Senator Sanders has made his mind – he will NOT run in 2020.

Senator Sanders had announced that in 2018 he will run as an Independent.


I do not want to get into a discussion “who betrayed whom or by whom”; I find it useless.

For me, Senator Sanders’ decision says very clearly that he has made his mind about what will be his legacy as a politician.

He had a very “simple” choice to make – does he want to be a “king”, or does he want to be a “king maker”?

I have deep doubts that Senator Sanders wants to run in 2020. He does not want to publicly rule it out, in case there will be no good progressive candidate. But he would rather give his full support to that candidate, than being that candidate himself.

He weighed his chances to become the President and then he decided that he wanted to be a “king maker” (i.e. the one who will have a strong influence on who will run in 2020).

Based on his knowledge of the internal state of the Democratic party, he decided that his influence from the outside the Democratic party will be much stronger than he had if he stayed in the party. Clearly, talks about “unification” between different wings in the Democratic party lead to nowhere.

Now, after his announcement, his immediate political goal, naturally, is to win 2018 Senatorial election.

His strategic political goal should be the formation of a strong nation-wide coalition of the progressives (mostly “outsiders”, i.e. people who are not the Democrats and not the Republicans, or at the fringes of their parties). When this coalition becomes large enough, Senator Sanders will be able to force the Democrats to follow his agenda and support his candidates by threatening that otherwise his coalition would not support the Democrats.

He also needs to find at least a couple of more independents who could run in 2018 and win the Senate races, hopefully by taking down some of the Republicans (but even if they would beat some Democrats, that would be good, too).

Having brought both – the Republicans and the Democrats – to the Senate minority, the Senate Independents (even just 4 or 5 of them) would be able to take over the Senate, meaning – over the Congress, meaning – over the Country.
Conservative Liberals – future Porgs of the political America (hopefully).


But even more importantly, America is losing a middle ground.

For example, study shows that the number of the Republicans or the Democrats who did not care if their children would marry someone from the opposite party fell from about 70% in 1958 to about 45% in 2016; on the contrary, the percentage of people who say they want their children to marry someone from the same party grew from about 30% to about 60% (https://www.voanews.com/a/mixed-political-marriages-an-issue-on-rise/3705468.html).

This is just one of the indicators which show that the political dialog has gradually changed to intercultural loathing.

When we see on TV people chanting a “work together” mantra: “Politicians in Washington must stop its petty fighting and start working together for the benefit of the whole Country” – we see people who live in a dream, who do not know the reality, sometimes because they do not want to know it.

For the last twenty years the ideological, cultural, and even emotional divide between the two major parties has only grown.

What would be the reason for them to suddenly forget all the differences and start working together?

None.

Such a reason doesn’t exist.

A politician changes his or her way of acting only when he or she feels that his or her personal political existence is at risk.

That risk does not come any more from the opposite party; for the majority of elected officials the biggest challenge comes from the same party.

Hence,

If we want to force the Democrats and the Republicans to work together, we have to create a political force strong enough to make them to fear it.

That political force should not base its actions on ideological dogmas (what the Republicans and the Democrats already do).
The new -- the third one -- political force has to act based on a reason and a common sense.

It does not have to be a party. In fact, it should be a movement open to everyone who accepts the common goals and principles of the movement.

Those common goals and principles of the movement should yet be developed, but some of them can already be set right now.

#1: “Americans first, profits second.”

Trickle-down economics is bull$#it (don't listen to me, listen to the Republicans: http://www.kansascity.com/news/politics-government/article154691724.html).

No businessman would have ever thought: “Hmm, I got 56 million dollars, now I can stop making money for myself. From now on, everything I make I will give to the government to be distributed among the citizens”.

At the best, a businessman would think: “Hmm, I got so much money, now I can start thinking about carving my name on the human history stone. I’m going to establish a charity (also helps to write off some taxes)”.

If one does not listen what the Washington Republicans say, but watches what the Washington Republicans do, one sees that the Republicans build their politics on the assumption that all people are lazy and stupid (except them, of course, and the Lords of the Money who pay them to do what they do).

Since all people are intrinsically lazy, the only way to make them work is using “a carrot and a stick”.

Since all people are stupid, they need a Leader who will tell them what to do and how to do it. And for that, the Leader can take and have whatever he wants, and it is the Leader who decides what he gives to all those lazy stupid people who he leads to their bright future.

Every registered Republican voter needs to take a look in a mirror and say: “I'm a stupid lazy person, I need a leader who will tell me what to do, and who will decide what I can have”.

Of course, no Republican would do that. Instead, a Republican voter says: “I’m for economic freedom, I’m for business entrepreneurship, I’m for independent people who are doers and creators – so, give me my highly paid job, and secure my economic well-being”.

The last sentence, despite its internal contradiction, includes the seeds of wisdom.

Saying that ALL people have to be entrepreneurs is just wrong. It is a huge exaggeration of the fact that in reality only about 10 % of the population run some kind of an enterprise (https://www.inc.com/leigh-buchanan/us-entrepreneurship-reaches-record-highs.html; or http://www.asianentrepreneur.org/how-many-people-in-the-world-are-really-entrepreneurs/).

Entrepreneurs represent a very important part of a society; they are responsible for the change (hopefully to the better, a.k.a. progress). But it does not make them any better than the rest of the people. The remaining 90 % of the population is at least equally important; those are the people who let (or don’t let) entrepreneurs make the changes they want to make.

Eliminate all the entrepreneurs, and the society will run into a stagnation (until new entrepreneurs will be born), but it will survive.

Eliminate all the regular folks, and the society will cease to exist (contradictory to the book of a Russian born writer Alisa Zinov'yevna Rosendbbaum, also known as Ayn Rand, who wrote “Atlas Shrugged” - a beloved fantasy of every conservative, a fine book, but still is a fantasy: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ayn_Rand).

A normally functioning society needs a certain number of entrepreneurs, but they just can’t form the bulk of the society. To make a society stable, to keep it away from...
chaos and anarchy, the bulk of a society has to be built from steady functioning individuals.

Checks and balances are important not just in politics; they are also important in economy.

Everyone who is not an entrepreneur needs to ask himself or herself a question: “I am not an entrepreneur. Does it make me less important individual?”

If you say “Yes” – congratulations, the Republicans brainwashed you well.

If you say “No” – congratulations, you have a potential to change the American political landscape.

If you said “No”, follow up by saying “I am an individual who lets our leaders to lead until they keep their end of our social bargain. I am ready to work hard. I will learn what I need. I will do what I have to do. In return, I need to have a stable income letting me and my family to live well above a surviving limit.”

The social bargain between those people who make the society stable (90 % of the population, let’s call them “doers”), and those people who make the society move (10% of the population, let’s call them “movers”) should be very simple:

- first, the “doers” get the resources sufficient for them to live well above a surviving limit;

- then, the “movers” can have the rest of the wealth.

This is what “Americans first, profits second” approach means.

It requires a two-step wealth distribution system.

Step one: the wealth created in the society is divided between the “doers” and the “movers”.

Step two: the rest of the wealth is divided between the “movers”.

The rules for wealth distribution have to be constantly assessed and accordingly adjusted.

The human history has known and knows many different systems of wealth distribution (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Distribution_of_wealth), and many examples of a transition from one system to another (https://aeon.co/essays/history-tells-us-where-the-wealth-gap-leads).

It is evident, that the current system of distribution of wealth in America does not work for the benefits of many Americans, and needs to be adjusted (https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-inequality/a-guide-to-statistics-on-historical-trends-in-income-inequality).

The Republican party does everything it can to fight any adjustments to the current wealth distribution system, which could decrease that part of the social wealth which goes to already rich people. The most common tactics are lying and scearing. For example, they try to scare “doers” by lying to them that if the “movers” will not get all they money they want, they will not create good jobs for “doers. “Job creators” (this is how the Republicans call “movers”) need to take as much money as they want! Only then they will be able to dispense some of that money to the working folks.

When I hear this argument, my first intention is to ask a question - should we really call people who closed more than sixty thousand factories “job creators?” I don't think so (unless, of course, we count jobs they have created in China).

Then I ponder, what would really happen if "movers” would get say 5 % less than they planned? Would they quit their job? Would they move to a different country? Well, maybe they would. But would it destroy America? I don’t think so.

I remember a colonel told me once that in the army everyone waits when a general would die, because in that case everyone below him would move one step up on the career ladder. He probably was joking. But the truth is, if our current moguls get upset with us - people - we should start looking for better moguls, for the ones who will not be so easily upset when workers start demanding to keep his end of the social bargain. And I am pretty sure, there is a long line of the potential moguls, who would
work for the less. If our current "movers" try to replace some "doers" with the ones who would do the same for less money, we - "doers" should start doing the same, we should start looking for "movers" who would do the same for less money.

The connection between tax cuts for the rich and job creation, may have even worked in the past, but has been broken for at least twenty years. Slowly but surely the Wall Street moguls had imprinted in the brains of all CEOs that there is only one criterion of the quality of their work as a CEO, and that criterion is the price of their company stock; everything else is irrelevant. The result is that all CEOs are squeezing the last penny from everything they can. All Republican's tax plans are completely in the line drawn by the Wall Street. i.e. squeezing "doers" in the favor of "movers" (hoping to get some of it, too).

The Democratic party (except its radical Sandersian wing) also does not want to make any visible changes to the current system.

The radical wing of the Democratic party does not have a solid strategy which implementation would lead to the changes in the current wealth distribution system ("be active" is not really a strategy: https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/10/spectre.html; this link has links to more posts on the matter).

That is why without a strong third political force one cannot expect any soon any serious social and economic changes.

#2: “Reason first, dogmas second”.

Whatever words we hear from around, from radio or from TV, those are just words. They are not given to us, humans, by an existential force. They are invented by other humans, and as such they are relative and challengeable.

Everything we hear/read/think/say/write is challengeable.

The words we hear may sound demeaning or uplifting, familiar or ridiculous, boring or exciting. We need to learn how to get through the emotional reaction on what we hear, and get to the meaning of it.

First, we need to understand what people are trying to tell us, and then to compare it with our own views on what we count as right or wrong, what we want to achieve or avoid.

Of course, we also need to be able to be articulate about what we count as right or wrong, and what we want to achieve or avoid.

For me, that is imprinted and implied in #1 principle: "Americans first, profits second". As an example of this approach, let's enter the debate about the federal budget and the tax code.

The federal budget is in trouble; it has a big deficit, which is growing due to healthcare and entitlement spending (in part).

The Republicans want to cut the funds for the healthcare and entitlement programs.

The Democrats want to increase taxation on the rich.

"Each action has an equally strong but opposite reaction" (in politics physics works, too), hence, a stalemate.

The reason says, that this is a case when people need to start searching for a third path.

And the third path exists.

The third path always exists; people just have to wish to start the search for it.

My suggestion is to move all the healthcare and entitlement related spending outside of the budget.

In that case there will be no problem to discuss (well, tax code still will have lots of loopholes to be fixed, but that requires a different conversation).

I do not suggest to eliminate healthcare and entitlement programs.
Of course, we have to keep them and make them effective and broadly accessible.

Of course, we will need money to pay for them.

But those money should not be regulated by the congressional or White House budgetary committee (or whatever committee regulates the budget).

Instead, the Congress needs to establish two more “federal reserves”: a “healthcare federal reserve”, and an “entitlement federal reserve”.

Each “reserve” will be run by the board of independent appointees.

Each year each board will be calculating the amount of funds needed to pay for the related spending.

Then, that amount will be distributed among “income holders” (individuals or establishments/corporations) accordingly to the equation the board will come up with.

Each “income holder” will have to send a specific amount of money directly to each “reserve”.

That individual amount of money, each “income holder” will have to send to each “reserve”, will depend on the total amount of funds the reserve will need to accumulate on an annual basis.

Hence, every year that amount of money may be different, depending on the needs of the “reserves”.

It cannot and will not be called a “tax”; it will be a “fee” every “income holder” will need to pay.

Imagine you run a big company, and you have to pay healthcare cost for your employees, and it is huge. Maybe you will begin to reaching out to insurers and hospitals and start pushing them to drop the cost down?

Imagine you run a big company, and you pay your employees so little, that they have to apply for federal help. Maybe you will begin to think about raising their wages?

Imagine you run a big company, and you have to pay a big “fee” to the “entitlement federal reserve” because many people across the Country live of unemployment benefits. Maybe you will begin to think about bringing businesses to economically depressed areas, or about helping people to get education sufficient to get a nicely paid position?

It you are a Democrat or a Republican deeply rooted in the dogmas of your party, you will not even try to ponder a possibility of such “reserves” – “it’s never gonna work; ‘that’s just bull$#!t”.

**That is why only people who reason first and keep their doctrines in a reality check can find the solutions to drastically unordinary problems of our time.**

As conservatives, those people always need to know where the money will be coming from.

As liberals, those people always need to fight for preservation of the democratic freedoms.

That is why I would call such people “Conservative Liberals” (not the other way around, because for me freedoms are above money; in that money is just one of the instruments for preserving and supporting freedoms).

Recent “Star Wars” trailer brought to us a Porg – “an adorable new Star Wars creature”.

No one really knows what it is, but everyone already loves it.

My hope is that very soon Conservative Liberals will become “political Porgs”, and then a political force.

P.S. A reader may say: “Valentin, all your explanations are limited, they do not include many important aspects”. That is absolutely correct! But **that is how a reason works.**

To understand a complicated phenomenon we always start from the **simplest model**
- as long as it grasps the essential features of the phenomenon.
Then we build on it, making it more and more accurate, by making it more and more complicated. To discuss all the aspects of the past, current, and future American politics one post would never be enough; that would require a book (but some other aspects of "what happened" and "what needs to be done" have been discussed in previous posts of this blog - see the links at http://the3dforce.blogspot.com/2017/10/spectre.html).

P.P.S. The comments I often get on Facebook tell me that the Democratic party is the one which has passed health care reform, advocates raising the minimum wage, defends Medicare and Medicaid, worker safety, etc. I assume, comments like that mean to defend the Democratic party from my criticism.

To avoid a lengthy discussion (which 9 times out of 10 does not help anyone), I usually try to forward attention to facts. One important fact is that the Democrats has lost the support of many people in the Country (i.e. they literally lost governorships, and legislations in many states); http://reason.com/blog/2016/11/14/the-2016-election-turned-more-state-legi.

Why did it happen?
A reason tells us that we can blame (a) the Republicans; (b) the Democrats, or (c) the people – there is nothing else!
Blaming people is counter constructive (plus, it does not explain why did they make the switch).
The Democrats always blame the Republicans for many bad things those did.
And that is exactly why I blame the Democrats for their losses.
The Democrats never look inward; they always look outward searching for excuses.
And that is why many people turned away from them (among other reasons). People do not like someone who always accuses others in wrongdoing, but never accepts mistakes done by him. That’s just a human psychology. As I see it, the Republicans have better consultants in human psychology than the Democrats do (President Trump is a living proof of this).

For a long time, many authors have been criticizing the two-party political system.
However, only now we see conditions for the third – possibly strong – political force to arise. And the reason for that may happen is NOT the fact that many previously enrolled people go unenrolled. The reason is that inside both major parties we see a growing divide. That may lead to formation of a large number of people who would like to keep being enrolled, but do not want to stay neither with the Republicans nor with the Democrats.
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The worst birthday gift to Senator Sanders

The worst birthday gift to Senator Sanders

Since the very first day of its existence, DraftBernie people dreamed of making Senator Sanders to officially join their “party”.

The feeling was NOT mutual.

Senator Sanders is the most popular politician in the Country, and it is clear why DraftBernie people want him.

But why would Senator Sanders want to join DraftBernie, or, for that matter, ANY OTHER PARTY?

The #1 thing people love about Senator Sanders is that he IS AN INDEPENDENT!

A real one.

The minute he joins a political party, he will become just one of many other politicians playing games with people and donors – at least in the eyes of many people in the country.

Does he see it the same way as I, and millions of people watching the politics, see it?

( the picture is from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/the-myth-of-the-impenetrable-two-party-system-the_us_599d189fe4b056057bddd83)

I do not know.

It remains to be seen.

On September 8, 2017, on the Senator Sander’s birthday, DraftBernie people prepared for him an “ambush”.

They invited Senator Sanders to their party – literally – to officially establish a new “progressive” political party (http://convergence2017.org/).

Of course, the event has been made to seem as a collaborative effort of many progressive movements, but at its core – it is same old DraftBernie people luring Senator Sanders into their crowd.
There are two main facts on which DraftBernie activists are building their arguments.
1. Many people who used to go with the Democrats do not like them any more (due to various reasons).
2. A large portion of the political population is represented by Independents. However, even within this seemingly favorable political climate, DraftBernie activists are struggling with attracting peoples’ attention. They want to build “A New Progressive Supermajority Party” (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/fork-in-the-national-road-new-progressive-supermajority_us_599af3b1e4b033e0fbdec630), but they cannot do it just by screaming out progressive ideas, and attacking the Democrats for not being progressive enough.

Hence, they are trying to push a pressure on Senator Sanders, using all the means available, including his birthday.

