The January 6th insurrection was not justified according to Rousseau's account on the Social Contract (particularly the general will). Rousseau uses the pillar terms: body politic and general will as a diagnostic trial of why the insurrectionists don't meet specific qualifications of the social pact but ironically dishonors certain miniature clauses. For a siege to have folded and unfolded at the U.S. Capitol served as a detriment and provoked harm (within the scope of governmentality and typical congressional duty) where such actions were unjustly unfair for those who bare or wield the perspective that real foreign philosophical thinkers to actual Rousseauian scholars see this as an utterly baffled moment and time in American history. Rousseau’s methodological thought in this case seems to be spoiled and ruined due to Americanism and the differentiation of political affiliation. Based on this doctrine, a reconfiguration and reexamination analysis will appropriately address why the January 6th insurrection does not comfortably or plausibly accept Rousseau’s renowned publication, the Social Contact, as this perspective and opinion disassociates from such mission.

Rousseau's perspective of the '*body*' (noun) '*politic*' (adjective) is a kindred paradigm with different touchstones. Body politic imagery resembles a social contract where "equal citizens suggest that a society can be unified, coherent, and governed by and for the people." Body politic refers to “the Western political thought, an ancient metaphor by which a state, society, or church and its institutions conceive a biological (usually human) body” (**Britannica**). Under such symbolic nouns in contemporary English, the body politic relies on this dichotomy "ages and dies." The powerhouse of the legislative branch drives such a reality. Rousseau remarks by implying "it is not by laws that the State survives, but by legislative power" (**Book III, Ch XI**). If it weren't for Ancient Law, the functionality of the state would've never taken place as an ethical principle for people and the prosperity of legislative governance. As for the general will, it is always right and always tends to the public good; but it does not follow that the deliberations of the people always have the same rectitude (**Book II, Ch III**). Rousseau was right to say that the general won’t always follow the individual regarding one's liberties. Therefore, one must be careful when discovering the plot of civic or federal governmental procedures. President Trump was 'the cheerleader' that so suddenly rallied up a crowd of extremists that wanted to ruin foundational democracy. Rousseau finds that such political and metaphysical leadership style (when it comes to the general will) can spark drama and narcissistic tension that may doom society and the man. Trump, along with his administration, were heavily relied on Trumpism as a new doctrine of political influence. Rousseau slightly has a different management origin when it comes to the body politic and the general will.

Six terms in Rousseauian law enlighten the reader as to what the behavior of the social pact portrays. They are city, republic (or body politic), state (passive), sovereign (active), power, and citizens as subjects that seem to merge with the social pact. Rousseau is aware that such terms are conflicted and flawed. Although, "it is sufficient to be able to distinguish them when they are used with precision" (**Rousseau, 164**). Before the siege took place on the US Capitol, "Congress was disrupted on a normal day as the constitutional legislation took place as electoral votes were accounted for hours.” Experts on terrorism believe that such violence was just the beginning and not the end. Furthermore, Trump (a.k.a authoritarian leader) encouraged this dark-blight motive by tweeting his fellow followers, “the election had been stolen.” Even though his lawyers, including Trump, "denied the request of evidence and conformation of fraud" (**LA Times**).

The *Los Angeles Times* assured the insurrectionists' intention to storm the capitol on January 6th. Doyle McManus, Washington Columnist, referred to this unprecedented moment as an unleashed predator of "election denialism," where such demonstration damaged democracy. Trump wanted to partner and arouse the pro-Trump extremists and right-wing militia to disrupt the sanctity of American democracy. Given Trump's immediate portrayal as President, Rousseau finds such presentation of sovereign authority (based on the status questions acknowledged) violates his paradigm of the body politic on January 6th by not cherishing "obedience and liberty." Due to such cruel behind-the-scenes manipulation, liberty, for this matter, is seen as being "nonexistent." Such inflicted power is granted by "the individual's capacity to get what he or she wants will be limited by his or her physical and competitive tactic of power on others" (**Stanford Encyclopedia, 3.3**). This shows us that obedience and liberty are not always justified but unjustified. Restrictions are in place and will cause others to easily fall in the grip of unethical or utopian behavior based on Rousseau's idealization of the body politic and general will. Due to such outcomes, the formation of the state often will experience unnecessary feedback (as it relates to protecting one's rights). Polarity, for the insurrectionists, is relied upon as it brings out their true colors, considering Rousseau. Rousseau sees this predicament as disheartening and somewhat of a panic mode for the intruders to learn why obedience and liberty are essential and how sometimes they can be unclear or bothersome.

Another contemporary article that serves to illustrate as a testament to why the January 6th right to revolution was not justified comes from the *Washington Post*. Associate Professor Lilliana Mason and Nathan Kalmoe address the insurrection on the US Capitol by theorizing such extremist activity by classifying this ideological and psychological motive of "radical partisanship" that was candid and somewhat risky in the atmosphere of political media following the days after. Well, Rousseau strongly affirms this notion of radicalization taking precedent in the aura of the general will. Particularly with large states, like the forms of government: monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. These different types of government serve efficacy to preserve the radical partisanship that the *Washington Post* displays.

Sometimes such individualistic conditions trespass as they seize the person's ability to allow compassion to thrive during a tumultuous performance. Rousseau finds that "the individual member alienates himself totally to the whole community together with all his rights... First, is when conditions will be the same for everyone when each individual gives himself totally; secondly, is because no one will be tempted to make that condition of shared equality worse for other men.”

Given the rate of unnecessary conduct from the insurrectionists and rage fueled by one human being (such as Trump) justifies that anger and revenge helped encourage usurpation over this notion of "the right to revolution." The US Capitol and the members of Congress were vulnerable to the tendencies of terror and corruption led by a leader who stuck with classical extremism and classical republicanism at the same time. Problematically, Rousseau varies viewpoints that aren't holistically justified by extremism. His persona, is indeed rational as a journey of radicalism is being shared among the insurrectionists and as the social contract dominates over nuance analogies that may (in some instances) pressure or upheld one's faith of what happened on January 6th.
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