

# FREEDOM EDUTAINMENT

® Trademark

Wednesday, February 18, 2026

Freedomedutainment.com©

## IS IT RACISM OR IS IT NOT

### Prejudice, Power, and the Dangerous Cost of Neglect

By Love

February 18, 2026 – The Question That Refuses to Go Away

#### **Opening Reflection: Is It Racism or Is It Not?**

Is it racism or is it not racism? This question has taken on a renewed urgency when considering the immigration crackdown in the United States and the response to it by leaders within the Democratic Party. Regardless of whether one agrees or disagrees with immigration enforcement itself, something deeper has revealed itself in how leadership has chosen to respond. What has disturbed observers is not simply

disagreement, but what appears to be an absence of duty by the Democratic Party where duty is most required.

*As Love once said, “The public is not safe when there is no law and order to establish and maintain peace.”*

That statement reflects a belief that transcends party lines. It reflects the expectation that government, above all else, must preserve peace. Therefore, whether one believes the immigration crackdown is right or wrong is not the focus here. The deeper

issue is how prejudice emerges when a government violates, neglects, or refuses to protect the rights of the people under its care. Prejudice is not always about race; sometimes it is about the refusal to uphold the duties that leaders swore to carry out. And in the recent immigration protests, a disturbing pattern has emerged that exposes this truth. In other words, a troubling reality becomes clear when observing the Democratic Party's response to the immigration crackdown. Regardless of whether one agrees with Donald Trump's approach, one thing is undeniable: Democratic governors and mayors are not present with their police forces and agencies at these protests to maintain law, order, and peace. They believe that withholding police presence is a strategic way to counter Trump. Yet this strategy does not deter him, nor does it weaken his position. Instead, it harms the public, which are ordinary citizens who depend

on law enforcement to keep the peace.



### **The Absence of Authority in Moments That Demand It**

A disturbing pattern has emerged in the public eye. When large-scale protests are anticipated, they are not a surprise, because they are announced, they are broadcast, and they are discussed for days in advance; therefore, leadership knows that they are coming. Yet in these moments, there appears, in the eyes of critics, to be a failure to ensure sufficient presence of authority to maintain order and protect the public. Ordinarily, when large crowds gather for any reason, police are present as a precaution. Their presence is not an accusation. It is not an assumption of guilt. It is a

recognition of human reality, which is, crowds are unpredictable, and leadership has a responsibility to prepare for that unpredictability. So, when this preparation is absent, questions arise.

*Love once said, “Duty does not disappear because you disagree. Duty exists precisely when disagreement is strongest.”*

Governors and mayors swear an oath not to political parties, but to the public. Moreover, their responsibility is not conditional upon whether they personally agree with federal actions. Their responsibility is to preserve peace within their jurisdiction. To critics, failure to do so appears not as protest, but as neglect, because by refusing to disperse police to these protests, they violate that oath and reveal a neglect of duty. I must stress, again, that whenever a large crowd gathers in any city or state, police presence is standard protocol. Therefore, this

absence is not an oversight. It is a choice. And it is a dangerous one.



## **A Double Standard in Plain Sight**

If Donald Trump behaved this way, that is, by refusing to enforce federal law, encouraging chaos, or withholding law enforcement, he would be accused of insurrection. He would be impeached, condemned, and dragged through the court. Yet Democratic governors and mayors act as if their states and cities are sovereign nations, independent from the United States, and no one calls it what it is. They openly defy federal law, not because the

law is illegal, but because they do not like the approach.

*As Love once said, "These governors and mayors are governing their state and city as if it is its own sovereignty, separate from America."*

This is not a legal argument. It is a preference disguised as resistance. And preference is not a justification for neglecting duty, and a disagreement does not eliminate obligation. States entered into a union. They agreed to operate within a shared constitutional framework. That framework does not require agreement. It requires cooperation under law. When leaders refuse to cooperate, this proves that they are not simply resisting a policy. They are redefining their role. Consequently, they are acting not as participants in a union, but as independent

sovereigns. And that perception carries consequences.

### **The Sinister Silence: No Alternative, No Compromise, No Plan**

What is most concerning is not whether the Democratic Party wins politically, but what happens if they win while governing this way. If they truly believed Trump's actions were illegal, they would present a legal argument. But they do not. Their argument is simply that they do not like his approach. If they agreed that Trump is right but disliked his method, they should offer a better one. They should propose a compromise. They should work within the system to enforce the law in a way that they believe is just. But they have offered nothing. Their silence is not passive; it is revealing. In other words, their refusal to enforce the law

is not about compassion. It is about power. It is about creating an environment where anarchy becomes normal, where chaos becomes a political tool, and where the public becomes collateral damage. Remember, anarchy does not always begin with violence. Sometimes it begins with absence, that is, absence of enforcement, absence of accountability, and absence of cooperation.

