

## Twitter Thread by Eric Weinstein



**Eric Weinstein**

@EricRWeinstein



**The president of the United States addressed the rally on January 6th which was not a mob at the time. He did not call for violence. He exhorted them to “Stop the Steal” telling them” We will never give up. We will never concede.” This is called “Direction by Indirection” in law.**

This is a situation paralleled by Henry II in his struggle with Thomas Beckett. “Will no one rid me of this troublesome priest?” is not a call for violence in a direct sense.

A short time ago we talked of “putting people to the sword” or “heads will roll” meaning to fire people.

If one were not addressing a massive rally, such language might be seen as colloquial hyperbole. But when you exhort people to the Capitol to “stop the steal” of a US election, context matters. The courts did not support the challenge. This wasn't hyperbole. Context is all here.

In this context, the President yet again used the technique of plausible deniability via the principle of “Direction by Indirection”. He as addressing a massive rally near the Capitol. For some reason the partisan BS, colloquial speech and the context are obscuring what happened.

To see what happened:

A) Subtract the abysmal behavior of the Democratic Party in the modern era. They are horrible. So what?

B) Place the President in the context of a real life massive rally Context is everything.

C) See the colloquial as layering indirection over direction.

D) Recognize that the courts had rejected the president's challenges. \*Even\* if there were a stolen election, we abide by the court's decision. Even-If-The-Supreme-Court-Is-Wrong. That is why it is the \*Supreme\* Court. Tough Shit. Courts blunder all the time. It just ends there.

E) If your claim is that the courts are part of a corrupt cabal that includes the Vice President, sitting senators, and the judges you yourself appointed...then there is no United States to save. You can't 'save' the United States by overruling the

Supreme Court even if wrong.

F) If you say to a real life massive rally, “we’ll never let it happen” after exhausting all legal appeals, you are living in a fictional USA in your own mind. We may be corrupt. We may be engaged in intrigue and deceptions. We may be petty. But it has to end in law or violence.

G) if you were *\*absolutely\** convinced the election were stolen, It would be far better to have accepted defeat and spent the next four years trying to prove the election were stolen. In short there is no excuse. You can’t save the US by overruling the courts via Henry II. No way.

“Will no one rid me of this troubling result?” to a rally within a stroll of the US Capitol, is not a defense. Tough.

I’m sorry, but I didn’t create the principle.

For those not familiar with the story and the principle of Direction through Indirection: <https://t.co/nJREZCymVK>