

Letting Go

The left facade—conversation is normal: they bring up politics, Trump hatred, common topics, and ad hominem dramatized and smeared in left media. The conversation turns into an “emotional venting” session where only one side talks about their opinions, and it becomes too volatile for disagreement and uncomfortable. The problem is that they are often “too comfortable,” making others uncomfortable, and these are often ruleless and boundaryless relationships.

The issue at this stage is not politics; it is whether the other person has the social maturity, or even “love” in their heart, to respect others regardless of their political opinion. The left often expresses that it is the “party of love,” but it is really often more or less seething with hatred against “the norm.” It wants radical change, and it does not care who it harms or affects along its activism-war path toward that change.

It is even willing to kill or assassinate a president. It does not care who it hurts so long as it gets its way on its ideological viewpoint. It is a dangerous movement because it says, “Only my conscience matters,” and it is willing to cause fear, damage, and intimidation when others do not agree.

Either the other party agrees, politely remains neutral, and the conversation goes well, or the conversation turns. If it does turn, the three common tactics are gaslighting, blame-shifting, and causing harm or becoming verbally abusive. At that point, the conversation is no longer a healthy exchange of ideas but a conflict driven by hostility and emotional escalation.

Often, the conversations are not fully grounded, not fully logical, or based on logical fallacies and biased arguments. They come from emotional places rather than truth and sound judgment, with emotions too high and conversations pushed too far to the left—to the stage of abnormal Cold War dynamics and confrontations. They think they know it all, but they are not aware enough to recognize shared humanity in conversation, and these conversations often become “me, me, me”: “This is how I feel, and I’m seeking others who feel the same way, and if you do not, well, I might hurt you.”

Furthermore, they are often not emotionally coached enough, so the conversation is far from structured and often goes off the rails on various topics. This makes it difficult to have a truly healthy, academic, and sound conversation. Without structure, mutual respect, and emotional regulation, disagreement can quickly become personal and harmful rather than productive.

Unfortunately, propaganda has become so heavy on the left that it is impossible to reach many people on the reality that America has safeguards and that we must protect and preserve our territory. We are actively mitigating World War III and are always doing our best to simplify our energy situation at home so that, in the case that

America is attacked, we are ready and able to navigate it and thwart it. These concerns require preparedness, sound judgment, and a willingness to recognize genuine threats without allowing political disagreement to destroy social cohesion.

Threats to the U.S. are something we are always deterring, and readiness is not an option—especially not at this stage. We experienced a historic invasion, and this understanding should have been enough. Yet, OSIRAM is in town, the great thief of peace, and he/she loves to manipulate, twist, vampire, and abuse the energy of others.

The left, unfortunately, takes a pro-“enemy and adversarial” position of open borders and radical abolition campaigns that are not normal or safe for the American people. These are not only opinions, but are very much opinions held by the majority now and are dangerous threats. Political opinions should never pose a threat to the American people.

The movement has become more like a regime—a communist regime—and one that is very hateful, seething with hatred and volatility toward the American people and way of life. It is not normal, nor is it justified. When political activism becomes hostile toward fellow citizens, it becomes necessary to establish firm boundaries rather than continue participating in destructive interactions.

America is actively mitigating terrorism threats, and either the left gets on board, or it continues down the warpath against the American people it is on. This is not just speculation; the left activism arena has caused catastrophic and historic harms against the Western world. Regardless of political affiliation, the response to harmful activism should be grounded in personal boundaries, and the protection of innocent people.

We choose to let go of those who attack us. We do not need to maintain relationships that repeatedly become abusive, threatening, destructive, or hostile. Letting go can be an act of self-preservation, peace, and respect for our own boundaries.

Any form of activism that causes harm or destruction is unwelcome. We view it as a weaponized threat to innocent and vulnerable people. We simply let go.