But what has Senator Sanders been doing all this time?
For starters, so far, he has been rejecting DraftBernie’s proposals.
Seemingly, he has been spending his energy on activating the leftists/progressive forces within the Democratic party. These actions are absolutely within his strategy he laid out in his book.
However, he cannot not see that the internal changes in the Democratic party require a very long time to happen. By the time those changes may happen, the political landscape may change.

People may turn away from the Democrats much sooner than the Democrats may be able to reform themselves.
That may significantly hinder Senator Sander’s political agenda. That is why he is looking for another way to proceed, which, so far, does not include joining any third party, despite the fact that many Americans do not like neither the Republicans, not the Democrats.

According to this poll (http://www.washingtonsblog.com/2015/09/gallup-60-of-americans-want-a-new-political-party-but-why.html) “A majority of Americans, 60%, say a third major political party is needed because the Republican and Democratic parties ‘do such a poor job’ of representing the American people.” However, the answers to any poll heavily depend on the way the questions have been framed. Reading the numbers in the way that 60 % of Americans are ready to vote for a single new party is just wrong.
The poll clearly says that at least 60 % of Americans do not like neither the Republicans nor the Democrats. But that is that.
All political “outsiders” (i.e. politically active people who do not want to affiliate themselves with any of the two major parties) currently represent a large number of small independent activists groups. They do not have a significant political power.

Of course, if all those small political groups and movements would join their forces, and coordinate their actions on every possible political scale – from towns, and cities, to states, to Washington – that could make a huge difference.

But the approach chosen by DraftBernie’s people will not work.
First, they make a big mistake in treating the Democrats as an enemy.
Second, thinking that in the near historic future a third-party Presidential candidate can win is a delusion, and the way to political power should be based on a different agenda (more on this at https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/3party.html).
What does it all mean for Senator Bernie Sanders?
One thing for sure is that he cannot join any obscure party. That would look the same like a big-league athlete (e.g. LeBron James) would join an obscure school team (e.g. Boston University). Your first thoughts would be: "Is he dying?", or "Did he lose his mind!", or "Did he join a cult?"
And it also means that to propel his political agenda, he needs to step out his comfort
zone – a political operative, and step into a new zone – as a political leader, champion, or a “messiah” (so to speak).

As the most popular politician, he has the power to converge many different groups toward himself.

But to do that, he CANNOT join any specific political party.

To do that, he has to invite everyone – every single political activist who does not want to be affiliate with the Republicans or the Democrats – to join their political forces.

Instead of stepping in DraftBernie’s party (which would be the worst birthday gift ever), Senator Sanders needs to ask everyone step toward him.

Eventually, this political activism should lead to a formal establishing of a wide coalition (more on this at www.3dForce.net).

And the Democrats need to embrace and support the formation of this political 3-d Force, because, ultimately, it will benefit their cause (https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/08/dem3df.html).

For Senator Sanders, his upcoming birthday would be a good day to make such an announcement.

That announcement would be the best birthday gift from him to the Country.
Saturday, October 21, 2017

“A spectre is haunting America – the spectre of … .”

"A spectre (a.k.a. specter, ghost, phantom) is haunting America – the spectre of socialism.

Oh, wait, there is another one!

"A spectre (a.k.a. specter, ghost, phantom) is haunting America – the spectre of dictatorship!"

Mr. Frum is a senior editor at The Atlantic and the former speechwriter for President George W. Bush. He also is an anti-Trump Republican, which makes him a smart and honest representative of the current American establishment.

I hope Mr. Frum is familiar with the origin of the phrase in the title. Here we have a fork. It feels like most people have moved on, and do not think much about the 2016 Presidential elections anymore.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Frum is not familiar with the origin of this phrase.</th>
<th>Mr. Frum is familiar with the origin of this phrase.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American establishment is less knowledgeable than I thought.</td>
<td>He may find some ideas presented in this piece useful for his future articles, which could help to attract attention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is 80% chance that within 10 years American democracy will be greatly reduced to the level similar to the one in Russia or China (a.k.a. to an autocracy). I have no idea if that would make any difference, but as people say "a hope dies the last."

There is an occasional book about what happened, but the conversation is mostly directed toward the future.

For example, recently 20 of America’s top political scientists gathered in Yale University to discuss our democracy. "They are scared.” “Nearly everyone agreed: American democracy is eroding on multiple fronts — socially, culturally, and economically.” "If current trends continue for another 20 or 30 years, democracy will be toast."

https://www.vox.com/2017/10/13/16431502/america-democracy-decline-liberalism

As I see it, that estimation is too optimistic. What we see today is the result of the processes started about 20 years ago. No one paid attention to those processes, until they have become so visible that could not be ignored anymore. So, we may have no more than five to ten years of democracy left – unless something drastic will be done.

It has to be drastic, it has to be outside of the commonly accepted political theories, because the election of Donald J. Trump as the President of the United States was a very drastic deviation from conventional political routes (drastic good, or drastic bad – that depends on one's personal perspective, but it was – beyond any doubts – drastic).
He had beaten them all: the Democrats, and the Republicans, TV pundits, and think-tank analysts, and the odds.

Outside of his campaign, no one except unnoticed few (https://michaelmoore.com/trumpwillwin/) believed that he had any chance to win. And yet, he did.

**Without having a clear understanding of why did he win, planning future political actions is just a self-serving waste of time.**

In her book “Unbelievable”, Katy Tur shows a concentrated portrait of Donald Trump during his 2016 campaign. The book screams: “How could such a person become the President?”

*My question is: “How could American elite not see the processes which had led to the election of Donald Trump?”*

Yes, for everyone living these days, all the events of the recent past are new, and fresh, and emotional, and significant.

But from a historian’s point of view, nothing happening in the U.S. is unseen and unique.

Very similar events had happened in the past in other countries, and unfortunately, often they led to dictatorial (Russia in 1920s, Germany in 1930s; https://www.forbes.com/sites/jimpowell/2013/02/05/how-dictators-come-to-power-in-a-democracy/#52c058c27ff7), or authoritarian (China in 1980s, Russia in 1990s) regimes.

The roots of all political transformations were of economical nature (more on that below).

The roots of the Trump’s Presidency are also economical.

Yes, many Trump supporters could be described as “deplorables”; i.e. racists, bigots, white supremacists, misogynists, or poorly educated.

Yes, for many Trump supporters voting for him was a payback for having eight years of the black President.

But people who lifted Trump to the victory were not from the camp of “deplorables”. Those people have been in America all along; Trump just let them feel powerful and freed them to express themselves. The fact that there are so many Americans who are openly and proudly “deplorable” was one of the shocking discoveries of the 2016 election.

People who lifted Trump to the victory were from the different camp; they were from the shrinking middle class.

Trump won because of the people who were scared of seeing the future for their children would be worse than their own present. Trump won because of the people who lost their trust in the ability or even the intention of the American elite to share its wealth with working folks.

In 2004, and in 2008, many of those people voted for Obama.

They did it in a large part because they wanted to show to the political elite that they did not want to keep the status quo, that they wanted a change. But the elite did not understand the message. Barack Obama was not able to bring any economic relief to the shrinking middle class, in a large part because of the sabotage from Congressional Republicans. The economic policies he started begin to paying back, but, naturally, Trump claims it is he who gave the boost to the economy. For regular folks, all what has been happening in the Washington D.C., looked like a mud fight. All they saw was a dysfunctional establishment.

And in 2016 the same people who already twice voted for a change, voted for an even bigger change, by throwing at the American elite a “Molotov bomb” in the form of Donald Trump (I borrowed this comparison from Michael Moor, who predicts Trump’s victory in 2020, http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/michael-moore-predicts-trump-win-election-2020-1033599). Thinking that the voters did not see what type of a person Trump was is just naive. The voters knew very well how “kinly” Trump was, but chose to ignore it, because they cared about other issues much more than about “kinkiness” of a Presidential candidate (even if the “kinliness” meant “rasic”, “bigot”, “white supremacist”, and “misogynist”; can you imagine how bad should people live, how badly should they want a change, and how low should they think about Clinton if they chose to ignore all this?).

I assume that voter suppression, gerrymandering, even Facebook ads played some role, too, but not as much as the economic downturn for millions of Americans. If they really wanted, the Democrats could have DONE something about those issues (pointing fingers and screaming “look at the bad things those evil Republicans do” is NOT doing), but they didn’t. NOW all the excuses they use sound like “if only people who did not vote for us could vote”. When I hear this, I always want to ask - what DID you do to make them vote?
For many Americans, Trump represents a new type of a "politician". But for a historian, Trump is just one of many reincarnations of a "political opportunist" (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_opportunism).

Trump is not the first American political opportunist (http://www.cambriapress.com/cambriapress.cfm?template=4&bid=392).

Trump is the first American political opportunist who succeeded.

When any political opportunist succeeds, it does not say much about him or her, because they all are essentially the same; narcissistic psychopaths.

When any political opportunist succeeds it says much more about the state of the society.

Trump is merely a thermometer exposing the social temperature of the Country;

and the reading screams "Fever!"

Is the disease curable, or lethal?

That remains to be seen.

That heavily depends on the actions the elite will be undertaking within the upcoming two to four years.

And those actions heavily depend on the actions regular folks will be undertaking within the upcoming two to four years (since so far, the democracy is alive, regular folks still have capabilities needed to put a pressure on the elite; but the time is running out).

And those actions heavily depend on the state of mind of the politically active regular folks (because a kitchen talk does not have any political influence).

One couldn't not notice how heavily I use the word "elite". That is because every country – no exceptions – is ruled by its elite. The difference is how can people enter the elite social stratum, how can they become a part of the elite. For example, in a monarchy, the elite status is preserved by blood (a.k.a. by a birth). In a dictatorship, to enter the elite, one has to "kiss the ring" of the leader of the gang, and the rank of the one is linked to the rank of his gang. In a democracy, anyone can become an elite by convincing enough people to trust him or her.

However, all elites in all times and countries have the same weakness; they tend to become a self-serving bureaucracy. Interestingly enough, that usually happens when people from a large part of the society have a relatively comfortable life, and do not pay much of attention to the everyday dealings happening between different parts of the elite. As the result, a growing gap between the self-serving interests of the elite and the everyday needs of the rest reaches the critical size, and – boom!

A revolution – of some kind.

Sometimes a revolution is bloody; sometime a revolution is "soft".

But, eventually, the old elite is being replaced by the new elite, and the history begins its next cycle.

The form of the governing after the revolution depends mostly on the cultural traditions of the country.

For example, for more than a thousand years, Russian people always ended up installing a new Tsar (a.k.a. an emperor; a.k.a. a king). A Tsar has to be smart, and kind, and fair, and make people feel good about themselves and the country. As long as the Tsar is smart, and kind, and fair, he can rule with an "iron fist".

Will American democracy survive the challenges brought on her and on the whole world by the globalization, rise of rival economic powers, robotisation, technological advances, climate and demographic changes?

I would give a 50–50 chance to it to happen.

But, as you can see, I'm trying to tilt the chances into the favor of the Democracy.

And for me, random actions do not make any sense, but reasonable actions need to be based on a reason – that is why we call them "reasonable".

My reasoning tells me not to count on the Republicans.

The strongest and growing movement within the Republican party is represented by Stephen K. Bannon. He is an anti-establishment politician; his economic agenda is actually not much different from the Bernie Sanders's agenda – tax on the rich, leave trade agreements; but he wants that all the economic benefits went only to the American whites. And since the whites comprise the bulk of the shrinking American middle class, Bannon's ideas of economic nationalism find a broad acceptance outside and within of the Republican party. Naturally,
economic nationalism does not necessarily require sustainable functioning of the democratic institutions; on the contrary, democratic institutions represent an obstacle on the way to the new economic regime. A democracy is deeply rooted in pluralism, but for the economic nationalism to succeed, only one philosophical system should dominate in the politics – the Bannon’s one. Essentially, the Bannon’s Republicans want to follow the steps of Vladimir Putin in adopting the Chinese approach to the political and economic structure of the Country.

My reasoning also tells me not to count on the Democrats.

The main reason is that the Democrats have lost the trust of the large part of the working (and voting) middle-class Americans, and they do not do much to regain this trust. For about two decades the liberals of all kind have been talking to each other about how great they are, how progressive their ideas are, seeking the attention of liberally inclined moguls, and turning their back on the middle class.

And now the middle-class Americans had shown the Democrats the middle finger. Plus, the Democratic establishment is deep in the internal struggle for the control over the party. This situation will last for years to come. As the result of the internal chaos, the Democratic party will not be able to form a unified front to fight the Republicans. And the weakening of the Democratic party will inevitably lead to the weakening of the Democratic institutions.

The Republicans are attacking the Democracy, the Democrats are not capable of building a strong opposition.

That is why many people turned to the search for the third political power, which could at least mitigate the strength of the Republicans, and the impotency of the Democrats.

The leading candidate for this third political power is Senator Bernie Sanders. Half a Democrat and half an Independent; for some people he represents the force for reforming the Democratic party, and for others he is the father of the future third political party. In reality, he is neither. In reality, Bernie Sanders is a manifestation of the “Buridan’s ass” (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Buridan%27s_ass); his political position is not dual, it is ambiguous. He will not be able to seat forever on two chairs; deeper into 2018 election season he will have to make the decision – will he run again as an Independent, or he will remain to be a Democrat. It would be better for him and for everyone else if he would make this decision as soon as possible.

I am not so smart to figure out everything on my own; that is why I read what other people say about things.

No matter what decision will Senator Sanders make, he will remain a strong political figure with millions of followers. So, I’d read his latest book “Guide to Political Revolution”.

First thing to say – this is not a guide.

A guide, like a manual (IKEA manuals would be a good example of a guide), describes specific steps which have to be done in order to achieve the specific goal starting from the specific initial state.

I know about one person who wrote a guide to a political revolution (which I read) and who eventually used that guide to make a revolution to happen. That person was Vladimir Lenin, who wrote (among other books) “What is to be done?” (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/What_Is_To_Be.Done%3F). Senator Sander’s book is more of a description of “what is to be built”, i.e. what society do we want. His book is more like “The Manifesto”; “A spectre is haunting America – the spectre of socialism” (http://marxist.net/marx/index.html).

Senator Sander’s book provides a clear and concentrated description of what is wrong with the current state of the Country, and how did the Country come to it. I strongly recommend to read the book.

In short, it tells us that some time ago Americans had a good and comfortable life. When people are happy, they are relaxed and do not pay attention to politics. That was the time when the financial elite of America has pushed of the political throne the manufacturing elite of America. Wall Street businessmen were making big money and they wanted to make even more. So, they said to the politicians: “Hey we could make even more money and you could do it with us, if we had more freedom and less regulations”. And both parties said: “Great! Let’s deregulate financial speculations!” Then Wall Street businessmen said to the politicians: “Hey, we could make even more money, and you could do it with us, if we could move the money between the countries freely and quickly.” And both parties said: “Great! Let’s sign trade agreements! (let’s call them about trade, but make them about money)”. And just like that, slowly but surely, American elite refocused its efforts from making money of making things, to making money of making money.

The Federal Reserve was printing dollars. The Wall Street was printing stocks. Abracadabra, and
all those papers settled down in the volts of banks and hedge funds. In the meantime, sixty thousand factories across America were closed (http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2017/mar/24/donald-trump/trump-china-joined-wto-us-has-lost-60000-factories/).

The collateral damage of “a profit trumps everything” approach is a gradual and broad decline in the quality of products and services (due to “good but expensive” is being replaced by “cheap but OK-ish”).

When a stock market was invented, one would buy a stock in order to “loan” money to a company, and in exchange to have a continues return in the form of a portion of the company’s profit (usually on an annual basis). Overtime, the return would reach the amount of the “loan”, and from that time the stock would bring to the owner a pure profit.

Today stocks have become a tool for financial speculations. When a company offers its stock, the hope and the main goal is that the price of the stock will rapidly increase. In that case the owners could sell it and make a profit. But why would the price of a stock go up? The only reason for that to happen is when many people would like to buy it. But why would many people want to buy a stock? Because they hope is that the price of the stock will rise. But why would the price of a stock go up? Because many more people would like to buy it. But ... Etc. Etc.

Do you see the pattern?

People buy a stock, because they expect more people to buy the stock, because they expect more people to buy the stock. This is exactly how a financial pyramid, or a Ponzi scheme, works. And that is how the Wall Street have become operating. To keep operating in this regime the Wall Street does not need Democracy. Democracy requires openness; but neither Wall Street businessmen, nor Washington politicians want people to know about their symbiotic relationship.

In general, any big business is the opposite of a democracy. In a big business people do not use “one person – one vote” rule; they use “one dollar – one vote” rule instead. In a big business people with money do not install checks and balances; they install a “king” (a.k.a. CEO) whose job is to make everyone richer and for that must rule the company with an “iron fist” (https://www.vox.com/the-big-idea/2017/7/17/15973478/bosses‑dictators‑workplace‑rights‑free‑markets‑unions). History has been demonstrating again and again that big business and dictatorship can live together (don’t want to dig into history? Look at contemporary China!).

Sander’s book helps to unite people around a vision of the future, but does not tell us how to get from here to there (except a standard call – be active).

And he is not the only one who wants to form a sort of a movement different from the two major parties.

One such movement is represented by the backers of the independent voters, http://independentvoting.org/ – the saddest people in politics. For more than twenty years the Independent Voters have been waving a flag and calling on the voters: “Join us, we better than the Republicans or the Democrats!” And every time the voters said: “Nah, we are independents, but we better vote for a big party”.

