

In This Moment - Whose Conservatism are We Embracing?

Thinking Critically about Who We Support

(Twelve-minute read)

A respected friend, pointed me to the latest Imprimis article from Hillsdale College – [National Conservatism, Freedom Conservatism, and Americanism](#). The article awakens us to a fundamental discussion of **who we are following** – it is also helpful in recognize the subtle differences in basic ideologies. We need to think deeply in this hour because the cultural landscape is changing at warp speed – both politically and religiously. These differences WILL affect the future of our faith, our culture, our youth, and the future of our nation. Sooner than we like.

This article outlines the stark differences between the National Conservatives (NatCons) and the Free Conservatives (FreeCons). Be careful, the terms are a bit deceiving and the differences are huge.

The FreeCons suggest that their differences are just of the “Family type” – kind of like Christian doctrines that we can disagree about – no big deal. **The NatCons disagree** stating that we are in a political fight or a “**cold civil war.**” Victor Davis Hanson calls it “**and existential war for the soul of America.**” So, what are the differences and do you even care? You better if you care about your faith, your culture, your kids, and your country.

As you read my musings and hopefully, this Imprimis article, think about this. **Where do the candidates you are considering voting for, stand on these two radically different ideologies?** Because, otherwise, this becomes an exercise without meaning. Or what about your Pastor or City Councilman? Most of them probably are not thinking that deeply But, some of them are – for sure – trusting that you won’t. They are hoping you will just get on their band wagon, be loud, and not think about such STUFF. They might essentially fall into the NatCons camp but message and vote pretty much in the FreeCons camp – they really have no ideology that guides their everything. I will define the differences more precisely in a minute.

NatCons vs. FreeCons Lived Out in Montana Politics?

Following the Herd!

I will risk this rabbit trail for a minute because I am **troubled by what happened Friday** – 08/09/24. That day **many of my friends gallivanted off** to [Bozeman](#) – a radically liberal village, (you should be asking Sheehy and Trump why Bozeman) to support a U.S. Senate candidate who is [compromised](#), has a [swampy past](#), and **refuses to explain his background on the issues of Climate Change, ESG, and DEI** – he also [refused to answer](#) my questions about these, and has joined the Establishment or Uni-Party [Occupational Cabal](#) in Montana.

DEI (Diversity, Equity and Inclusion) is not just some faddish THING. It is **hard core Critical Theory (Marxism)** – you know of the *oppressor-oppressed vintage*? It is strongly in the FreeCons camp – or worse. **This is a question that you should want answered before you vote in November!** I know, the real attraction was Donald Trump (who is very careless about who he endorses). You can thank Steve Daines for this who is close to Trump and has undoubtedly talked Ted Cruz and other into supporting Sheehy.

By now, hopefully you realize that Kamala Harris is a radical Marxist. IF... she gets in, and we can't assume she won't, then having **Senators that don't care about these differences** - between the free market and Marxism - matters.

If you actually read the Imprimis article, you will discover that what I am saying here is relevant because the FreeCons camp would apparently be very comfortable with Sheehy – along with his Cabal pushers Dains, Gianforte, and Zinke. No, I am not saying these are Marxists, I am saying they are **Globalists who could care less** about the difference. So, **where do YOU fall** in this debate and how much are YOU willing to compromise?

I am arguing that these friends of mine are **supporting this man who is not tethered to a godly ideology** – an article I will reference in a minute seems to support that also. These Republicans are supporting an inexperienced individual, who has NO record of involvement in government in any way, for the United States Senate. **This is not the home-coming king race, this is the United States Senate** where you actually have to speak with respect to people you disagree with and a little governing background is actually helpful. Tim was endorsed early on by [Steve Daine's](#), the [Pary Bosses](#), and the rest of the Montana Cabal. The honorable Senator Daines insisted that **we needed Senate Candidates who are**

[millionaires](#) and could finance their own campaigns. Never mind that I get an email from Tim pleading first for.... money... almost every day.

As mentioned above, I have another concern, and it stems from an article on NBC News that a friend sent me intitled [Tim Sheehy may turn the Senate Red. But is he really a successful Business man?](#) Careful here, just because it is a liberal paper does not mean it is wrong. These respected authors ask some reasonably good questions that relate to policy and integrity.

