

## Fermenting the foment

I was recently accused of being too forceful in one of my latest articles that dealt with what I see as the impending inevitable conflict between the Left and the Right over the Presidential Election of 2020. I was told that I needed to find my *diplomatic center* and remember that our ideological disagreements can be resolved with more dialogue and more unity instead of confrontation.

I'll admit. I did think about it for a while. I took a walk back in time to the Obama nightmare and reflected on the actions (or rather inactions) of the Republican Party and the Right in general to push back at his methodical moves to re-make America, and I wondered in my mind if the Republicans' approach of measured dialogue was the right way to tackle the Left's aggressiveness. It didn't take me long before I came to conclusion that, 'no,' it was definitely not a winning strategy, but it did serve one very useful purpose...it gave the Right the right to say, "we tried."

This is not to say that many Conservatives in leadership positions didn't push back at the Obamaites. They did. There just weren't enough of them (us) at the time in 2012. It took another four years to ferment the foment that would produce a sizable number that would take back our government.

I was also accused of being an isolationist because I supported an 'America First' solution to reclaiming our economy and our nation's rightful position in the world. "I thought you were a diplomat" an acquaintance told me. "Aren't diplomats supposed to be diplomatic?" he said. "Yes," I replied, "but diplomats are also supposed to honor their obligations to the country that made them diplomats and charged them with representing our best interests." This fell on deaf ears as it always does when one is speaking with those who believe that America has a responsibility to subordinate itself to the authority of others (the globalist elites) who believe that every nation should be equal.

This is the BIG lie, of course. Like every human being, nations are different. Some have more resources and more intellectual capital or better governance than others. It's the same with people. While we may be judged equal in our rights under our system of laws, we are all different with varying degrees of intelligence, talents and abilities. Those are separate from our rights and they give us our individuality. The Left, however, wants to homogenize all those individual unique differences and pretend that we Americans are all the same. The same is true of our country. This, of course, flies in the face of our founding *raison d'être* as an American nation - a nation of free individuals - that forms a large community of people in a constitutional republic that serves the needs of itself, first.

Many of my former colleague diplomats forgot to remember that when they dealt with other countries as have many of our elected Congressional Representatives, Senators and even our Presidents, not to mention the entire Progressive Left of today. They are more than willing to give away our sovereignty just to become members of the 'club' of nations that all share the same philosophy of collective governance as *the only true way* to move the planet forward. This is not to say that we shouldn't join international organizations or sign on to treaties that benefit the world in general, but what we should never do is surrender our right to act in our own interests first, not second.

I have repeatedly told my critics (and I have more than a few) that THAT is the nub of the difference between the Left and the Right - whether America is a country of individuals with individual rights that are sacrosanct (the belief of the Right) OR are we a body that gives preference to collective rights over the individual's (the belief of the Left). Think of America as a Venn diagram (two circles made up of those two beliefs). Sometimes the circles overlap when issues that affect the individual also affect the collective and vice versa.

It is in those times that we must come together to make some difficult decisions, like when we should go to war, when we legalize abortion, protect the climate or our public health. These are the times that try men's souls and demand us to choose what kind of nation we truly are. We are once again entering one of those trying times when the pendulum has swung back to the Left and will test our mettle. Will we act responsibly in the interests of the individual or will we ignore those rights as we have done in past Democrat Administrations? I'm afraid that the latter is true. We are in for a rough ride that will not only create a war of words that will lead us to the steps of the Supreme Court on these issues, but will produce a war of physical confrontation in our cities and towns as the two groups collide.

Make no mistake; our Constitution will be sorely tested, and along with it will be our willingness to restrain ourselves from engaging in further conflict that may end up in violence. Few of us want that to happen, though I'm willing to admit that there are people on the far Right and far Left that are ready to *let* it happen. And those who do favor revolution will, invariably, look to the Declaration of Independence for their justification. Something in the Declaration does seem to advocate a right to revolution and it is contained in these words, "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 - That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government."

And there is another similar sentence... "But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

Some scholars do not agree that these passages guarantee the 'right' to revolt. They say that they are merely suggesting that the people have a right and indeed a responsibility to perpetuate a functioning constitutional government but don't go *that* far to codify the right to revolt. It is widely assumed, however, that the founders believed their actions IN revolting were justified and that any future action would also be justified, but only as a last resort. Our Constitution establishes the arena for adjudicating disputes that could lead to such actions.

That said, how close are we to a revolution and what would it take to push us over the edge? I would submit that we are still a long way from that point, but that we are moving steadily closer as the ideological divisions are growing as is the government overreach that is hiding behind the 'protective measures' instituted by many states' governors due to the Coronavirus pandemic. THIS is driving the *collective versus the individual* conflict now playing out that could create a constitutional crisis and lead to a breakdown in law and order in America.

What roles and responsibilities do President Trump and presumptive President-elect Biden have in this drama? The answer, again, depends on which side of the *collective versus individual* argument you come down on. One thing is for certain. Our untraditional times, coupled with an untraditional leader and an untraditional election are combining to produce an untraditional outcome for our presumptive transfer of power in January 2021.

The President's lawsuits may possibly wind their way to the Supreme Court, but that might not be enough to stay the certification of the electoral votes. If that happens, Donald Trump may be presented with a dilemma. Should he concede the election (despite the voting irregularities and the hundreds of sworn affidavits attesting to those irregularities) or refuse to concede and leave the White House under protest? If that happens, I think it's entirely possible - and defensible - that President Trump could boycott the inauguration ceremonies on January 20<sup>th</sup>. Granted, this would be a radical departure from tradition, but this year and this election have been anything but traditional ones.

Such an action would set the tone for the coming years and almost assure continuing, heightened confrontation between the two political parties and serve to reinforce the divisions that currently exist. It's at this point that the 'moderates' usually appear and encourage all of us to come together, to unify and to bury the political hatchet. This year, it's the Democrat forces that are singing that song. Little do they realize (but maybe they do) that those of us on the Right aren't buying it. We see their efforts and hear their words as preemptive attempts to neutralize our opposition in the name of 'saving the heart and soul of the Republic.'

We've seen this movie before, and it always ends badly...for our individual freedoms. That's why those words will fall on deaf ears this time and will do nothing EXCEPT stiffen the Right's resolve to expose the Left's hypocrisy for the phony patriotism it is. Donald Trump has energized Conservatives of every stripe and has created a formidable opposition movement that will not go away no matter how many heartstrings are tugged on by the Left. There is always another shoe to drop in American politics.

*Stephan Helgesen is a retired career U.S. diplomat who lived and worked in 30 countries for 25 years during the Reagan, G.H.W. Bush, Clinton, and G.W. Bush Administrations. He is the author of ten books, four of which are on American politics and has written over 1,000 articles on politics, economics and social trends. He can be reached at: [stephan@stephanhelgesen.com](mailto:stephan@stephanhelgesen.com)*