In her recent opinion piece, the leader of the Independent Voters Jacqueline Salt writes about the drop in the number of enrolled Republicans and Democrats, and takes it as a good sign for the independents (http://www.kansascity.com/opinion/readers-opinion/guest-commentary/article178807951.html).

She seems willingly ignores the huge difference between being enrolled/unenrolled and casting a vote.

In 2016 elections the number of enrolled Republicans or Democrats was irrelevant. The Democrats presented their candidate, the Republicans presented their, and then independent voters made their selection.

I expect to observe the same behavior at least two or three more election cycles.

And everyone who says that this behavior is new is naïve, delusional, or a liar.

Let’s take, for example, the statistics of 2000 Bush – Gore debacle; https://transition.fec.gov/pubrec/fe2000/tcontents.htm:

Bush and Gore had gotten almost identical number of votes. But who made the difference in the final count?

Roper Center for Public Opinion Research (https://ropercenter.cornell.edu/polls/us-elections/how-groups-voted/how-groups-voted-2000/) give us the answer:
It is not unexpected that the majority of the Democrats voted for a democrat, and the majority of the Republicans voted for a republican. But, as we can see, it was independent voters who selected/elected the President. We also see that neither the Democrats nor the Republicans could not make any difference, but the independents could choose any of the two major candidates (if they would have decided not to vote for Nader).

The same pattern we saw in 2016, and the same pattern we will see in 2020, and 2024.

**Counting on a third-party candidate is just not smart.**

It is uplifting, dreamy, emotionally charging – but not smart.

Which means, we cannot count also on any third-party movement – like, Draft Bernie, Progressive Independents, Socialists (of all kind), and other (for the in-depth discussion of the role of the third political party, please follow to: [http://the3dforce.blogspot.com/2017/04/3dparty.html](http://the3dforce.blogspot.com/2017/04/3dparty.html)).

Those movements are (a) young – that implies “not smart” (otherwise they would not be gearing up for a third-party president); and (b) narcissistic – that means, they do not want to join any other movement, but they want every other movement would join them (in complete accordance with the description given by Vladimir Lenin in 1920 in book “Left-Wing” Communism: An Infantile Disorder” [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%22Left-Wing%22_Communism:_An_Infantile_Disorder], just replace word “Communism” by word “Sandersnism”)

The immediate goal of each group is to “enroll” Bernie Sanders and use him as a flag. They dream that Bernie Sanders would run in 2020 as the member of their third party, and that would make their party “the first”!

Mark my words, if Senator Sanders will run in 2020 he will do it as an Independent.

The saddest feature of the current political reality is that none of the democratic, liberal, or progressive movements, groups, parties is talking to the people who elected Donald Trump. All those groups fight for the same people – people who have already shown that they tend to align with a progressive agenda, people who followed Bernie Sanders, people who voted for the third-party candidates. Simple saying, all those progressive groups fight for people who did not vote for Trump. People who voted for Trump have been forgotten once again.

Some political “genius” coined for Trump term “Forgotten Americans”. Those forgotten Americans did not go to Trump’s rallies; they just quietly came to the voting booths and made him the President. Those people have been forgotten by the elite, including the progressives [https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/the-forgotten-american_us_5b2225bf4e4b044827a7950f], and still is being forgotten by the same elite, including the same progressives.
Progressive activists, authors, TV personalities, analysts, passionately tell to each other how awful Trump is, how bad the Republicans are, how dangerous is their agenda. But all that passion will not make any difference, because people who will again vote for Trump do not watch, listen or read a word coming out from the progressives, or even if they occasionally do, those words do not resonate with them.

Imagine a person who has not been eating for a long time anything but little of bread and water. Promising this person anchovies and chocolate is not just silly, it is mean.

Similarly, if someone had a respectable life, a good job and lost it, and then for years was barely making a living off unemployment benefits, telling to the one about the climate, or college education is just – not wise. The one will quietly listen to you making your passionate speech, will not say anything, give you a shrug, and will vote for Trump.

Everything Trump promised to his voters was bull $#it.

But that bull $#it worked for him because the Democrats had nothing specific, realistic, and convincing to make a counteroffer to people who desperately needed it.

And still don’t.

So.

Is the American Democracy doomed?

What must be done to save it?

Can anything be done?

In the venue of the traditional politics– nothing.

An extraordinary problem just cannot be solved by ordinary means.

Constructing the solution of an extraordinary problem requires a deviation from well-established ideas.

For instance, the first step toward taking America back to normal is to accept the fact that the current state of the Country is not normal.

Then to accept the fact that Trump’s victory is not a random fluctuation.

And then to accept the fact that the next American President will not be coming from any third political party (including independents), but will be selected by the voters who are not enrolled in any of the two major political parties.

You want to do politics but do not accept the three premises above?

Fine; suite yourself, but don’t try to involve me in your actions, I have no time for a self-serving political play.

You agree with the three premises above?

Great!

Let’s try to find more like us, and start talking.

We have a lot to talk about.

And fast.

Because we need to be prepared to 2018 elections, to use them as a test run, to see how things are, who is who, what we can and cannot do.

Of course, we need our platform, but first we need to meet.

Of course, we need specific goals, but first we need to talk.

“A spectre is haunting America – the spectre of the Third Force.”

I have a library of publications and open to questions, suggestions, and critique.

P.S. I am not a Marxists, but at the time I had to read some of the literature as a requirement for getting my physics degree. I also think that people who want to make a revolution should be familiar with the work of people who actually succeeded in making revolutions, in the same way people who go into business read books written by former and current business leaders.

P.P.S. Clearly, English is not my native language, but I hope that does not make my writing unreadable.

P.P.P.S. Until 11/08/2016 I was not writing any political pieces, it all started after that day.

P.P.P.P.S. A reader may say: “Valentin, all your explanations are limited, they do not include many important aspects”. That is absolutely correct! But that is how a reason works.

To understand a complicated phenomenon we always start from the simplest model.
- as long as it grasps the essential features of the phenomenon.
Then we build on it, making it more and more accurate, by making it more and more complicated. To discuss all the aspects of the past, current, and future American politics one post would never be enough; that would require a book (but some other aspects of "what happened" and "what needs to be done" have been discussed in previous posts of this blog - see the links below).

P.P.P.P.P.S. The comments I often get on Facebook tell me that the Democratic party is the one which has passed health care reform, advocates raising the minimum wage, defends Medicare and Medicaid, worker safety, etc. I assume, comments like that mean to defend the Democratic party from my criticism.

To avoid a lengthy discussion (which 9 times out of 10 does not help anyone), I usually try to forward attention to facts. One important fact is that the Democrats has lost the support of many people in the Country (i.e. they literally lost governorships, and legislations in many states): http://reason.com/blog/2016/11/14/the-2016-election-turned-more-state-legi.

The story is the same across the map. Republicans now control both legislative chambers in 32 states, up from 30 before last week’s election. As recently as 2010, Republicans controlled as few as 14 states.

Why did it happen?
A reason tells us that we can blame (a) the Republicans; (b) the Democrats, or (c) the people – there is nothing else!
Blaming people is counter constructive (plus, it does not explain why did they make the switch).
The Democrats always blame the Republicans for many bad things those did.
And that is exactly why I blame the Democrats for their losses.
The Democrats never look inward; they always look outward searching for excuses. And that is why many people turned away from them (among other reasons). People do not like someone who always accuses others in wrongdoing, but never accepts mistakes done by him. That’s just a human psychology. As I see it, the Republicans have better consultants in human psychology than the Democrats do (President Trump is a living proof of this).

For a long time, many authors have been criticizing the two-party political system. However, only now we see conditions for the third – possibly strong – political force to arise. And the reason for that may happen is NOT the fact that many previously enrolled people go unenrolled. The reason is that inside both major parties we see a growing divide. That may lead to formation of a large number of people who would like to keep being enrolled, but do not want to stay neither with the Republicans nor with the Democrats.

The Manifesto of The 3d Force Movement

Join The Campaign!

Conservative Liberals– future Porgs of the political America.
Scott Greer’s Terrible understanding of John Oliver’s piece on slavery.
Make America Whole Again! The 3-D Force in politics.
Sorry, it is a long post, but nothing related to beating Trump is trivial, hence not easy or short.
The central point of the post is simple: every politically active progressive person needs to make a choice in 2018 and later, what is more important, "Bringing Democrats in Congress to the majority" or "Bringing Republicans in Congress to the minority"? Because "Bringing Republicans in Congress to the minority" is NOT the same as "Bringing Democrats in Congress to the majority". Hence, these two different goals will require two different political strategies.
In particular, for "Bringing Republicans in Congress to the minority" the creation of the third political party may play a crucial role.

There is almost nothing in the world that is absolutely good, or absolutely bad. Even poison can heal when used in small doses. I see at least one positive outcome from the Clinton's loss. Imagine that for a long period of time your stomach was giving you some issues: dull pain, gases, and eventually your doctor sent you to do CT scan. Turned out, you have a gastritis. However, the scan also captured some parts of your lungs. Turned out you also have an early stage of a lung cancer. Who knows how late could it be to catch the cancer if your stomach would not force you to get to the scanner. Now, at least, you have a good chance to treat it. A year or two without catching it up, and it could have been too late.
During his election campaign Donald Trump was like that gastritis; worrisome, aching, but not deadly dangerous. The Election Day was like a CT scan, which showed that the problems were - and are - actually much more serious than almost everybody thought.

This knowledge IS the positive outcome from the Clinton's loss. Hopefully, "the cancer" has not yet metastasized all over the "body". But it is clear that (a) we need a deep and serious analysis of all the reasons for the Trump's victory; and (b) the strategy to beat Trump's troops in 2018 and 2020 cannot be based just on the hope that people would eventually see how bad Trump is ("Trump is BAD" strategy did not lead Hilary Clinton to the victory; https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/clinton.html); that strategy needs to be based on a drastic revision of all previously "obvious" knowledge about politics and approaches to do the politics.

I want to start from this question: what do all these people: Deborah Wasserman-Schultz, Donna Brazile, Barack Obama, Vladimir Putin, Steve Bannon, Gary Johnson, Jill Stein – have in common?

They all helped (differently, of course!) Donald Trump to become the President.
I can feel the wave of resentment! How could I say that Obama helped Trump?! Please, calm down. I have my reasons to say what I just said. You do not have to agree with my reasons, but it could be useful to see the logic my reasons are based on.
Deborah Wasserman-Schultz and Donna Brazile pushed for the wrong candidate, even when they needed to remain neutral.
Barack Obama has disengaged from the internal party politics he was too neutral (even when Clintons pushed Biden out).
Vladimir Putin created a massive cyber force specifically designed to help Trump to win.
Steve Bannon designed the strategy for mass brainwashing and mind manipulation (which was and still is literally a copy of a KGB/FSB/GRU playbook on disinformation, just Google “disinformation”, or read memoirs of Ion Mihai Pacepa).

Gary Johnson and Jill Stein took votes away from Hillary Clinton (for example, read http://www.msnbc.com/rachel-maddow-show/third-party-voters-played-key-role-election-results).

If those Americans who voted for Gary Johnson or Jill Stein would be voting Democratic, Hillary Clinton would win (for better or worse – that is a different discussion).

The last fact should present a pivot point for all contemporary political strategists.

Imagine, that two or three weeks before the election day, both, Gary Johnson and Jill Stein, would went on TV and said to their followers: “People, we understand your frustration with both major parties and both major candidates. We are grateful to you for your support. This election comes at the critical moment in the history of our Country. The result of this election will shape the Country for decades to come. We are realists, and we see that we have no chance to win. And the polls show that the election will be very close, practically unpredictable. That is why we decided to step down, to withdraw our candidacy, and we urge everyone of you to vote for Hillary Clinton”.

There are no “backdoors” in history, but I am positive that if Gary Johnson and Jill Stein would do that, they would swing the victory to Hillary Clinton. Unfortunately (from my point of view) both, Gary Johnson and Jill Stein, were too egoistic to withdraw from the race and held their own ego above the needs of the Country (exactly like Hillary Clinton).

Or, maybe, they both were just politically ignorant to understand the true role a third party should play in a complicated political system.

A case of a third party is a classic case of a coexistence of two large and one small political systems.

For example, when a small country fears that a large neighboring country could invade it, it seeks a coalition with another large country, which has interests opposite to the first one. History has numerous examples of such coalitions; the latest one is the NATO (“small Europe” has a coalition with “big America” to be guarded from “big Russia”).

In politics, however, small parties may play a crucial role and be a decisive political force. It is just a matter of (a) having a democracy, (b) math, and (c) willingness to suppress the own ego and provide a political support to a competitor (if it comes to that).

Imagine, that some fictional country has a parliament with one hundred seats in it. After a general election two large parties have 44 seats and 41 seats (so, 85 together), and a third party has the rest. For a third party to have only 15 seats is denial. But without those votes (at least 7, or 10 to bring the total to 51) no bill can be approved, no law can pass, because neither of the large parties has a majority. That situation will force the other two parties to seek a coalition or at least a temporary agreement with the third one, even if the third party is very small. This situation will make the third party a decision maker, or at least a decision broker. For the large parties the existence of a third party gives them an opportunity to save their faces in front of their constituencies: “We did not give in to the adversaries, to get things done we forgave a compromise using our friends from “the party #3”.

According to a short article from 2011 https://www.good.is/infographics/infographic-what-congress-would-look-like-if-it-really-represented-america-46% of the U.S. voters regularly vote mostly democratic, 41% always vote for republicans, it leaves 15% of voters who basically make their mind on the election day (see the introductory picture). Time goes, but this divide only sharpens and is expected to last for a decade or more.

Clearly, the elections are won by those 15 % of voters who do not see themselves neither as democrats nor as republicans, but swing the power toward one or another depending on (… long talk). But major parties understand it. Both major parties now are regrouping the forces hoping to attract in 201, and 2020 the votes of those unenrolled voters. However, the Democratic Party has a serious image problem, and a difficult internal struggle. There is a high probability that the Democratic Party will not be able to solve both those problems in time for the next elections.

The “three party situation” is very well known in the history of the European politics. You can Google “the politics of coalition” and see how many books and papers have been written on this topic. However, the first thing you would notice is that all the top books are written about England, Germany, Europe in general, Brazil, India, and almost none about the American politics (for example, look up books by Michael Laver, Norman Schofield).

The first listed paper related to the American politics addresses the issue of coalitions between African-American and liberal political movements; but there is nothing on the Congressional or Presidential elections.

If you Google “what is the role of a third party?”, you find that third parties are “forcing major political parties to address new issues they might not have previously addressed very much”, and “third party candidates can also greatly impact an election by taking away votes from one of the major political party candidates” (that we already know!). And every source also tells us that in the foreseeable future it is very unlikely that in America a third-party candidate would win the Presidential elections.

But that is exactly what a small third party does NOT even need to fight for!

The main goal of a small third party should NEVER be winning the Presidential elections (people need to be realistic). If the party IS small, trying to win the Presidential elections only demonstrates that party members and leaders are delusional (or ignorant, or arrogant, or egoistic).

The number one goal of a small third party should be preventing opposition from gaining seats.

Where?
Anywhere!
Everywhere!
And, if possible, if it is realistic, to promote its own candidates into political power.

The most important goal for an American small party (especially in 2016) should be taking in the Congress seats from Republicans; making Republican party to be the Congress minority.

Ideally, those seats lost by Republicans would be taken by the third party candidates, but this goal is secondary (more on that in a couple of paragraphs).

There is no doubt in my mind, that the current party line division will be a long-lasting fact of our political reality (at least one or two decades). That is exactly why a small political party has a very good opportunity to make a very big difference. When the two major parties will not have the majority in the Congress, and will not be able to find a compromise, the third-party caucus will become a mediator, a bridge builder, a deal maker.

In my eyes, Libertarians and “Greens” had compromised themselves by not helping Clinton to win. Other existing parties have no influence on politics.

That means, that a third party, which will play the role a third party needs to play in politics, has to be developed from a scratch.
What do we need from the upcoming first truly third political party?
I can answer this question only from my personal point of view.

I am a pragmatic and a liberal, hence I am a pragmatic liberal. My philosophy is “pragmatic liberalism” (which means, I just use the best parts from all major philosophies). I believe in individual freedoms. But I also value the role of the Government. I consider myself smart, educated, honest, and active man, and among thousands of my former and current students and colleagues there is none who would call me a stupid, ignorant, lying, or passive person. (https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/03/dusk.html). That is exactly what I also want to see in the members of the first truly third party.

The party needs to value openness and honesty. That includes (a) having disclosed all the sources of the financial support; and (b) having rejected any private influence from any large donor.

The party has to refuse the use of any brainwashing and mind manipulating techniques. So, when I would be listening to any party member, I would know that I could trust him or her.

The political goals of the party have to be:
(a) fighting for the fairness for all,
(b) no person can build his or her prosperity by exploiting other people,
(c) establishing social and political mechanisms which will allow every American to succeed in his or her pursuit of happiness,
(d) the continuous improvement of work and living conditions for all American.

Here comes the pragmatic part.

