

Where is the opposition to Trump?

Published: January 13, 2026, 10:27 am

An [FT editorial this morning](#) says:

The most important task of the US legislature — America's first branch of government — is to check the executive. By that measure, the country's 119th Congress has lost its purpose less than two months after going into session. Donald Trump's administration is explicitly pursuing a "unitary executive theory" of the US presidency that largely bypasses Capitol Hill and has scant basis in constitutional law. Instead of asserting its prerogatives, Congress is rolling over.

I agree. Congress is rolling over, but that is not by accident. As the editorial then notes, this is happening by design, and is the deliberate consequence of the action of the Republicans who control Congress. They are willingly absenting themselves from responsibility as Trump stages his coup that makes the US constitution and its supposed democracy almost irrelevant to both the current and future structure of government in that country.

Where are the Democrats in all this? As the FT notes:

The Democratic Party, meanwhile, is responding to Trump's power grab with routine manoeuvres. Though in the minority and lacking teeth, Democrats also seem to have lost their tongue.

Like many in the international arena, it seems that the Democrats simply did not believe that Trump would do what he said, when he had absolutely every intention of doing so, as I always expected. They, therefore, undertook no preparation for this moment, just as Europe failed to do so with regard to international security.

So what happens now in the absence of international leadership, almost anywhere? The FT suggests that:

Congress was meant to hold the presidency to account on behalf of the people. In its absence, the states, business, civil society and the public must occupy that vacancy.

I do, of course, agree. If I did not, I would not be bothering to write this. I do, however, suggest that the FT also shows its naivety when making this observation.

Firstly, the business community, backed by a majority of academic economists, is as guilty of creating Trump's philosophy as anyone.

Secondly, good luck to those states who stand up against a vindictive president and then have to account to their electorates for the losses that they have suffered as a consequence.

Third, it might be wise for the FT to note what the likes of Orban in Hungary have done with regards to the freedom of civil society organisations. The likelihood that they will suffer significant curbs on their activities in the not too distant future is very high.

Fourthly, press freedom is something that the likes of Trump do not value too greatly. The FT might wish to address the question of how it might be preserved. They assume it will be. I suggest that, like much else that they are suggesting, is naive on their part.

In summary, it was seen that the FT's editorial board is no more aware of the issues that they are addressing than the Democrats are, and that is some indication of the mess that we are in. It would seem the FT still thinks we are dealing with a normal political situation. They need to appreciate that fascism, which is the reality the US faces, does not operate like that.