Most of these friends will not take the time to read this detailed article. But like it or not, there is a lot of *Shaddy Sheehy* (he keeps giving Tester ammunition) in this article but I just want to bring up one issues **that keeps coming up in the article.**

A former employee (see under an employee mistake) is said to have made a mistake, claiming one Bridger unite qualified as ***Socially and Economically Disadvantage*** and that could make a difference in getting government contracts. That mistake was on their records for four years (2018-2022) before it was discovered. A spokesman claimed *the “firm **did not secure any government contracts under that certification** but declined to provide details about why it took the firm so long to identify the error.”* **That’s a lot to swallow in the light of the fact that Bridger continues to depend heavily on government contracts.**

So, THINK! This essentially suggests that either the **favor the government policy promises** to *Socially and Economically Disadvantaged* companies was not adhered to for four years **OR** that this segment of the business **got no government contracts!** In typical Sheehy fashion, they gave no explanation.

These are the **qualification standards** for being a *Socially and Economically Disadvantaged* company. **Ask yourself**, how in the world did this *mistake* ever happen?

“To qualify for the small **disadvantaged business program**, a firm must be **51% owned by one or more socially and economically disadvantaged people.** The code defines a socially disadvantaged person as someone who has been **“subjected to racial or ethnic prejudice or cultural bias within American society because of their identities as members of groups and without regard to their individual qualities.** The social disadvantage must stem from circumstances beyond their control.”

Companies that qualify as small disadvantaged businesses can receive preferential treatment on government contracts, according to the [Federal Code](#), with the government awarding 10% of federal contract dollars, or roughly \$50 billion a year, to them.”

The code also says that government agencies “can limit awards to competition only among small disadvantaged businesses. As Bridger Air Tanker did, a company **can self-certify to participate in the small disadvantaged business program if it believes in good faith** that it is owned and controlled by one or more socially and economically disadvantaged individuals,” the Federal Code says.

Somewhat similarly, there were also concerns with Bridger not actually qualifying for veteran considerations as you can read.

While I have admittedly been skeptical of Sheehy as a strong Senate candidate, I also found some of the **donation and other issues** less than encouraging. I am not a great financial analyst but there does seem to be a lot of gymnastics that makes me think about what this man will be comfortable with in the Senate. From beginning to end, this article **makes me question** – even further – is **Tim the straight shooter we want representing us in the U.S. Senate for the foreseeable future?**

My disappointment is that many friends who I believe are NatCon **don’t seem to have any interest in thinking critically about this issue**. Reasonable people can disagree but, **can we at least think about what we are doing and not be Shepell?**

So Close and Yet So Far Apart!

So, what are the differences between the NatCons and the FreeCons that this article defines and why does it matter – they may seem not that far apart. In the past two years they have issued competing manifestoes. **These offer conflicting understanding of the Progressive challenges and the American way of life**

You can find the **National Conservatism Statement of Principles** [here](#). You can find the **Freedom Conservatism: Statement of Principles** [here](#). The differences lie more in what the **FreeCons DON’T say**, particularly relative to God and globalism vs. [nationalism](#)

I am reminded of Francis Schaeffer's book the [Great Evangelical Disaster](#) where he talks about two rain drops that fall an inch apart on either side of the continental divide. They seem so close but in time, one ends up in the Pacific and the other in the Gulf of Mexico.

So interesting that way back in 1984 when this book was written, the write up says:

"Have Christians compromised their stand on truth and morality until there is almost nothing they will speak out against? Has the evangelical church itself sold out to the world?"

It's interesting that Megan Basham is asking the same questions in her book that you should read (or listen to) – [Shepherds for Sale: How Evangelical Leaders Traded the Truth for a Leftist Agenda](#). Here you will see that, while Megan does not reference this controversy, an ever increasing majority of **Christian leaders are moving from the NatCons to the FreeCons camp**. There is a virtual tsunami taking place in the church.

The Three Waves Imprimis author John Fonte mentions:

- The **first** is out of the Reagan-Buckley camp and were traditionalist concerned with virtue, [classic liberalism](#), and above all liberty. Anti-Communism and religion were main stays.
- The **second**, after the Cold War, American conservatism (think both Bush's James Baker, and Paul Ryan) supported globalization that gave us NAFTA, WTO, increased immigration, amnesty, and Bush W's *North American Free Trade Agreement* (attempting to erase our borders)
- The **third** wave was **nationalist-populists revolt** against the policies and attitudes of the second wave – on immigration, trade, sovereignty, and national identity. This started with Sen. Jeff Sessions and has been carried forward by Trump.