Love once said, *“Anarchy is not born from disagreement. It is born from abandonment of responsibility.”*

This fear is not rooted solely in immigration. It extends to broader concerns about crime, housing, and public safety in communities where people feel their rights are not being protected. When citizens call for help and help does not come, they begin to question the purpose of government itself.

## **A Pattern Already Seen in Black Communities**

This pattern is not new. It mirrors what has long been seen in many Black communities that are governed by the Democratic Party, which is slow police response, neglected rights, lack of enforcement, government agencies that do nothing, judges who look the other way, housing officials who ignore violations, employment regulators who fail to act et cetera. In other words, the same neglect shown toward Black neighborhoods is now being displayed on a national stage through the immigration crisis. Yet the Democratic Party claims that they refuse to assist federal enforcement, because they dislike Trump’s approach. But what is their excuse for taking the same approach in Black communities, where Trump

has nothing to do with the local issues? The pattern is consistent: neglect, absence, and refusal to uphold the law.

### **The Road to Anarchy**

This is why the Democratic Party's approach is dangerous. They protest, shut down government operations, and dominate the media with emotional appeals, yet they offer no legal strategy within their power. They do not fight within the system. They do not use the tools of governance. They rely on spectacle, not solutions.

*As Love once said, "This is why I feel this will lead to anarchy."*

Trump may be liked or disliked, but he acted within the scope of the law and his position. The Democratic Party, however, is acting outside the scope of their duty

by refusing to enforce the law at all.

### **Sympathy Without Agreement**

There is another truth that must be acknowledged: the immigrants themselves have a legitimate argument. Many have a valid reason to fight within the system. Their desire for a better life is understandable. Their frustration is real. And their pain is not imaginary. But their approach, which is burning down the country metaphorically or literally, is not the answer. They are being rallied into destructive thinking by political leaders who benefit from chaos.

Love expressed this clearly: *"Even I have problems with this country and I entertain the thought of burning it down when I am mad. But it is only a thought."*

*There is no way in the world that this would work.”*

*Love also once said, “I pity immigrants’ struggle, but pity cannot justify a path that destroys the very refuge that they seek.”*

My perspective does not deny suffering. It questions method. If the goal is stability, then instability cannot be the solution. If the goal is protection, then destruction cannot provide it. There is an analogy that captures this dilemma. If a person owns only one car, and that car breaks down, destroying it does not solve the problem. It eliminates the possibility of repair. The problem becomes worse, not better. Nations function in much the same way. When people, driven by anger or frustration, embrace lawlessness, they do not fix the system. They remove the very structure that makes solutions possible. History has shown

repeatedly that destruction rarely produces justice. It only produces suffering.

### **History Repeats Itself: The Lesson of Israel**

This moment in America mirrors a historical pattern. Israel once complained to God about the law, and they were demanding a change. Yet they were not keeping the law in the first place. So, the problem was not the law but the people who refused to uphold it. America is in the same position. The problem is not the law, not the immigrants, not Trump, not the Republican Party, and not even the Democratic Party alone. The problem is everyone, because everyone is forcing their will through violence, pressure, and disregard for the system. Some even justify violence as necessary. But violence cannot be justified when breaking the

law. Immigrants fled violence in their home countries. They came here seeking peace. They must not repeat the same patterns here. And neither should America's citizens.

### **A Warning Fulfilled**

History offers many examples of nations that were consumed by internal conflict. When law loses legitimacy, conflict replaces cooperation. When cooperation dies, unity follows. When unity disappears, stability becomes impossible.

Love once said, "*No nation has ever destroyed its own foundation and found peace standing ...*"

This warning is not a prediction. It is an observation. This is not a call to blame one side alone. It is a call to recognize shared responsibility. Therefore, leaders must lead. Citizens must act with restraint.

Protest must remain within law. Law must remain worthy of respect. Peace cannot exist where duty is abandoned. Peace cannot exist where law is optional. Peace cannot exist where power replaces principles.

### **The Choice That Determines the Future**

This moment in history will be remembered not for disagreement, but for how disagreement was handled. The future will not be shaped by who was right. It will be shaped by those who upheld their duty. That is the test of leadership. That is the test of citizenship. And that is the test that will determine whether America moves toward stability or toward the very chaos that history has warned against time and time again.