Every politician will quickly submit his or her name to these goals. But pragmatic liberals should establish clear and measurable criteria for every important aspect of those work and living conditions the party pledges to continually improve; the fairness for all has to be measurable – and measurable using the same standards for all!

“Restore the American promise!”
“Make America fair for ALL!”
“Fairness should not depend on wealth!”
“Bring back American values!”
“Same Constitution for ALL!”
“Politics for people is politics without lying!”
“Do not trust angry yellers, rely on your common sense!”
“Democracy is the goal. The party is just an instrument!”
“Progressives, stop talking about what to do. Start doing!”
“Abolish economic slavery!”
“The rich bent the rules, we will bend them back!”
“Share wealth fairly!”

Due to the limitation on the size of this paper, I will give here only one example of a pragmatic approach to the politics.

Democrats are very proud of the various regulations they had put in place to make the environment clearer. Republicans claim that those regulations “kill American jobs”.

Do we need clean air and water to live a happy healthy life? Of course! Hence, the logic tells us, we need to regulate pollution and other aspects of human effects on the environment. Do those regulations affect macro and micro economics? Of course! However, do we know the exact cost of that effect? No. But more importantly, we don’t even know what do small business owners hate the most about regulations?

Based on listening to various conversations of “experts” and “pundits”, my impression is that the majority of small business owners do not see regulations as a big financial drag. So, why do they hate them? Many small business owners hate regulations because they have to spend a lot of time to fill up various paperwork to prove that they do not do anything bad; and that paperwork has to be approved in many places, and it all takes a lot of time.

I have no specific data on this matter, because there are NO data! No one has researched the actual relationship between small business owners and federal regulations (which means that all the stamens on the issue have no logical foundation and based solely on ideological dogmas).

Everything I said about regulations is purely my personal assessment. But based on this assessment, a smart pragmatic politician should say: “Ok, there are two most important variables in this case – money, and time. Let’s design – together with businesses – and conduct a research on how much time and money do our regulations cost to businesses.” And I am pretty sure that if the government would ask businesses to help them to design a simple and efficient technology which would allow small business owners to be in compliance with existing regulations without spending huge amount of time, many of them would be much less inclined against regulations per se.

When I look at the current political landscape, I see that the Country is finally ready to accept the first truly third political party.

This year (2017) should be the year when potential members would begin forming a movement. The movement should have a simple but memorable name – I personally love names like “The First Third American Party”, or “Pragmatic Liberals”. During this period members of the movement can keep all their current party affiliations.

The next year should become the critical for the movement/party. The first decision to make will be to still remain being a movement, or to register an actual political party. No matter what decision will be made in 2018, movement or party members will need to participate in all available races.

However, the quality of the members will have much more importance on the results of those races than the quantity.

When a pragmatic liberal candidate will be in clear lead in a race, he or she becomes an active governing figure. However, in cases when a pragmatic liberal candidate has no chance of winning, two or three weeks before the Election Day he or she should call on the supporters to give their votes to . . . – well, this choice will require a judgment call. In this case, members of the party will have to calmly and logically analyze pros and cons of each remaining candidates and make the decision solely from the point of view of who will serve the Country better (I would expect that 99 % the third party would support the Democrat, or the Democrats would support the third party candidate). Building up political coalition should become one of the tools in the toolbox of the first truly third political party.

American people are smart, and given the right choice they will support the party built on honesty and openness, and managed by the people and for the people. Statistics also shows that the Congress does not reflect the
current demographic, economic, and ethnic distribution of Americans, and the political room for an active third party does exist (http://visual.ly/not-my-beautiful-house). The future of the Country needs to be in the hands of smart, educated, honest, and active pragmatic liberals. Becoming the decision brokers will be only the first stage of the party development. With the growth of the party the time will come when the third-party candidate will finally have a real shot for becoming the President of the United States of America.

How should this type of party be created?

I think, it should start from small local formations, "clubs", united by (a) the goal of bringing Congress Republicans to the minority; and (b) believing in the role the third political part has to play in politics (decision brokering).

It would help to have a charismatic leader (Bernie Sanders??!).

When he or she will get traction in the media, people will direct more and more of their attention to the party. Today Bernie Sanders' political group "Our Revolution" (https://ourrevolution.com/) presents the closest approximation to the first truly third political party. However until this movement remains inside the Democratic Party, it will not be able to attract moderate Republicans and "radical" independent (who would never vote for Democrats).

The "Our Revolution" movement offers a very inspirational platform, no doubts about that. But if 2016 taught us anything, it is that there is a big difference between saying all the right words, and being able to deliver, being able to win. In order to win, a social group needs to use a right political mechanism. The Democratic Party is at the edge of making serious changes in the way it functions.

In 2016 Clinton's "clique" forced all prospective presidential candidates to step away (even Biden!). If it wasn't for independent Bernie Sanders, Democrats would not even had a contest. Then, the same "clique" stacked the deck against Sanders. And now they want to "unite" the party, meaning, making Sanders' supporters to agree with the views imposed by rich donors. Clearly, the Democratic Party has two very different factions. One faction represents people who believe that if it was not for KGB/FCB/GRU and FBI Hillary Clinton would win. This faction has no nationally recognized democrats who would be brave enough to stand up against Clintons. Sanders' supporters will never agree with Clintons' views, but many of them are afraid of leaving the party. As the result, we will be seeing long internal arguing, which will keep the party weak. Democrats want to hit Republicans with a fist, but due to internal squabbling all they will be able to produce is a slap (at the best).

If "progressive" Democrats would leave "regular" Democrats; each of the two new parties would be able to make a flat to hit Republicans. The new small party would be able to attract people who did not vote and will not for Clinton or Clinton-akike "establishment" candidates (because they know that her ego goes ahead of everything else; and because they do not want to vote for people backed by reached donors). The remaining Democratic Party will be able to concentrate on fighting Republicans using means which would not repulse large donors. But - and this is very important - these two parties will NOT be enemies (like "Draft Bernie" people v. Democrats; https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/DRAFT.html). These two parties are allies! (at least for a foreseeable future) They have a mutual enemy - Republicans!

When elections happen, they will present their own candidates. But they will need to make a pact; three weeks before the voting day, whichever candidate gets more traction, that candidate will get the full support of the both parties.

This is the best strategy to beat Republicans in 2018 and 2020.

********

Some old post on the matter:

Bye-Bye The Pathetic Democratic Party! (one way or another)
Liberals! Stop living in a bubble!
What is wrong with being "neutral journalist"
Who will be the real President of the United States?
Statement of Massachusetts Democratic Committee.
Why did Hillary Clinton Lose the Race?
What Could Liberals Learn From Physics?
Intellectual stagnation, social conformism, and the crisis of logical communication.
Liberals, stop whining!
American Republicans are just Russian Bolsheviks!
The election is just over. What's now?
To everyone who has been emotionally attacked, called names, threatened, verbally degraded!
"A failure of imagination" has lead to 11/08/2016.
Were Democrats Doomed, or There Was a Path to The Victory, and Does It Still Exist?
A mob revolution

To Nancy Pelosi

Posted by Valentin Voroshilov at 5:18 PM

Reactions: funny (0) interesting (0) cool (0)
Are the political parties usable? That is a loaded question

some thoughts on
http://independentvoting.org/national-conference-call/
I wonder what was the logic behind the question for the call.
The history of politics has demonstrated a simple fact: there are different governing structures (check the CIA: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2128.html; or just read
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Forms_of_government - textbook on political history would be better, but wikipedia is better than nothing).
The next fact: different governing structures are based on different distribution of mass involvement.
The third fact: a democracy is based on wide involvement of the masses into the decisions making process; no mass involvement - no democracy.
The forth fact: to present their power the masses form groups based on the similarity of their interests - how do you want to call those groups - parties, or something else - it is irrelevant.
Mechanics (technical methods) for group formation may be different, but in the end, the bigger is a social support and people representation of a group, the more it has political power, meaning, the more influence it has on a decision-making process.
Those all are very well known and long time ago established FACTS - denying those as facts is not different from denying the existence of the correlation between the climate change the human activities.
Asking "are the political parties usable?" demonstrates either (1) political infantilism; or (2) the intention to manipulate people into doing something - here I start wondering - into what?
Hi, fellow 3d-party-er or Independent!

For many decades, people have been telling you – “You are a joke; you will never have a political power”.

**I believe the time has come to prove all those people wrong.**

I believe the time has come to all 3d-partiers and active Independents to finally rise up, and seize the real political power.

Everyone who does not trust neither the Republicans nor the Democrats in their ability to govern our Country is one of us!

We all may have different reasons for that.
Based on the 2016 elections, and the following events, I believe that – at least in Washington – most Republicans are generally smart but evil, and Democrats are generally nice but stupid (or dumb, or choose whatever word you prefer to describe their inability to think).

**And both parties are in the pocket of big money.**

And I believe, that there are millions and millions of people, who see the things the same way.

If you truly believe that neither the Republicans nor the Democrats can navigate the country in the right direction -

**this is your time!**

This is our time!

**America is much MORE than Republicans and Democrats!**

We are ready to become an actual political force – **the third force!**

We are ready to become an actual political movement.

But first, we need to agree on the basic principles of our movement.

**1. We need to agree that not now, nor in foreseeable future, there will be no third-party president.**

We have to be reasonable.

We have to be pragmatic.

The presidency is *not* our immediate goal.

**2. If the presidency is not our goal, how else would we gain political power?**

The answer to this question may seem counterproductive.

But it will work!

**We need to gain such a number of seats that neither the Republicans nor the Democrats would have the majority of votes.**

Currently the House of Representative is split between 241 Republicans and 194 Democrats; and the Senate is split between 52 Republicans and 48 Democrats.

**Our first goal is to take down 3 (!) Republican senators.**

Hence, we have to participate in the upcoming 2018 elections.

Where?

Well – ideally, everywhere!
Our candidates will have to run in *every possible election.*

We do not have to win all of them.

We need to win just enough to make both – the Republicans and the Democrats – the minority in the Senate; in the House, and in as many legislative bodies as possible.

That will make us – the 3d-forcers (i.e. 3d-partiers and active Independents) – decision brokers.

**That will make us decision makers.**

Not a single decision will be able to pass without our vote, without our approval.

The representatives from both parties will have to talk to us, **and we will make them talk to each other!**

We will act like that family mediator who makes a husband and a wife to finally agree on something (you can choose who is who in this analogy).

For at least a decade, American people have been calling on the both parties in Washington to stop fighting and to start working together for the benefits of the whole America.

Unfortunately, it has not happened.

I am absolutely convinced, that there is no chance of seeing the Republicans and the Democrats working together – *unless the third strong political force will make them (!);* unless the third strong political force will scare them.

3. To follow this strategy, we – the 3d-force members – should present our candidates against the Republicans and the Democrats (to test and to show the force) in *all possible elections.*

Even if our candidate will not be getting enough voices to win the election, we still will be presenting a strong political power by attracting the voters who do not want to give their votes to neither out of the two major parties!

Imagine, that two or three weeks before November 8th, Jill Stein and Gary Johnson would say to their followers: “I know, I will not be the President of the United States. And I vow to you, that the fate of my country is much more important than my personal fate. That is why today I end my run, and I ask all of you – my fellow supporters – to vote for Hillary Clinton”.

I have no doubt that in this scenario Hillary Clinton would have become the president.

Those few million votes would be enough to change the course of the election.

And we can use this strategy **for every future election.**

We may not be able to say any time soon – “The 3d-force gave to the Country the President”.

**But we will be able to say very soon – “The 3d-force made the Country’s President”!**

4. My next statement may seem contradicting everything I just said before.

But it is not.

**At this point in the history, we don't even need** to launch a new additional party.
We already have so many of them!
We already have millions of people, who do not want to affiliate themselves neither with the Republicans nor with the Democrats.

**We just need to join our forces – all 3d-parties’ members and all independents who want to actively participate in politics (not just vote on the election day) should form a movement.**

We need to establish the Massachusetts 3d-parties and Independents Coalition.

We need to reach out to all other states and to institute the American 3d-parties and Independents Coalition.

5. Our platform should unite people around the core principles this Country was founded on.

It is not right, when people have to work 60 – 80 hours a week, and still live from a paycheck to a paycheck, barely making a living.

It is not right, when people cannot afford a medication which would let them have active and accomplished life.

It is not right, when the job market shrinks, but at the same time the same few people get richer and richer, and the rest of the country gets closer and closer to the poverty.

It is not right, when having a good education means diving into the debt hole till the rest of the life.

We are against of elitism and extremism in any form.

We truly believe that “All men are created equal”.

Our platform should be simple but sound.

**Restore the American Promise!**

**Make America Fair for All!**

**Take Lying Out of Politics!**

**When Rich Bend Rules, We Straighten Them Back!**

The Republicans and the Democrats in Washington have lost sight of their purpose; they are stuck in the war of ideological dogmas; they are clung to old social, political, and economic models, which obviously do not work anymore.

Having the minimum wage close to $15 an hour is a good idea, but where would money come from without damaging the economy as a whole?

Slowing down the negative effects of the climate change may put some pressure on businesses, but the alternative is to risk the mere existence of all the businesses.

The Country badly needs a tax reform, a health insurance reform, a manufacturing reform, an educational reform.

The problems at hand have become so complicated and large, that **easy solutions simply don’t exist.**

We need new models.

We have to start from scratch.

Every single idea – as long as it helps people to live and prosper – is on a table.
Nowadays, all mass media make everyone think that there is an ideological war between liberals and conservatives; that liberal values and conservative values are incomparable, internally contradictory to each other.

However, no one has to choose between individual freedoms and an efficient government, or between the health of the nation and the prosperity of its businesses.

The choice everyone needs to make today is between truth and facts, against fiction and lies; between realistic, pragmatic solutions, and dogmatic ideology and wishful thinking; between having an open and honest talk with people, against hypnotizing rhetoric and manipulating peoples’ minds.

**We will prove that liberal conservatism (or conservative liberalism) can exists.**

We will prove that such ideals as freedom of speech, freedom of enterprise, efficient governing, and pursuit of happiness for all can coexist. But in order to restore those ideals and preserve them from erosion, we have to be smart and pragmatic, firm and inclusive.

**We need to bring to the same table people with opposite views, and make them talk to each other, guiding that conversation away from an ideological war of words toward pragmatic solutions benefiting the whole Country.**

This will be our political mission (at least for the close future).

6. No one knows yet, if in the future our Coalition will make the transition from being a movement to becoming an actual political party.

There is no way to predict this today.

**But I can predict that the American 3d-parties and Independents Coalition will become a formidable political power very soon.**

I have a clear vision of what we need to do as soon as possible:

1. we need to reach out to each other and start getting organized – I just created website www.3dForce.net, and a Facebook page ([https://www.facebook.com/The-3-D-Force-1917882951796361/](https://www.facebook.com/The-3-D-Force-1917882951796361/)) with this manifesto, and my contacts (currently, you can email me to mawa@3dForce.net);

2. we need to establish a basic agreement on our goals and means;

3. we need to set up a functional office;

4. we need to start reaching out to all 3d-party-ers and independents, we need to initiate an advertising campaign;

5. we need to make the movement official, set up state meetings, set up a unifying national convention, and present our candidates for all (ALL!) upcoming elections.

In 2016 Presidential elections 65,844,969 voters went Democratic, 62,979,984 voters went Republican, but 7,627,197 people (close to 12 % of who could have been voting for a certain party candidate; or about 6 % of all who voted) voted for a third force. Many people did not even vote at all because they did not trust neither the Republican nor the Democrats, but did not see a strong third choice.

**The American 3d-parties and Independents Coalition will give to all American voters a viable third choice.**

The year of 2018 will be our test drive year.

**The year of 2018 will be our year!**
Your fellow Independent,
Valentin Voroshilov
You can reach me at
mawa@3dForce.net

the main website will be located at
www.3dForce.net

If you want to join or to support the movement, or to volunteer, please send me an email.
Currently, the only way to financially support the movement is through the PayPal button below (currently it is linked to my business name TeachOlogy Consulting, but I am working on setting up a campaign at www.crowdpac.com; as an amateur in setting up online business communication, this is where a professional coder could help).

Some intro about who I am.
I was born and grew up in Russia.
This link http://www.teachology.xyz/vv.htm leads to more on my professional experience.
In 2002, I moved to the U.S.A. to escape the presidency of Vladimir Putin (I am NOT a Russian spy :) !).
I have been living a quiet life of a math and physics instructor, until Vladimir Putin has essentially chosen my new President (at least, so I think so far).
I have been posting my thoughts on the matter on my blog. All those posts represent my life philosophy, my political views, my ideals and dreams.

For example:

1. Why did Hillary Clinton Lose the Race? Or. Conformism and Arrogance of The Establishment. And. What To Do Now?
https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/clinton.html

https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/02/4s.html

3. DraftBernie and “People’s Party” is NOT the answer
https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/DRAFT.html

4. Democratic Party Leaders Have No Vision
https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/03/vision.html
Much more on the topic is at:

www.3dForce.net

and

http://the3dforce.blogspot.com/

Specifically at:

http://the3dforce.blogspot.com/2017/10/spectre.html

“Guide to Political Revolution” is *NOT* a guide (manual, handbook).
It is *not* “what needs to be done”
It is “The Manifesto”.
It is “what needs to be *built*”

The book gives a description of what wrong and what should be achieved.
But the book does not lay out SPECIFIC steps which need to be done to make the transition.
This blog is about politics; for the discussion about education, please go to https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com Thank you!

