to stand up and say, Nope, enough is enough. That system needs to go. And we need to come up with some some other kind of solution. I hope we don't ever end up there. I think, you know, as far as we know, this is still the best system, the best country on the planet at this time. And I'm extremely excited and grateful that I was born and get to live here. My My great grandfather had to come here. And you know, it was definitely a good decision for our family. And I'm, I'm grateful for that. So, hey, I've given you plenty to think about. I appreciate you joining us. Have a great day. We really hope you enjoyed this episode. Please take a look at our website at [WWW dot healthy perspectives](http://WWW.dot.healthy.perspectives). With a dash in between the healthy and the perspectives. Make sure there's an s at the end.com So again, [www dot healthy dash perspectives](http://www.dot.healthy.dash.perspectives) with an s.com