Written by Selwyn Duke on October 20, 2016

No, Trump Should Not Accept the Results of a Possibly Stolen Election

Crooks on the left, cowards on the right. Where do we go to find integrity?

One of the most talked about parts of Wednesday night's final presidential debate was Donald Trump's statement that he'd let us know on election night if he'd accept the balloting results. An NBC commentator expressed her bubble-headed opinion that the statement lost him the election. Worse still, "conservative" commentator John Podhoretz wrote that Trump's comment was "a shocking and cravenly irresponsible thing to say, the sort of thing that threatens to rend our national fabric, and for that alone, Trump has earned his place in the history of American ignominy." But Podhoretz' criticism is what's shocking and cravenly irresponsible — and reflective of profound ignorance.



Are some of us living in an alternate-reality universe? We just saw NYC's *Democrat* election commissioner, Alan Schulkin, <u>caught on video</u> admitting that "there's a lot of vote fraud," as he talked about how people are "bussed" around to vote illegally. This was followed by a Project Veritas sting video <u>showing</u> a Democrat operative slug named Scott Foval giving advice on how to commit the fraud, saying that it has been going on for 50 years and that it "doesn't matter what the friggin' legal and ethics people say, we need to win this m****rf****r." There was also the WikiLeaks released email <u>showing</u> that Clinton allies, also Democrats, presumably, believe that Obama forces committed vote fraud in 2008. Then there's another WikiLeaks email in which Clinton campaign manager John Podesta wrote that "if you show up on Election Day with a drivers [sic] license with a picture [and 12 states and D.C. allow illegals to get licenses], attest that you are a citizen, you have a right to vote in Federal elections." Add to this the 2012 Pew study <u>showing</u> that approximately "24 million — one of every eight — voter registrations in the United States are no longer valid or are significantly inaccurate. More than 1.8 million deceased individuals are listed as voters. [And] [a]pproximately 2.75 million people have registrations in more than one state," and what does it add up to?

That the John Podhoretzes of the world are, through their cowardice and sins of omission, hurting our republic.

Reality No. 1: There is vote fraud.

Reality No. 2: Since there's vote fraud, it's possible an election — especially a close one — could be stolen.

Yet the three-little-monkey coward-cons think that, somehow, it's noble and healthy to view a possibly



New American

Written by <u>Selwyn Duke</u> on October 20, 2016



stolen election and say "Nothing to see here; move along." Maybe if we pretend hard enough, everything will be okay.

I have no idea how Trump's statement will play out, given that he didn't explain the matter well and we have coward-cons doing the jobs (real) Americans *wouldn't* do, but I suspect the average person doesn't share Podhoretz' concern over violation of a twisted view of propriety. But here's the answer I would have given debate moderator Chris Wallace when he stated, to Trump, that we have a "tradition" in this country of a peaceful transfer of power:

Yes, sir, and we have another American tradition: it's called the "rule of law." And when you suspect an election has been stolen, and allow it to go unanswered, you become complicit in the undermining of our rule of law. Moreover, vote fraud that swings an election thwarts the people's will. You may not care about that. Hillary Clinton certainly doesn't care about that. But if I have reasonable suspicion that the Nov. 8 contest has been stolen, I will stand against the thwarting of the rule of law and the people's will — even if I'm the only person in America to do it.

In addition, what is Wallace talking about? Trump isn't proposing that tanks roll into Washington, D.C., and forcibly extract usurpers of power. He's talking about what has happened before — most recently when Democrat Al Gore contested the 2000 election — and what Hillary Clinton wouldn't hesitate to do if she thought it would benefit her. And did the punditry say that Gore rent America's fabric and earned his place in the history of American ignominy?

I cannot tell you how disgusting I find the coward-cons' cravenness. It is, sadly, a common failing of man to prefer to rationalize, or stick one's head in the sand, than to face up to tough challenges and hard truths. This is the mentality causing coward-cons to tell Sheriff Joe Arpaio not to look into Obama's birth certificate, and and to tell judges to refuse to hand down anti-establishment rulings for fear of opening "that can of worms." But tolerating criminality gets you more criminality. This is, mind you, a hallmark of Third World nations. Corruption is rife, tolerated, and many pretend it isn't going on. You want to descend fully into Third Worldism? Listen to the coward-cons.

What the coward-cons miss, in their infinite lack of wisdom, is that unanswered corruption means our national fabric is *already being rent*. And their prescription is to allow corruption to fester, to grow, to become status quo? It's as with cancer: attacking it early involves some pain, perhaps enduring nauseating treatments or an operation to excise a malignant tumor. But ignoring it, refusing to face reality, means a metastasis that will consume the whole body and lead, ultimately, to death. Tolerate a bit of visible rending now — or risk having nothing left to rend later.

The coward-cons are the people who get elected to office — and then get nothing done. They're the weak sisters who never saw a culture-war battle they couldn't lose. If you suspect your vote has been negated by electoral fraud, would you want those charged with ensuring the system's integrity to look the other way? Or would you want the matter sifted to the very bottom?

If the coward-cons would choose the former, then they've earned their place in the history of American ignominy.

Contact Selwyn Duke, follow him on Twitter or log on to SelwynDuke.com



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

24 Issues Per Year Optional Print Edition Digital Edition Access Exclusive Subscriber Content Audio provided for all articles Unlimited access to past issues Coming Soon! Ad FREE 60-Day money back guarantee! Cancel anytime.