Tuesday, February 21, 2017

An Open Letter to Senator Bernie Sanders, Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator Chuck Schumer, and Senator Al Franken

An Open Letter to

Senator Bernie Sanders, Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator Chuck Schumer, and Senator Al Franken


According to The Atlantic (and other media) on 02/19/2017 in Melbourne, Florida, Donald Trump started his 2020 reelection campaign (https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/02/trump-kicks-off-his-2020-reelection-campaign-on-saturday/516909/).

Reaching out directly to constituents is nothing new, of course. Every politician does it. The point the media miss is that with the constant use of Twitter, regularly issuing provocative statements which ignite extensive media coverage, and with regular rallies, Donald Trump and his advisers have brought this political tool to a completely new level (at least in the U.S.). Trump does not have much of a support from his own party, and by reaching out directly to people, he manages to put a pressure on local and state officials of all sorts (and Trump must keep his supporters in the state of excitement, or he will lose them).

Among extreme examples of such reaching out directly to people, we can mention the Cultural Revolution which happened in China (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cultural_Revolution). When the then-leader Mao Zedong was on a brink of being pushed out of the power, he appealed directly to the Chinese young people, asked them to form militia, and paralyzed the country for ten years. Probably, America should not worry about running into such an extreme social disaster as the Cultural Revolution, but there are core American values which are at risk of being watered down, or even dissolved (such us the freedom of speech, checks and balances within governing institutions, trustful media).

For everyone who has even the slightest concern about the future of the Country, David Frum’s article “How To Build an Autocracy” in The Atlantic should be a must-read one (https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2017/03/how-to-build-an-autocracy/513872/).

In part, Frum cites words “written more than 200 years ago to explain the most important safeguard of the American constitutional system: “Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.”” That is exactly what Democrats and all progressivists have not been able to produce to counteract Trump’s team.

Dear Senators Sanders, Warren, Schumer, and Franken.

Unfortunately, each of you alone is not strong enough to successfully spar with Trump, but four of you together may present a formidable counter-force to his current media domination. You are respected politicians; your names are nationally recognized. The hope is that when you start leading the “resistance” (quoting Bill Maher), eventually Democrats will be able to present to the American people a smart, and charismatic (and, hopefully, young) person, who will be able to consolidate all the progressives.

But that is just a hope; the time for thinking about the next Presidential elections has not come yet. The immediate goal is to mobilize the forces, to direct the actions by giving activists clear goals, and to win back the Congress. There is no time for waiting. This fight had to begin on November 9, 2016.


http://the3dforce.blogspot.com/2017/02/sanders.html
but still is dormant. Inside party maneuvering, reshuffling the same people between the same chairs is the recipe for a failure.

The first thing you have to do is to accept the fact that the top Democrats f@$ed up the elections. You have to tell people that the top-level Democrats made big mistakes, that Hillary Clinton and her team made mistakes, that you made mistakes. But you will use those mistakes to learn from them, and to regenerate the party, and to re-energize the people.

You cannot follow the same path Hillary Clinton and her team followed in 2016. Right after Trump became the nominee, it was clear (for those who could see) that the social landscape was drastically different from what Clinton’s advisers thought. But their arrogance made them blind; they kept using the same old “playbook”, and they lost.

Winning the popular vote and losing the White House does not make the situation better; it actually makes it worse.

There is only one silver lining in this loss. If Clinton had won, the Democratic party might had been stagnating for at least four more years. Now, after a slap in the face (well, a hit in the face), the party has only to choices; become obsolete, or reform itself on the march.

I hope, you see that the old methods and approaches to build the movement, to lead the party have not worked, and will not work, because they have been developed for a situation which is in the past, and will not come back any soon (more on this later).

Basically, you have to invent new methods and new approaches to build the movement, to lead the party, to help rise to the top new people.

In the meantime, four of you have to build a progressive media firewall.

For each Trump’s rally, you have to organize at least four of yours. For each Trump’s media outburst, you have to fire up at least four media eruptions.

Do not wait for an approval of your actions from anybody else; this is up to four of you (at least for now).

The good start for developing a new strategy would be just thinking of what would you do in the past, and do just the opposite (this, of course, is a hyperbole). For a while, you have to stop listening to the party officials, advisers, think tank intellectuals, etc. who you have been listening in the past. You need to find and gather people who have been giving away warnings about Trump since the beginning of his campaign. Then and only then you can call back some of the people who used to work for Hillary Clinton (because you do not want to repeat her mistake by listening only to people who tell you only what you want to hear).

You have to accept the fact that the approach “We are good – Trump is bad! We tell the truth – he is a liar! We care about you – he only cares about himself! We are for all people – he is racist!” etc. has not worked, and will not work.

You cannot honestly think that all people who voted for Trump are racist, or white supremacists, or poorly educated, or just hate Hillary Clinton. Hence, you need to know the hidden reasons underlying peoples’ choices, otherwise you and then all progressives will follow the Hillary Clinton’s fate.

Here I begin the most important part of this letter.

We have to start from addressing a question: “How do people make decisions?”

For example, when you (or your child, or your friend, or your enemy) stand in Baskin Robbins (or Dunkin Donuts, or Burger King) staring at the menu trying to figure out what to order this time – do you make a decision?

The answer actually depends on what do you call a “decision”.

Without deeping into a long discussion, let’s just say that in general, we – humans – make two types of decisions: rational decisions (a.k.a. logical, via a step-by-step reasoning), and “irrational” (a.k.a. intuitive, a.k.a. a guess, or a hunch). The ability to make rational decisions differs humans from other animals; take this ability away – and we will be no smarter than dolphins, or dogs, or monkeys, or cats.

During a usual day, we do not make too many of rational decisions, because usually we do not have to. Usually, we just have to make choices which would not greatly affect our well-being, or our future.

It is a well-known fact that our choices are affected by our emotional state (the literature on the matter is huge: from popular https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2016/09/the-best-headspace-for-making-decisions/500423/, or https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/intense-emotions-and-strong-feelings/201012/it-or-not-emotions-will-drive-the-decisions-you, to professional https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/jenniferlerner/files/annual_review_manuscript_june_16_final_final.pdf).

When we are angry, or when we are happy, or when we are sad, or when we are stressed, we may not make the same choice which we would have made if we were calm and rational.
The reaction which we call a choice, or a decision, is the result of the brain functions happening in our subconscious mind without our interference. Maybe, on average, we use about ten percent of our brain power for a logical reasoning. But that does not mean that other ninety percent do nothing. Our brain is constantly analyzing a huge amount of information to answer one single question: “What to do to survive?” (the strongest instinct of every healthy animal is self-preservation). Then our brain makes a choice for us, and places it into the logical part of it, so we would be able to articulate it (first of all – to ourselves). And then we start defending this “decision we had made” like we were actual authors of it.

Of course, the picture I just painted is very simplistic, but presents a good initial model of a human decision making process.

And one more note: the stronger our emotions are, or the longer we experience those emotions, the more chance that we would not listen to any rationalization of our actions. We would tend just to react. There is a study which demonstrates that when people experience stress over a long period of time the brain chemistry changes (that is why doctors prescribe pills to help with depression). Disorientation is not just a psychological state, it is a state of a physical disjunction in a brain. It does not mean, of course, that people become insane, but people become less influenced by logical arguments and more inclined to a simple emotional reaction to various stimuli. If it involves massive numbers of people, it may lead to mass migrations (for example, Syrian refugees, but also the same reaction we can see regularly in animal world), or to following “a messiah”.

For millions of Americans the past two decades are associated with a continuous state of stress. The fall of the Twin Towers, two wars, natural disasters, economic depression, job loss, social stagnation; these are only some of the major sources of a pressure on the society in general, and on the middle class in particular (one of the latest publications: http://nypost.com/2016/05/12/americas-middle-class-is-headed-toward-extinction/). The social and especially the economic environment has become very stressful for millions of Americans.

Ecologists know that a stressful change in the environment (like, a change in the average temperature, or average humidity) may lead to significant changes in the ecosystem (some species can even extinct like dinosaurs, or begin mass migration, or mutate). When due to any reasons species start experience the shortage of food, they start searching for the ways to adapt to the new situation. When in 2012, due to a harsh winter, the population of blue hares in Yakutia (Russia) suddenly dropped, “a "super pack" of 400 wolves laid siege to the remote town of Verkhoyansk, forcing locals to mount patrols on snow mobiles until the government could send in extra help” (http://www.telegraph.co.uk/science/2016/03/15/wolf-attacks-lead-to-state-of-emergency-in-russias-siberia-region/).

Whether we like it or not, our brain is wired in almost the same way as a wolf’s brain. Of course, we experience much deeper emotions than just a hunger. But living in a constant fear of not being able to provide for a family, feeling day-after-day how the usual prosperity is slipping away like a sand through fingers, leads to a gradual transformation of the way people view the world and their position in it. We could say, that a longitudinal social stress leads to a psychological “mutation” of a large part of the population.

Millions of Americans expressed their frustration with the current state of social events and economic status. They have been forced to accept lower paid or less stable jobs. They feared that they would not be able to leave to their children better living conditions. They have been losing their savings. They felt like they lost a “game” called “life”.

Trump and his team brilliantly used this massively spread psychological state. Everyone wants and needs to be a part of a winning team. This need is growing with every day of feeling sad and lost.

For millions of people, who have been feeling a stress so strong and for so long time, that they started disconnecting from a reality, Trump created a fictional reality. In that “reality” he was “a head of a winning team”, promising to everyone who joins “so much winning, you will get tired of winning”.

In fact, Trump and his advisers have not invented anything new. Trump, Bannon, and Inc. used the tactic which has been very well known for at least a century.

1. Make as many people as possible to feel as miserable as possible (“our Country is a disaster”).
2. INVENT enemies and blame on them everything bad, do not care about how illogical it might sound (liberals, immigrants, Muslims).
3. Present strong emotional passages, even if they do not make any sense (“You will get tired of winning”).
4. Promise anything, even if it is impossible (“We will build the wall and make Mexica to pay for it!”).
5. Embrace and bring to your team people who have no moral limits and who want only ONE thing – a three-headed dragon (money/fame/power).
6. Suppress any opposite views, or at least drown them in the ocean of misinformation (a.k.a. fake news)
7. SCREAM!!

This tactic is very old and well known for everyone who read Karl Marx or Vladimir Lenin; and had been successfully used to bring many former and current dictators into a power. Evidently, Clinton’s advisers have not read this literature (which makes them “a vanilla” of consulting).

The tactic does not appeal to a logic, it does not offer rational approaches. Its main goal is basically to generate the atmosphere of excitement similar to the one sport fans feel on a stadium when their team has been losing until the last minutes but won in the end (a.k.a. Super Bowl LI). Everyone who experienced this feeling once, got “addicted” to it, and wants to feel it again; this feeling is like a drug (why else do sport conglomerates make billions?).

Donald Trump’s priority has been and always will be his own personal rating.
That is why Trump has never cared and will never truly care about the meaning of the words he says or writes, because for millions of people the meaning of his words does not matter. They will support him no matter what he says, as long as he will make them feel as winners.

And to feed the need to feel as winners Trump, Bannon and Inc. constantly create for them an “alternative reality” (some people would call it “disinformation”).

Liberal media can point at Trump’s mistakes, lies, fictions as much as they can; liberal media can make fun of Trump as much as they can – that will not make any difference for people who support Trump.

Trump’s team brilliantly exploited everything they could to paint Hilary Clinton as a loser. Of course, the content of the “damn emails” never mattered. However, making Clinton explaining herself made her look defensive; and “winners do not look defensive” (unless they do, but who remembers that).

And, of course, for rational people Benghazi or emails did not make any difference. But Trump was not appealing to rational people. He (or most probably Bannon) was counting on that the number of people in distress had risen and reached the critical mass. Clinton’s team did not see it. Trump won.

Dear Senators Sanders, Warren, Schumer, and Franken.

Your immediate goal should be creating and promoting a clear view of the “real reality”. It must be truthful, which makes your job harder than Trump’s. It also must be positive, energetic, winning!

It will never be enough just to scream: “He lied!”, or “Look what he did!”, or to make fun of Trump’s Tweets or appearance. Firstly, this is also just a fog to deflect the attention from the actors hiding behind the fog (Bannon, and Inc.). Secondly, liberal media have to get out of the bubble and finally start reaching out to non-liberal audience. Thirdly, your media actions need to be such that even Fox news channel could not avoid talking about them on a regular basis.

You have no much time to get prepared. You have to start acting now. Many people who voted for Hilary Clinton, have been feeling like now the Atlanta Falcons fans are feeling, and may soon become so dissatisfied with the Democratic party that will be lost (will become politically inactive).

As a “dictator-in-the-making”, everything “bad for the Country” Trump will blame on the opposition, and everything “good for the Country” Trump will attribute to himself. Your task will be to counteract Trump’s team and to offer people the actual facts (David Frum has more on this).

And one last note: please, tell your supporters, and then remind them once in a while, that if they just act on emotions without giving some rational thinking to their actions, they are no different from people who support Donald Trump. Trump’s team outsmarted Clinton’s team. Do not let his team to outsmart you.

#THINK

Good luck.

Dr. Valentin Voroshilov

P.S. A special word to Senator Bernie Sanders

Dear Senator. You have been speaking about the need for a political revolution all along.

Well, now you have a second chance to lead it. Turns out, before revolutionizing the Country you need to revolutionize the Democratic party

P.P.S. Dear Senators, please, keep in mind that if the Democrats will not take the Congress back, it will be your fault.

P.P.P.S. Please, feel free to leave your comments! I have a blog where you can find a comment box

https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/02/comments.html
Appendix:
Below is an actual comment left at
http://www.bu.edu/today/2017/us-russian-relations-under-microscope/

**
“Keeping the West weak is to their advantage.” Trump is not to blame for the economic or military obligations this country faces today. All of these were created and put into place by previous administrations, career politicians and Washington insiders who profit from the actions of the military industrial complex and its perpetual largely ineffective “nation building” schemes that began at the end of the second world war and continue to this day under the supervision of both political parties.
Trump is not and should be expected to perpetuate those expensive failed policies. He should concentrate and building up the strength of our military, while at the same time avoiding engaging us in any avoidable new conflicts. In short, he should walk softly and carry a big stick.
Many people do not like Trump because he looks like a wolf. FYI, a sheepdog looks like a wolf to a sheep. But ironically it is the genetic similarly between the wolf and sheepdog and the teeth of the sheepdog in particular that allow him to fight off the wolf when necessary.
Trump is a sheepdog whose bark and bite may ultimately prove very uncomfortable for Putin should he take any offensive actions against the USA and so I strongly suspect that Putin has more respect for Trump than that the paranoid sheep recognize.
Time will tell, but I strongly suspect that Trump will do a wonderful job of keeping his flock safe.

**
This comment perfectly represents the sentiments of a common Trump supporter. No logic. Outburst of emotions. Arguing with this type of a person would be the same as arguing with a patient of an Alzheimer clinic.
The main theme is shown in the end – “I want to feel safe” (meaning, this person has not been feeling safe for a long time). ”Trump makes me feel safe”. The rest is just self-justification.
Many liberal pundits have not noticed this stressful emotional state of many Trump supporters, they just bluntly called those people “basket of deplorables”. We all know the result.
P.S. click here for some of the publishing history on the matter
Why Should the Democrats Support The 3-D Force?

Why Should the Democrats Support The 3-D Force?

First of all, The 3-D Force is NOT a 3-d party.
In this post: https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/08/mawa.html you can find a clear description of the difference between the two.
And in this post: https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/3party.html you can read more on the true role of a third party in the current political climate.
DraftBernie people and other similar groups who call themselves “progressive” are at war with the Democrats.
They blame the Democrats in – well – everything bad what happened in the politics.
I do understand the reasons behind that sentiment. I also blame the top Democrats in many things, including being arrogant, shortsighted, bought by the big money, and eventually they brought to us President Trump.
However, the political calculus shows me that the Democrats are not enemies; strategically, they are allies.
And the Democrats need to understand that a new “progressive” force is the best thing which could have happened to the Democrats.
Firstly, the Democrats will have to sharpen their ideas, reshuffle the top people, and that will make the party stronger.
Secondly, every political action which brings more people into politics is good for the democracy.
But more importantly, the 3-D Force (the right one, the smart one) will be fighting the same enemy the Democrats are fighting, i.e. the Republicans.
Let’s imagine, that one Republican, one Democrat, and one 3-D Forcer are fighting for the same chair (could be a local election or a national, does not matter).
There are only five possible outcomes.
1. The Republican candidate is much stronger than all other candidates, and wins. Well, there is nothing what can be done at this point in time.
2. The Democratic candidate is much stronger than all other candidates, and wins. Well, there is nothing what can be done at this point in time.
3. The Republican and the Democratic candidates go head to head; there is no obvious leader. In that case, the 3-D Force will make all the difference. Two weeks before the election day the 3-D forcer can appeal to his or her supporters to through their votes to the Democrat. Why? Because most probably, the Democratic candidate will present ideas which are much closer to the ideas of the 3-D Forcer, and electing him or her would be just the right thing to do.