The NatCons: They recognize that Progressives have achieved dominance over education, most corporations, Big Tech, Big Law and the military leaders – and I would add the church. **These are calling for a counter-revolutionary** responsiveness to restore the **virtues of patriotism, courage, honor, religion, man and woman, the family, the sabbath and sacred as prerequisite to recovering**

and maintaining our freedom, security, and prosperity. You can see more of this in their [National Conservatism: A Statement of Principles](#). Scroll down and look at their Ten Principles – from National Independence to Race. One of their group – Congressman Jim Banks (IN – see p. 3)) founded the **Anti-Woke Caucus**. I wonder if Ryan Zinke is a member – sounds more like Matt Rosedale who the [Four Horseman of the Republican Party](#) did all they could to get rid of.

These Horsemen are **not** ones that have and adhere to a Biblical worldview-ideology and that is not a four-letter word. **I am weary of men who do not have and cannot stick to a personal ideology - convictions.** They are driven more by pragmatism than principle.

Notice how the author of this article talks about the **very principled Gov. Ron DeSantis** has signed legislation prohibiting instruction on sexual orientation in the classroom and much more - something Montana will not be able to do if [CI-128](#) passes, thank you pastors for your silence. And what about Mitch McConnell, the one married to a Chi-Com, who our-boy-Steve is snuggled up to? Where do you suppose these two fall on the spectrum? I suspect, pragmatically, the FreeCons.

And what is the FreeCons Response? These were mostly second-wave conservatives (thank you George H.W. and George W.) who affirmed individual rights, private enterprises, the rule of law etc. **But then comes the proverbial BUT!**

- As you will read, some of these FreeCons are **Biden supporters** who oppose third-wave issues.
- They appear **silent on God-Given free will** and make no reference to God or virtue.
- They appear **critical** of those opposing Wokeism – people like DeSantis. They are **dismissive of efforts to stop DEI.**
- The key difference between NatCons and FreeCons has to do with the **character of the current political struggle** against **Progressives on the Left.** FreeCons believe we are mainly involved in policy arguments.
- FreeCons signatory Yuval Levin, for instance, writes that our divisions are a **family argument** between two forms of liberalism: **progressive liberalism and conservative liberalism**—we are **not**, he assures us, in a “**political fight to the death.**” NatCons, on the other hand, generally believe we are

involved in what the late Angelo Codevilla called a “**Cold Civil War**”— or as third waver Victor Davis Hanson has put it, we are in an “**existential war for the soul of America.**”

- **On combatting racial discrimination**, FreeCons would go further than NatCons “by recognizing the **persistent inequality of opportunity** for descendants of the victims of slavery and segregation.” They border on agreement with the woke Left’s view that **America is “systemically racist.**

Early National Review senior editor Willmoore Kendall wrote that since liberalism “**seeks a change of regime, the replacement of one regime by another**, of a different type altogether, it is, quite simply, revolutionary.”

Kendall asks: “Is the destiny of America the Liberal Revolution or is it the destiny envisaged for it by the Founders of our Republic?” That seems to be the bottom-line issue!

But perhaps **my most alarming concern** is, can the electorate - do we the people - **have the discernment to recognize** the differences when they are right before us. I DO NOT see it on display, anywhere!

Finally, the Disney Controversy

This kind of separated the men from the boys. We see Ron DeSantis fighting the woke progressives and taking away Disney’s privilege. How I wish parents and grandparents would **stop feeding all-things-Disney to their kids**. This teaches them that **their amusement is more important than their principles**.

I would argue that it was Disney’s wokeism that pushed DeSantis’ buttons – parental right, gender identity etc. Nikki Haley and Mike Pence opposed DeSantis on ideological grounds. No surprise, Feminist Halley had no ideology either. Disney was a cancer on Florida – I would argue all of America – DeSantis had the backbone to say no to this Marxism.

Thus, my wish that DeSantis was on the ticket – I have no respect for the BS arguments that he was too young, to inexperienced that many of the Trumpsters blindly espoused but that is now history. We have to pray that the shenanigans of the LEFT don’t defeat Trump. DeSantis and the Florida Legislature has been **surgical** on many issues – like a rifle. Trump operates like a shot gun.

You can read this section of the article but I leave you with this:

*“The Disney controversy helps to clarify a **core difference** between second- and third-wave conservatism [FreeCons]. **Second wavers argue that civil society and culture generally must be neutral zones free of any governmental or overt political influence.** Third wavers [NatCons] see **culture as crucial, because they believe it is critical to the struggle for ideological hegemony – [domination or supremacy.]**”*

Those who find our inheritance deeply problematic and seek a revolutionary transformation of the American regime should, logically, be called Transformationists. Today’s polarization should be viewed as an existential struggle between Americanists and Transformationists