   And that is what the 3-D Force is about – doing the right thing at the right time;
   making a clear pragmatic decision (not bound by an ideological dogma).

4. Another situation may happen when all three candidates go head to head. In that case, the Democrat and the 3-D Force should negotiate and forge the agreement and go to scenario # 3.

5. Finally, the last possible outcome is that the 3-D Force candidate is obviously stronger than the other two. It means, the Democrats could not find a good candidate, hence need to rethink their approach (which is already a good thing). Also, the Democrats should agree that having the 3-D Forcer is better than the alternative. As one can see, out of five possible situations, there is only one which is really bad for the Democrats. And that is why the Democrats need to embrace and support the formation of the 3-D Force (www.3dForce.net).

Unfortunately, people who are trying to create the new movement (a.k.a. Convergence), so far have no correct vision of the role that movement has to play, and the strategy that movement has to follow.
For progressives Convergence seems yet elusive - but still possible!

Part I: just a copy of a recent short Facebook post (09/12/2017)
So, the convergence2017.org (The People's Convergence Conference) meeting is over.
I just checked the websites of the three hosting parties
None of them has ANY mentioning of the event which supposedly had to change the political landscape.
Jackie Salit from http://independentvoting.org/ was there, too, but Independentvoting.org does not mention the event as well.
What happened to the converging?
It is a very well known fact that political collaboration requires a special set of goals, and skills, and more. So far the leaders of those old and new political groups have not shown the presence of those goals and skills and more.
So far all they do is opening a debate club (National Conference Call at independentvoting.org), or running a conference on political science (convergence2017.org).
Instead of initiating cooperative managing, they have slid in agitation and propaganda.
Agitation and propaganda are important! But without solid collaboration all those political groups will NOT make any difference.
The right approach is at www.3dForce.net

Part II: reflection on part I
If you read a mission statement or the goals of many new and old progressive groups and parties, you will find that they all look very similar.
You read about anger people feel toward the dysfunctional government, about a minimum wage, about the health care, student loans, etc., etc., etc.. None of those ideas are new; they just have risen to the political surface during the 2016 presidential campaign. But no one knows for how long people will be feeling frustrated and agitated. That is why nowadays every political group is trying to attract as much attention as possible.

The leaders do understand that none of the groups will ever have enough followers to compete with the two major parties. That is why – the hunt for the “big fish” (everyone wants to be able to say “Bernie sanders is with us!”). That is why some motion to build a collaboration (convergence2017).

The first problem is that the leaders of all active political groups would like to absorb all other groups and have everyone under their tent, but no one wants to be absorbed.

The second problem is that all those groups live in an illusion, or in a dream, so to speak. They dream of the 3d-party President of the United States. Freshly grown groups, like "DraftBernie", dream that the next President will be one of them. They don't understand that this would be like trying to run a marathon before learning how to walk.

Experienced, seasoned political figures, like Jackie Salit, look for one candidate from all the independents. Take, for example, her recent piece "Finding Otherness"(independentvoting.org). It is worth to read. But the most of the reading will be about options for the presidential run in 2020.

Each problem has a solution, though.

To solve the first problem, group leaders need to reject an idea of building one new super-party. It is impossible (at least for a foreseeable future), but also not needed.

They have to build a coalition which is not based on ideological principles (which for many are dogmas), but based on (a) mutual enemy; (b) mutual goal – but the goal has to be specific.

To solve the second problem, the leaders need to set one specific political goal – such that they all would benefit from its achievement; and which is also achievable – so, not the Presidency.

**Such specific and achievable goal is to take three seats from the Senate Republicans.**

This will demonstrate the power of the people not affiliated with the Republicans or the Democrats.

But most importantly, **this will give the “outsiders” real political power.**

After that the Republicans will fear the “outsiders”, and the Democrats will notice them (and both parties will hate them – the price to pay for having real political power).

I call all “outsiders”, i.e. active members of political groups not affiliated with the Republicans or the Democrats – the 3-d Force.

**The website: www.3dForce.net gives more reasons for the goal I just outlined above.**

The question is – if the leaders of the groups do not want to build an effective practical (I would say – pragmatic) collaboration, can we do anything about it?

Yes, we can!
It does not matter if you are in “DraftBernie”, or “SocialistAlternative” or else.
Ask yourself, do you want to march, protest, collect signatures, write petitions, and more, and feel good about yourself; or you want to march, protest, collect signatures, write petitions, and more, and feel good about yourself, and also having real political power?
If you like the latter, you should put some pressure on your leaders, you should tell them to set aside the ideological differences and reach out to all other political groups with establishing a coalition for achieving one specific political goal – bringing both parties in the Congress down to the minority, by taking down three Republican Senators.
The current political climate makes this task possible!
But this climate may not last for long.
Why did Hillary Clinton Lose the Race? Or. Conformism and Arrogance of The Establishment. And. What To Do Now?

Today’s Democratic Party

(this post originally was published a week after the election day, but after Senator Sanders said: “It wasn't that Donald Trump won the election, it was that the Democratic Party lost the election” I decided to re-post it.)

1. My first president was an idealist dreaming of a perfect society.
2. My second president was a power-grabbing irrationally acting drunk.
3. My third president was a former low level army spy.
4. In a case, you did not recognize them, they were Mikhail Gorbachev, Boris Yeltsin, and Vladimir Putin.
5. When I realized that my third president was becoming my last president I moved in the U.S.
6. I never would have thought to have again “Boris Yeltsin” as my president (only speaking English and not drinking).

Of course, I am very disappointed with this. However, as a scientist I find a relief in knowing that social forces do obey social laws in a way very similar to physical forces obey physical laws.

Despite the popular belief, Trump’s victory WAS predictable (all pollsters – go back to school).

What happened on November 8, 2016 was a bloodless revolution of a certain type, called a mob revolution.

It was not the first mob revolution known in the history of mankind (but one of the few of bloodless, at least so far).

Two of the most well-known are: the French Revolution of 1789-1790 (http://www.history.com/topics/french-revolution), and the Russian Bolshevik coup of 1917 (http://www.history.com/topics/russian-revolution).

The designer of the Bolshevik coup Vladimir Lenin studied the French Revolution (among many other studies) and wrote books on the matter. Then he successfully used his theory to design and to organize the coup.
Those books have been available in many languages for about a century. In different countries, many Marxists extremists used them successfully to take over a power. The theory works like a clock! But only under certain conditions (like any scientific theory). To win a power takeover organizers have to ride a wave of a deep populace disappointment and to direct it into actions (hopefully, just a massive voting turnout). That deep populace disappointment happens when the social establishment concentrates all energy on an internal power struggle and loses touch with the needs and feelings of common folks.

All mob revolutions had been based on a frustration masses felt due to economic downturns in the countries. People felt tricked, lied upon, neglected, exploited and powerless. As the result, they embraced leaders with strong rhetoric and simple solutions. “The system is rigged, those … (rich, Jews, intelligent, foreign powers, immigrants, …) are our enemies, we have to destroy them, demolish the system, and start from scratch”. “The International” (the hymn of Socialists and later Communists of the 19th and 20th centuries) has these words:


“Stand up, damned of the Earth
Stand up, prisoners of starvation
Reason thunders in its volcano
This is the eruption of the end.
Of the past let us make a clean slate”.

The latter line describes the typical emotion of people who have been feeling frustration for a long time. When negative emotions have been brewing for a long time, eventually logic just gets shot off. People just don’t care anymore about current social structures and what to crash them. It is like a movie detective who has to let go a criminal and in frustration brakes his beloved coffee mug against a wall.

If Clinton’s people read the books and knew the theory, they would be on guard and would be able to develop the right strategy to curb Trump’s enthusiasm.

But that exactly is the problem. Neither Clinton nor her team were able to step outside of a circle of traditional views on politics.

2. All those pundits, political scientists, sociologists, media analytics professionals, think tank members, pollsters, etc. have to admit that they have no idea how to access populace mood and how to predict populace behavior in extraordinary social circumstances. The current school of polling has completely failed.

One of many pollsters said today on a radio: “Clinton’s numbers were within the margin of error”. Another one said: “Evidently, many of those who did not show any indication to vote, voted for Trump.”

If the “margin of error” included the losing scenario, did you warn your client? Did you even know that the losing scenario was within the “margin of error”? Did you consider a scenario with a large percentage of hidden voters? Did your polls show a possibility of the last-minute voters? Did you even try to assess how many last-minute voters might exist? Questions can – and should – go on and on.

Right after Trump’s nomination it has become extremely clear that this election is far from regular, the social landscape is highly abnormal. It should have become self-evident (like it has now) that current technologies of social predictions work only for regular social events and cannot help with analyzing this race. Instead of asking “Who will you vote for?”, right questions would be “What do you talk about when you are in a bar with your friends?”", "What are your fears?", "Describe the leader you want to see in the WH?", etc. The problem is that no one from social-analytical establishment – on both sides – really saw how distorted the social landscape was, hence no one tried to developed methods which could capture those hidden abnormalities and irregularities.

Well, now they have four years to figure it out.

3. For the Democrats this loss is the result of “a failure of imagination”. November 8 2016 is Democrats’ 9/11.
Number 1 reason for this loss is the arrogance of the Democratic establishment. They saw how Trump just broke the establishment of the Republicans, but they didn’t believe that this could happen to them, they didn’t even consider this option (instead of thinking “I know I am right” they should have asked a question “What if I am wrong?”). That is why they didn’t try to listen to Trump supporters, didn’t really try to understand their motives, just dismissed them as “deplorables”. If they did, maybe they would see that in addition to “deplorables” there was – and still is – (a) a layer of people who felt tired of hard living and just wanted to feel for once as a winner (sport team psychology); (b) a layer of people who felt ignored and wanted to feel relevant (teenager psychology); (c) a layer of people who did not want to be pushed to vote for Hillary merely because “Trump is bad” (rebellious psychology: you want me to do this – here is the opposite!).

Currently I am an Independent.

During the Primaries, I voted Democratic. I was walking to the voting booth ready to vote for Hillary. I loved Bernie Sanders, but I knew he had no chance to get the nomination. And in the last second with a pen in my hand I changed my mind and voted for him. Yesterday I voted for Hillary. But I am sure that lots of people just could not force themselves to vote for her. We will discuss soon why couldn’t they do it. But the fact of the matter is that no one in the democratic camp even thought of this possibility and hence no one even tried to work with it.

Arrogance results in rejecting any ideas which do not belong to an established set of views. That is why Hillary’s team has been using the same old playbook used by Obama. I do not watch news on a regular basis. Lately, when I did – randomly and sporadically – I saw Trump and crowds of people speaking out, or I saw Hillary on a stage with celebrities. If you see these images again and again you get an impression of who is with people and who is above. But Hillary’s team did not try to dig into a psychology of undecided voters. They just kept pushing the “bad Trump” agenda. We – humans – love our independence, we do not like to be forced into something to do, even if that is for our own benefit (ever tried to make your kid to eat green stuff?!). We want to be convinced, not forced. We do want to feel as a winner. If we feel frustrated for a long time our logic just gets shot off. We react like a movie detective who has to free a criminal and brakes his beloved coffee mug against a wall. We just stop caring about consequences of our actions. We just want to break something to feel just a little bit better, do something unexpected, out of order – to feel power again. And this part of human psychology is very well known. However, even when the polls showed a big and sudden (!) drop for Hillary, which was a clear indicator of something unexpected, her team did not try anything from the outside of the playbook they used. You cannot treat something unexpected using methods established for well expected cases.

Arrogance results in surrounding yourself only with people with whom you feel yourself comfortable, which means, talking only to people who confirm your views. During my Russia days, I watched Putin’s closest advisers expressing views almost opposite to the boss’s. Maybe it was just a play, but maybe it was a deliberate politics. What I see around me now is a strong motivation to avoid any disagreement. No one wants to have any discussion if there is a chance to be criticized. Everyone wants to talk only to people with whom one feels comfortable. Conformism within Democratic establishment is the real reason of “a failure of imagination”. But the same conformism has taken place in all social establishment strata, including government, science, education. People within the same circle do not argue with each other, do not criticize each other – that would mean for them that they do not belong to the same circle. The only arguing these days, or years, is happening between opposing camps.

This division is clear when you watch or read news media. Different media outlets have very different audiences, which do not talk to each other. For more than a year late show hosts laughed at Trump, mocked him and his supporters, but for the last couple of months they’ve been communicating to the same group of people, who made their mind a long time ago (hence, didn’t help to grow the number of Hillary’s voters). These hosts
also mocked Hillary, but for her singing, or dancing, or dressing. No one mocked her for not trying to step out of her circle and to reach out to people with unorthodox ideas. Because no one wants to hear unorthodox ideas. Because that would require unorthodox thinking (a.k.a. thinking). Much easier to rely on names. If a big fish establishment name says or writes something – we publish or promote it. The result is – The Boston Globe (just as an example) has not published any interesting view, any unexpected opinion, any unusual examination, because who would read something extraordinary (a.k.a. outside of ordinary), if the most of the readers represent that establishment which representatives got published in The Boston Globe? 4. Republican establishment did not see a large stratum of people who brought Trump to the win. Democratic establishment did not see the same stratum of people who could bring Hillary to the win. That stratum is not composed of the obvious Trump supporters, who truly believe in his ability to build the wall, who hate minorities, LGBT, and abortions. A typical representative of this “hidden” social stratum said on a radio, that her brother is a gay, in her school they have and love many people from minorities and immigrants. Why did she vote for Trump? Because she felt ignored. Establishment was busy solving their own problems and simple folks got neglected, left on their own. The meaning of this is simple: (A) If I vote for Trump it does not mean I am a bigot or hate immigrants. (B) My vote for Trump is me screaming – I’m hurting and I want to be noticed! The first statement represents a form of a psychological escape tactic – by doing this (voting for Trump) I do not do anything immoral. The second statement is the expressions of fears and feeling of being trapped and helpless. Those fears come from many sources, like dying local economy, stagnated wages, rising cost of leaving, seeing other social forces growing up in power (yes – immigrants taking jobs, minorities whose life matters). Hence – revolt against the current status quo; the current system does not work, we need to break it. Vladimir Lenin wrote books and successfully used his theory to organize and to win the Bolshevik coup of 1917. I doubt that Trump’s or Hillary’s teams read those books (which is another sign of being conventional). But Trump was following his gut feeling, replaced his team three times searching for people with similar gut feeling, and who, like him, were able to think outside of the ordinary set of ideas (for good of for bad). Hillary relied on people using the same old strategy, which was her own strategy. Arrogance of Hillary Clinton pushed her to enter the race. Then her arrogance made her say: “We have seen that our nation is more deeply divided than we thought”. This is just silly (at the minimum). We all have clearly seen the big division in the country. Hillary did it, too. But she hoped that this division would be in her favor. That did not happen. Arrogance of the Democratic establishment led to nominating the worst possible candidate. Party culture led to that no other valid candidate, including Biden (!), risked to challenge Hillary’s party rank. Only one outsider stepped in, but due to arrogance of the party apparatus he was outmaneuvered. And even with all this arrogance Hillary still had a chance to win, if she and her team would be able to step outside of the playbook they used for the campaign. Instead they just have been running ahead like horses with blinders (in this case a narrow-sightedness is worse than a short-sightedness; hope this explains the picture – this how I see today’s Democratic party). 5. Whose fault is it? What do we do now? (Two beloved Russian unanswered questions) Previous parts of this piece answered the first question. The answer to the second one comes automatically. Everyone who cares about the future has to become an active Democrat. Has to participate in all local party events.
Has to vote out all current selected party officials and replace them with new ones. Remember the lady on a radio who voted because she felt ignored and neglected? I bet she has not been voting for a long time, she did not go to primaries or local elections. She did not want to participate in routine social activities, did not want to read various analytical articles and to participate in lengthy discussions. All she and many others want is having “a strong and fair king” who would make all important decisions to make their life better but without making them to participate.

Well, everyone who cares about the future needs to do just the opposite. That lady also represents “whites without college degrees” who brought Trump to a victory. She does not see the big disconnect in her own logic. Yes, she personally is not a bigot and does not hate immigrants. But she elected a person who on his own just incapable of being a good political manager (yes – this statement is based on personal view of “political management” and facts about Trump). Hence, like it has happened in the history of mankind many times before, he will be an object of constant manipulation. He will not be managing the country, but his circle of influence will (among so many historic examples, check this one about Grigori Rasputin: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grigori_Rasputin).

But to see that, one needs to know a history, and to know basics of political management, and just management, and just be able to derive relatively long logical conclusions, and act upon facts and reason instead of upon emotions.

All these skills come from good education. All these skills come only from good education. This is why the 2016 Presidential elections has been a testament of the U.S. educational system.

This is why the number one goal for all activists across the country should be fighting for making education great! (not again, though, because so far it has not been great, so – just great).

Here is more old posts on the matter:
http://www.gomars.xyz/op.html

This post has some more specifics on what to do:
https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/02/4s.html
Who are the real wealth creators?

Part I: it is a copy of the Facebook post by Dr. Reich (@RBReich)
"This morning Trump tweeted: "We are the highest taxed nation in the world - that will change."

Baloney. The most meaningful measure is taxes paid as a percentage of GDP. As you can see from the graph below, the U.S. has the 4th lowest taxes of any major economy. (Only South Korea, Chile, and Mexico ranking lower.)

And the wealthiest 1 percent in the U.S. pay the lowest taxes as a percent of their income and total wealth of any country anywhere – and lower than they’ve ever paid even in the U.S.

Once again, Trump and the Republicans are dealing with a non-problem, while ignoring the biggest problems.

What do you think?"

Part II: Some of the thoughts generated by this post
Let’s use that thing, I heard it’s gray, don’t know, never seen it, a brain, and try to force it into acting, people call it thinking.

Imagine that one day all WallStreet brokers disappeared, the NY Stock market isn’t open, all bankers are gone, too. And everyone who owns more than a hundred million bucks is out. What would happen? Well, at first – confusion, chaos, even panic, but soon enough new people would come and make the wheels run. It would have been a bumpy ride, but at the end a new structure would be put in place and functioning.

Now imagine that all low and middle level working folks are gone. No more baristas, drivers, nurses, teachers, professors, policemen, firemen, engineers, etc., etc. The world is left with only people who own more than $100,000,000. I am pretty sure, soon enough most of them would just die from starving.
This mental experiment is an illustration of the important fact, that people who own a lot of money are NOT wealth creators. People who work every day helping each other and creating new things – food, drinks, cloth, devices – those people are wealth creators. The only reason rich are rich is because they collect from everyone – from every single one – some of the wealth created by that one. And the portion they collect has been growing and growing – disproportionately, without any reasonable explanation. Simply because the rules have been bent in such a way that the most of the wealth created by people is taken away from them – the distribution of the wealth is being skewed greatly to the benefit of very few. And taxes play a huge role in this distribution. Not to see it means being blind, or bought, or brainwashed.
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Why I have NO Trust in Democrats

Why I have NO Trust in Democrats

I've been teaching for more than 20 years - mostly physics (middle school, high school, college and university undergrads, school teachers), but also math, problem solving, logic.

I know with the absolute certainty that people who do not analyze their mistakes do not learn from them. And people who do not learn from mistakes they've done will make them again.

And again.

And again.

It has been 5 months, but NO ONE from the top of Democratic party stepped forward with a COMPREHENSIVE analysis of all major mistakes done in 2015-2016 (and to be truthful – even before that).

Every official website of the democratic Party needs to have a link named "Mistakes we've made, and lessons we've learned from them".

But there is none.

This is why, THERE are NO DOUBTS IN MY MIND that DEMOCRATIC ESTABLISHMENT WILL MAKE THE SAME MISTAKES AGAIN.

Top Democrats act like they have no memory.

Even worse, they act like we have no memory.

They want us just to forget and move on and - of course - donate, donate, donate.

Well, if they could not use our money wisely in 2016, and I see no indication they would do any better this time, why would I want to give up my money for them?

They will need to choose between (a) keeping their seats and keeping collecting donations from rich supporters and losing again in 2018, or (b) getting serious about winning but risking losing those donations – they will choose the donations.

Of course – this is a very simplistic model.

But:

(a) It is better to have a simplistic model than no model at all;

(b) It is better to plan actions based on the worst-case scenario and be glad if it did not happen, than counting on “good intentions” (being fooled only once), but then be disappointed (being fooled again).

www.gomars.xyz/op.html#why

New Democratic operatives replaced the old Democratic operatives, but it has not made any difference. The new guys have no vision and cannot offer anything really new.

https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/03/vision.html

All they do so far is exploiting Bernie Sanders's image.

This is why I am going to give a serious consideration to the third party movement.

https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/3party.html

I am a delegate to the Massachusetts Convention and will attend. I asked the organizers for an opportunity to speak out to the delegates. So far I have no
feedback on this.
I believe that June 3d will be the day when I will make mind mind, do I want to stay with Democrats, or do I want to part my path?
And I am sure, I will not be only one making the same decisions.
When will the Democrats make the first step of the 12-step program (admitting!)? Seems - never!

Recently I added my two cents to a Facebook discussion on the nature of the current political environment. I also published a post “Peering through the fog of brainwashing”. (https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/07/fog.html).

Soon a Facebook comment brought a reaction to my post. One writes: “What do democrats do about it? Nothing” Maybe because they don't control any of the three branches of government. That line is written by someone who is ignorant of how the american political system works.”

I always welcome critical comments; they energize my thinking.

I posted a reply “Keep being an ostrich with the head in the sand. Good luck in 2018” and a comment: “Hey, we are The Democrats, we KNOW how the American political system works. What? Contradiction? What contradiction? Why did we lose elections? Why don't we control any of the three branches of the government? Well, we KNOW how the American political system works. I guess we just don't use it. I guess we just don't do anything about it” and waited. I knew I would get a further response.

And it came: “It's almost as if the extreme left spent the entire election sabotaging them over nonsense...”. While waiting for the response, I have prepared the new post – this one.

Quote: “It's almost as if the extreme left spent the entire election sabotaging them over nonsense...”. That line is written by someone who is ignorant in logic, and arrogant in the nature. This type of a “song” is old as the Nature.

“I know what I need to do!”

“OK, why then nothing changes?”

“F U! I am telling you, I know what I need to do!”

Like “I can quit smoking (drinking, using drugs, playing video games, … - you name it, there are so many addictions people may have) ANY time I want!”

“So, why don’t you do it?”

“F U! I can quit smoking (drinking, using drugs, playing video games, … - you name it, there are so many addictions people may have) ANY time I want!”

If only that would be so easy to do.

Human nature is not so simple; otherwise no one would need the 12-step program (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Twelve-step_program).

What is the FIRST step? - Admitting!

The Democrats still cannot make even this first step! They are still in the state of denial. The Democrats have not offered a single truly new idea.
Ideas like a universal healthcare, $15 per hour minimum, etc., etc., have been around for a long time. However, they have not attracted people in numbers enough to win the elections.

People who supported Bernie Sanders supported him because of the same reasons people who supported Trump supported him – personality, charisma, being an outsider, being bold, saying what comes to mind, being just unusual.

Still, expecting Bernie Sanders winning in 2020 is a delusion.

However, even more important than that, the Democrats have not offered any new political instrument (but conservatives did: [https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/07/fog.html](https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/07/fog.html)).

The Democrats are eager to point at two facts:

1. Hillary Clinton won the popular vote;

and

2. More people have become politically energized.

OK.

1. Saying: “Hillary Clinton won the popular vote” is NO different from saying: “Our team lost, but it made more ball throws to a ring”; “Our team lost, but it made more kicks to the goalkeeper”; “Our team lost, but it made more throws of a puck toward the net”; etc. It only demonstrates the fact there was indeed an opportunity for the Democrats to win, but they were simply incapable to use it. What to expect when that opportunity is decreased (the Democrats do not have any more neither the White House, nor the congress)?

2. Regarding having more energy at hand, I would like to offer an old joke (taken from this post [https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/progress.html](https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/progress.html)).

Scientists study if monkeys can solve problems. In a big glass cage they planted a tree and placed a banana on a top branch. A monkey enters the cage and sees the banana. It jumps, but the banana is too high. It tries to climb the tree, but there is a very slippery plastic wrap around it. It looks around, finds a long stick and uses it to hit the banana down. Success! Then the researchers prepare the tree for the next experiment, place the banana on a top branch, but leave for a lunch. A hungry physics student sees the banana. He jumps, but the banana is too high. He tries to climb the tree, but there is a very slippery plastic wrap around it. The student starts shaking the tree, but the banana does not fall down.

The researchers come back from a lunch and see a student shaking a tree. After watching for a while one guy says via the intercom: “Hey, have you tried to think?” And the student says: “I’m not stupid. F@#k thinking! Just has to shake it harder!”

I guess, it is clear that I see the Democrats - as that guy – trying just “shake the three harder”, in hope “the banana would fall” (the elections would be won).

In politics, like in physics, the amount of force or energy does not matter on their own.

What is much more important is how that energy is being used, directed, utilized, organized (a short video about what liberals could learn from physics: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OwzK1Pfpt_E](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OwzK1Pfpt_E)).

I’ve got much more on the matter at [http://www.gomars.xyz/op.html](http://www.gomars.xyz/op.html).
Bernie Sanders’ quote from the transcript of his speech:

https://www.democracynow.org/2017/7/3/bernie_sanders_on_resisting_trump_why

"Now, I am often asked—I’m often asked by the media and others: How did it come about that Donald Trump, the most unpopular presidential candidate in the modern history of our country, won the election? And my answer is—and my answer is that Trump didn’t win the election; the Democratic Party lost the election. Let us—let us be very, very clear: The current model—the current strategy of the Democratic Party is an absolute failure. This is not—this is not my opinion. This is the facts. You know, we focus a lot on the presidential election, but we also have to understand that Democrats have lost the U.S. House, the U.S. Senate. Republicans now control almost two-thirds of the governors’ chairs throughout the country. And over the last nine years, Democrats have lost almost 1,000 legislative seats in states all across this country. Today—in almost half of the states in America, Democratic Party has almost no political presence at all. Now, if that’s not a failure, if that’s not a failed model, I don’t know what a failed model is."

My question is – if the model of a LARGE social organization is a failed model, how much time would be needed to make a transition to a working model?

I am not a historian, or a sociologist, but I am absolutely convinced, that one or two years would not be enough — simply because of the huge social inertia. This bring us to the question of 2018 elections. Fixing the Democratic party is a long-term goal. But preventing Republicans from keeping the majority in the Congress is a short-term goal. That is why I insist on separating two questions:

(a) What do we need to do to bring the Democrats in the Congress to majority?

and

(b) What do we need to do to bring the Republicans in the Congress to minority?

These are two different questions, and they have two very different answers!

The first goal requires long and painful reforms inside the Democratic party (simply because social inertia is huge; inside fighting is vigorous and makes all factions weaker; but none of the factions will give up the fight). The second goal requires formation of a third national party – and it needs to be done NOW!

https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/3party.html

Appendix (added a day later).

today, in almost half of the states in America, Democratic Party has almost no political presence at all. Now, if that’s not a failure, if that’s not a failed model, I don’t know what a failed model is."
Dear Senator Sanders,

Thank you for your letter, (scroll down to the copy of the letter),

Let me make a couple of points which are very important for me.
1. your team lost.
2. Based on your answers to question 1, what do you think should be the Party's strategy for winning 2018 elections? I mean, besides touring and promoting your Our Revolution platform -- which is very good, I have nothing against it, except I do not see how would Democrats be able to realize it - so, please, help me see!

You say that we need to elect right people in the Congress. Isn't this always a case? I bet in 2016 we did not want to elect wrong people; all people who lost elections also were "right" -- right? But lost! Why? How are new people better than the ones who lost?

What I am waiting for to hear from Senator Sanders is something like this: "This is what I demand from the Democratic leadership: 1, 2, 3, .... If by the end of July I will not see it, I take our Our Revolution movement and form the third party."

Well, I have much more questions to ask, but these two are the most pressing ones. Hope to hear from you soon again -- but not your generic call, your specific strategy.

Good luck,
Valentin

P.S. regarding the money, please read this:
https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/progress.html

***************

Dear Valentin,

With Trump's election, we live in a pivotal moment in American history. This country will either move in the direction of an authoritarian government where the rich get richer and everyone else gets poorer, or we will successfully fight back and build a strong grassroots movement to create a government which represents all of us, not just Donald Trump and others in the billionaire class.

That's the struggle we now face. No one can sit on the sidelines. Not now. The only way we win is when we stand together and fight back. I need your help to do that.

The bad news is that Trump's agenda -- huge tax breaks for billionaires, enormous increases in military spending, massive cuts in health care and programs that protect
Dear Senator Sanders,

Thank you for your letter. But alone, I can't.

The good news is that the resistance to this extremist Trump/Republican agenda is growing rapidly. We saw that as millions participated in the Women's March in January. We saw that as hundreds of thousands attended rallies and town meetings in February and March to successfully defeat the Republican effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act and throw 24 million Americans off of their health insurance. We are seeing that now as people across the country are mobilizing for Green Day events to take on the fossil fuel industry, combat climate change and transform our energy system to energy efficiency and sustainable energy.

When we launched our presidential campaign two years ago, I told you that victory would require the active participation of millions of Americans in every community across the country. That it would require nothing short of a political revolution to combat the demoralization so many feel about the political process. That's what I believed then. That's what I believe now. And that's what I am attempting to do. During the last several months I have visited a number of states where Donald Trump won. My message: working people must not support a president and a party beholden to powerful special interests and the top 1 percent. We cannot support a party which wants to divide us up by race, gender, religion, national origin or sexual orientation. I was in Wisconsin where progressives are determined to overcome the Trump victory in that state and elect candidates who, in 2018, will stand with working people and not the 1 percent. I was in Kansas where, in one of the most conservative states in the country, over 5,000 people attended a progressive rally in Topeka. I was in Mississippi, a state today heavily dominated by the Republican Party, where brave workers in the auto industry are fighting for a union. I was in West Virginia, where Trump won a landslide victory, but where many people are beginning to rethink the wisdom of that decision.

And next week I am going back on the road, visiting areas of the country often ignored by Democrats. I will be in Maine, Kentucky, Florida, Nevada, Nebraska, Utah and Arizona. I will be talking about the grotesque level of income and wealth inequality that we face and the need for the rich to start paying their fair share of taxes. I will discuss the Medicare-for-all, single-payer legislation that I will soon be introducing. I will urge people to join the Fight for $15 minimum wage struggle to make sure all Americans enjoy a living wage. I will ask people across the country to help us create millions of jobs by rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure. I will explain the need to aggressively move forward for comprehensive immigration reform and why we must immediately fix our broken criminal justice system.

But I can't do it alone.

Please make a $27 contribution to my re-election campaign to help fund this national tour.

Please attend the rallies in your area. Please work with me to revitalize American democracy and advance the political revolution.

Like I said from the beginning, our political revolution was never about one candidate. It was about creating a mass movement for real change in this country. That's the struggle we began. That's the struggle we'll continue. No turning back now.

In solidarity,

Bernie Sanders
Thursday, July 6, 2017

Peering through the fog of brainwashing: the real reasons behind the conservative politics.

Peering through the fog of brainwashing.

The fog machine is working and is very effective. People are debating what health care plan is good, bad, or ugly. No one seems to get to the roots. And the roots are very simple.

1. The globalization had resulted in that many white Americans lost their highly paid jobs - and NO one (neither Republicans nor Democrats) know what to do about it, so they do nothing, but blaming each other.

2. For the last decades (at least) the American demographic has been drastically changing in such a way that non-white Americans soon should become the majority (http://www.epi.org/publication/the-changing-demographics-of-americas-working-class/). Everything so-called “conservatives” do is to prevent the white soon-to-be-minority from losing the political power. Gerrymandering, voter suppression, unreasonably strict anti-drugs laws was just the beginning. Conservatives have been quietly building a brainwashing media machine.

If you think FOX News, or Breitbart – you are wrong. Those guys are not quiet. Think Sinclair (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_stations Owned_or_operated_by_Sinclair_Broadcast_Group); check the latest John Oliver’s piece on it (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GvtNyOzGogc).

BTW: what do Democrats do about it? Nothing. They do not have any vision. Thy just happy that more people get upset with Trump and express their anger. But what do Democrats do now what we could called NEW and SIGNIFICANT? Nothing. They just keep doing the same thing again and again and waiting for new result to happen, but just with more energy (lots of posts on the matter at https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com; for example https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/clinton.html or https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/03/warren.html).

GOP’s healthcare plan is new tool to keep the status quo. It is designed to hit the poorest. Anyone who says: “but it also hits Trump’s base” does not see far enough. It may seem like the plan hits the Trump’s base, but when it comes to its realization, some adjustments will be done, but not for everyone.

In his recent interview to NPR Dr. Rod Hochman said: “America as a country is older and poorer.” (http://www.npr.org/2017/06/28/534681846/hospital-official-waits-to-see-when-senate-votes-on-gop-health-bill).

The GOP’s plan is to deal with this problem to let people who cannot afford health (minorities) insurance to die out.

Politics is never about anything but POWER (for good or for bad). What we see is the process of building the political machine which would keep minorities out of power even when they will become the majority.

And EVERYTHING what “conservative” do, they do it out of one single motive (so, just ignore anything they say).

They do it out of fear.

They do it out of fear of loosing political power - to minorities.

Unfortunately, that fear resonates with many, and ignored by even more. Why can't the Democrats use this knowledge for advancing their agenda, is a different conversation (e.g. https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/07/admitting.html)

Appendix:
A couple of weeks after this post was published, the Republicans came up with the new version of the health care bill. In that bill they proposed to treat differently rural folks and urban folks. This is exactly the type of adjustment I originally mentioned! When they say "rural" they mean "white Americans". "Urban" means either rich people who will not be affected by any version of the bill; and poor minorities who will be kicked out of the health care if the bill will be accepted.

There are however two commonalities in how Republicans treat all the poor, white and non-white.
1. The Republicans do not want people to think.
   And the best way to keep people from thinking is to make them work so hard, they have no energy left for anything else. When one has to work 60 hours a week, juggling two jobs to only make it a paycheck to a paycheck, one has no ability to think about social and economical issues. One just comes home, drinks some bear, and falls into a bed.
2. The Republicans do not want people to know.
   That is why they fight anything which may help improving public schools, especially in urban areas.
Mr. Ossoff,

Today I got an email from Tom Perez (please, scroll down for the letter). He asked me to send him some money to help you to win the election.

First, I want to congratulate you on your spectacular result, indeed!

And second, instead of money, I am sending to you a more valuable gift – a protocol toward your victory (each slogan needs an unambiguous and memorable pictorial representation). Your priorities are perfect. But some people need more than that. They need clear statements which make sense to them – slogans.

Using these slogans, you will win the seat.

1. “Restore the American promise!”
   “I promise to you that together we will restore the American promise!”

   N.B. It is exactly what you are trying to do, so no need to pretend.

   But more importantly, that is exactly what America has lost over the last two decades. Gradually, slowly, little by little, it has become harder and harder for regular folks to maintain a decent life for their families. This goes to whites and none-whites, rural and urban folks.

2. “Make America fair for ALL!”
   “Fairness should not depend on wealth!”
   “Same Constitution for ALL!”
   “Politics for people is politics without lying!”
   “Do not trust angry yellers, rely on your common sense!”
   “Democracy is the goal. The party is just an instrument!”
   “Progressives, stop talking about what to do. Start doing!”
   “Abolish economic slavery!”
   “The rich bent the rules, we will bend them back!”
   “Share wealth fairly!”

Jon Ossoff, a Democrat, Narrowly Misses Outright Win in Georgia House Race

By Jonathan Martin and Richard Faroest

April 19, 2017
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3. “Politics for people is politics without!”
   “Do not let yourself be dragged into the fog of lies! When Republicans have nothing to say they lie and lie and lie!”
   “Do not trust angry yellers, rely on your common sense!”
   “A difficult problem has no simple solution! If someone promises you a quick fix, it is “the cheese in a mouse trap”
   “Republicans are pouring tar of lies on me and all free thinkers! Don’t let that tar stick to you”.

4. “Democracy is the goal. The party is just an instrument!”
   “Yes, I am a democrat, but I am a new democrat. I am an independent democrat, and I am a pragmatic democrat. Besides Obamacare, what else have Democrats achieved? Obamacare is not perfect, but no one sent a bill to improve it. Taxes effectively funnel our money from us to the rich. But Democrats didn’t dare to touch the tax code because it was “too toxic”. Little by little too many Democrats forgot why people elected them. And I will remind them about that! We - new Democrats - will reform the Democratic party from the inside!”

5. “Stop talking about what to do. Start doing!”
   “The first things we – new democrats – will do are the tax reform which will benefit the middle class; the bill to fix the Obamacare and start the transition to the single payer insurance, …”

6. “Abolish economic slavery!”
   “Ten percent of Americans own three quarters of total American wealth! They force ninety percent of Americans to struggle for one quarter of what those folks make. 13 % off all American households are in debt! Imagine, you and 99 others together run a business. At the end of the year your business generated $1000,000 in profit. Out of 100 people who worked together, 10 people take $75,000 each, you and 76 more people take about $3300 each (which is about twenty-five times less!), and 13 people get nothing. This how America works today. America made a full circle! Today America again has barons who own the most of the country, and the rest who generates the wealth which the barons take for granted! Today 90 % of Americans wear chains of economic slavery.”

7. “The rich bent the rules, we will bend them back!”
   “1 % of American population controls one third of the total American wealth! How did it happen?
   The rich did not break any rules, they slowly bent the rules in their favor using Republicans as their puppets. We need to bend the rules back. We need to take the governing power back, and make it work in the favor of the working folks.”

8. “Share wealth fairly!”
   “Our goal is the new optimization of wealth allocation! Sound fancy, but describes a simple idea: working folks need to take back their fair share of what they produce.
   For thousands of years some people have been producing wealth, and other people have been deciding who gets what. Ancient Egypt - slaves and a pharaoh; middle centuries France – peasants and a king. American Constitution established that all people have equal rights for a fair share of the wealth. But the Constitution does not write the rules. People write the rules. And over the last two decades those rules have been greatly beneficial for a few and depressive for the rest. During the last ten years, the U.S. Federal Reserve added to the market about $4.5 trillion worth of assets” [https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/30/upshot/the-fed-has-not-stopped-trying-to-stimulate-the-economy.html?ref=upshot&abt=0002&abg=1] They called it “quantitative easing”, but essentially, it was just printing money and giving it away. If the average wage of 90 % of Americans has not changed, where did those $4.5 trillion go?

N.B. a must-read book on the matter for everyone in a progressive camp is “Saving Capitalism”, by Robert B. Reich.
F.Y.I: after your victory, please pass these slogans to the next new Democrat.

Mr. Ossoff, do not get sucked into “he said, she said” debates. Just tell your story!

Good Luck!

Dr. Valentin Voroshilov
www.GoMars.xyz
https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/

Appendix

http://www2.ucsc.edu/whorulesamerica/power/wealth.html
In 2007, the richest 10 percent of U.S. households owned over 71 percent of total household wealth; in 2013 they owned almost 75 percent.

This chart shows, that since 2013 one tenth of the American population owns three quarters of total American wealth! They make ninety percent of Americans to struggle for one quarter of what they make.

A letter from Tom Perez.

Friend --

For 38 years, Georgia's 6th congressional district has been a deep shade of red.

That means that after each of the past 20 elections, a Republican has gone to Congress who wouldn't fight for affordable health care, wouldn't stand up to protect the right to vote, and wouldn't demand a fair, livable wage.

On June 20th, we have the chance to change all that by sending Jon Ossoff to Congress. But to break nearly four decades of precedent, he's going to need all the help we can give him.

Can you split a $10 donation between Jon Ossoff and the DNC to help elect Democrats in Georgia and all across the country?

I know Jon, and I know he's someone who cares about the people of Georgia's 6th district. He got into this race because he believes, in the words of his mentor John Lewis, in getting in "good trouble" to create change. In a Congress that has become paralyzed by partisan gridlock, I know Jon will be a breath of fresh air.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Top 1 percent</th>
<th>Next 19 percent</th>
<th>Bottom 80 percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income class</th>
<th>Mean household income</th>
<th>Mean household net worth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 1 percent</td>
<td>$1,659,000</td>
<td>$18,023,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20 percent</td>
<td>$257,200</td>
<td>$2,265,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th-60th percentile</td>
<td>$76,500</td>
<td>$236,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th-80th percentile</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$86,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 40 percent</td>
<td>$20,200</td>
<td>-$10,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do We See The Dusk Of America? That Depends On …

Every country is as powerful as powerful its citizens. For any country to be successful the country needs to have a sufficient number of people who satisfy the four following conditions; those people have to be:

1. smart
2. educated
3. honest
4. active.

All four conditions are equally important and the order I list them does not matter; it just reflects the fact that I am a physics teacher. “Smart” means an ability to solve problems using reasoning. “Educated” means having in a working memory a sufficient volume of relevant information.

“Honest” means more than just telling the truth; it also means an ability to take risks and be open about it, an ability to accept mistakes (and – being smart and educated – learn from those mistakes).

“Active” means literally to be active, to be involved in actions, to act. A lazy genius who watches the events of the world and does nothing about anything might as well just do not exist, since his/her
influence is equal to zero. “Active” also means an ability and the necessity to communicate with fellow citizens.

We live in historic times. The whole World is undergoing a transition from one historic phase to another one. The World used to be essentially divided between two stable forces of influence, called “Communistic materialism” and “Democratic capitalism.” This old World does not exist anymore, but the new stable world configuration is still in the making. It will take at least a couple of generations to build the new World. By the end of that process the new configuration of the centers of influence will emerge.

If history teaches us anything, it is that there is no guaranty at all, that those countries which had the most of the influence at the beginning of the reconstruction of the world order, still will keep the same level of influence. On the contrary, the most of the historic precedents tell us that the new world order usually is based on the new most influential countries (for example, the Roman Empire https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roman_Empire; British Empire https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_Empire; Mongol Empire https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mongol_Empire).

Whether we like it or not, America is not insulted from the processes happening in the whole world. The events of the 2016 Presidential Elections is one of the most visible results of the social changes happening in America due to its interactions with the rest of the World.

No wonder millions of Americans express isolationists sentiments. However, the future of America is not defined by the processes happening outside of the Country.

The future of America solely depends on how many smart, educated, honest, and active people does America have (https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/03/sane.html).

Currently we can only hope that the number of such people is above the critical threshold.

P.S. click here for some of the publishing history on the ma_ er.
What should really differ a “Progressive” from a “Conservative”?

What should really differ a “Progressive” from a “Conservative”?

Please note: this post has a joke, to skip the post and go directly to the joke just scroll down!

"Republicans are against science!"

"Republicans consider ignorance to be a bliss!"

"Republicans do not want people to learn"

"Democrats represent the completely opposite approach to knowledge, to science, to education!"

OK.

Let us assume that all those statements are correct.

In that case, this is a very important piece of knowledge every politically active knowledge-lover should have:

emotions always cloud our decision, and in too many cases emotions govern our decision.

A quote from Wikipedia (or you can Google “How emotions affect decisions” and chose whatever source you like): https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emotional_bias

"An emotional bias is a distortion in cognition and decision making due to emotional factors.

That is, a person will be usually inclined

- to believe something that has a positive emotional effect, that gives a pleasant feeling, even if there is evidence to the contrary.

- to be reluctant to accept hard facts that are unpleasant and give mental suffering."

In simple words, it means that when we hear or read something, and if it makes us feel “bad”, especially if we start feeling “bad about ourselves” we tend to reject whatever we hear or read (and v-v).

At first, our brain makes the emotional judgement – “this is bad”, and then immediately follows a “logical” one – “this is wrong”. The emotional judgement happens deep inside in our mind, uncontrollably, subconsciously, and the rest of the energy is being used to develop a “logical” support around it.

Ten years ago, such knowledge would have been available only to a very tight circle of researchers in the field. Today anyone can easily find it on the Internet.

Of course, not everyone needs to have this particular knowledge.

I would suggest, however, that people who make certain claims about other people statements (in person, or on Facebook), need to be able to go beyond just “I like it”, or “I don’t like it”. Especially people who see themselves as the opposite of “those so much hated, stupid, ignorant Republicans”.

Because, anyone who does just one thing – provides an emotional judgement, but cannot offer nothing more to support it, or to logically disprove the opposite statement – is not really different in his or her actions, approaches, tactics from “those so much hated, stupid, ignorant Republicans”.

The true difference is not in the ideals and beliefs, but in the actions undertaken for supporting those ideals and beliefs.

And again, all I want to do is to point at writings on the mater provided by very smart people.


In short, when people accept an idea of some “ideal world” without any critical analysis, i.e. dogmatically, eventually they tend to reject every other idea which is incoherent with the “big idea”, and people who offer other ideas become treated as wrong, and as the enemies of the “ideal world” (and those people are needed to be destroyed).

I know, this is a gross simplification of the Popper’s views, but good enough to make a point.

In the end, the true big difference between people with different political views is not the views they have, but – if they treat those views dogmatically, or if they allow some critical reasoning.

So, if anyone writes on Facebook (or anywhere else): “I don’t like this!” - that is absolutely fine. But if that statement is related to a potential political action (not about food, clothes, etc.), a responsible Democrat should be able to add “Because of 1, 2, 3, …”

Similarly, if anyone writes on Facebook (or anywhere else): “I like this!” that is also absolutely fine. But if that statement is related to a potential political action, a responsible Democrat should also be able to add “Because of 1, 2, 3, …”
But developing and laying out logical arguments (a.k.a. reasoning) is as a job as any other job – requires a certain amount of practicing. The first step is just to start trying (like the first step to learn how to ride a bicycle is to start riding a bicycle). People who do that, propel themselves beyond just emotional judgement. But not everyone wants to do that (although – everyone CAN!).

Some time ago I had a Facebook chat with a lady, who attended a so called “Resistance School” (https://www.resistanceschool.com/). Long story short, eventually I asked her to write to me and everyone else one page of the summary from what she learned with a focus on what mistakes have been done in 2016 (according to her, it was covered in the “school”). At this point she told me that she needs to take care of kids, family, job, and she has no time for doing this. Since she has time to drive to the “school”, listen to the speakers, talk to other participants, drive back, and then chat about it on Facebook, I assumed that she rather did not want to do it (“no time” is just an excuse). I do understand that for the lady, attending the “school” plaid a very important role by giving her an emotional support, by having her being surrounded by people with similar views, by helping her to make sense from the 2016 loss and the current politics. But a small extra step, like writing one summary page, would make this whole experience even more valuable, more practical, more actionable (BTW: a true school always assigns homework! Since the videos are freely available at some point I will listen to them, usually I use a traffic jam for this purpose).

The willingness to make that extra step, to go beyond an emotional judgement, and to offer some reasoning to support his or her opinion (or to dismantle somebody else’s opinion) – that is what (in my view) separates a true Progressive from a Conservative.

So, I spent hours, and I wrote a long post about the importance of reasoning in politics. What’s in it for me?

There is a joke I learned many years ago when I was a physics undergrad.

Scientists study if monkeys can solve problems. In a big glass cage they planted a tree and placed a banana on a top branch. A monkey enters the cage and sees the banana. It jumps, but the banana is too high. It tries to clime the tree, but there is a very slippery plastic wrap around it. It looks around, finds a long stick and uses it to hit the banana down. Success! Then the researchers prepare the tree for the next experiment, place the banana on a top branch, but leave for a lunch. A hungry physics student sees the banana. He jumps, but the banana is too high. He tries to clime the tree, but there is a very slippery plastic wrap around it. The student starts shaking the tree, but the banana does not fall down. The researches come back from a lunch and see a student shaking a tree. After watching for a while one guy says via the intercom: “Hey, have you tried to think?” And the student says: “I’m not stupid. F@#k thinking! Just has to shake it harder!”
When I read something like: “Senator Sanders is on a tour! Donate $3!” I always remember that joke.

I fail to see the logical connection between the two parts of the statement. Does Senator Sanders need some extra money to buy airplane tickets, or to rent a car, or to stay in a hotel? It looks to me that people who sent this email think that I am no smarter than the student in the joke. All they want from me is “keep shaking”.

However, when I look at the current state of affairs, to me it looks that the Democrats (most of the top ones) are just “keep shaking a tree”.

In 2016 I trusted in the ability of the top Democrats to see the social, economic, and political landscape of the Country, and to design the appropriate strategy. Close to the October I started having deep doubts, because the whole campaign has been built on a trivial slogan: “Trump is bad! I am good!”. I knew that that would not work; and I was not the only one, for example, Michael Moor and Bill Maher expressed similar views. But no one at the top wanted to hear anything different from their own views. And Trump won.

“Fool me once, shame on you”, right? The thing is I do not want to be fooled the second time. I lost my trust in the ability of the Democratic party leaders to design the correct strategy to win next elections. But I still have a hope they may come around. My hope is thinning every day.

All I hear is “We will fight!” I have no doubts in that.

I have doubts when I hear “We will win!”

Well, Democrats, you did not win the last time. And you treat your loss like nothing special, like one pro-football team lost another one.

In reality, your loss is like a pro-football team lost to a bunch of guys who has never plaid football and who just has met each other. And you are trying to make an impression that nothing went wrong, it was just a fluctuation. “Look, we won the popular vote!” Yes, you did, which means you could have won the whole thing, BUT you did not, which makes things even worse for your ability to deliver.

In 2016 Democrats did not use the money wisely (http://gomars.xyz/op.html#why), They dreamed that people would see how bad Trump was and would not vote for him. Now they dream that people would see how bad Trump really is and will not vote for him. So, six months passed since the election day, but the Democratic leadership has not offered ANYTHING new in its strategy.

**I do not believe that a complicated problem has a simple solution. I do not trust people who say that. And I definitely do not trust people who failed but do not want to talk about it.**

Democrats, if you could not do it right in 2016, and keep doing old same old same in 2017, why would I give you any money? You will lose again, anyway!

For years, I have been voting democratic but remained an independent. A couple of weeks after Trump won I registered as a Democrat. I did not do it because I liked the Democrats. On the contrary, I did it because I did not like the way they acted in 2016 elections and wanted to see from the inside if the new leadership would show the signs of being able to make changes the party needs.

SO, I am observing, and thinking, and writing, and waiting.

If I will not see from the leadership clear signs that they know how to win the next elections (and I need a proof!), I will be doing what millions of people have done on November 9, 2016 – switching to the third party.

And yes, top Democrats – this IS a threat.

And yes – there are millions of us who are not trusting in just slogans (I am just a sample from that army), and whose vote will decide the next elections.
And the next.

And the next.

How do I *KNOW* it?

I reason! [https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/3party.html](https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/3party.html)

If Democrats will not be capable of being true Progressives (in time to 2018 elations), people who make decisions using logical arguments will have to put their efforts together and form a new, the first truly third, political party (I hope you would also read other posts available on the blog).

P.S. This is a link to a nice example of an exchange “logic” vs. “who are you?:

P.P.S. some introduction into practice of arguing:
[https://triangulations.wordpress.com/2013/09/01/laying-out-an-argument/](https://triangulations.wordpress.com/2013/09/01/laying-out-an-argument/)

or
[http://www.theskepticsguide.org/resources/logical-fallacies](http://www.theskepticsguide.org/resources/logical-fallacies)

P.P.S. FYI - when I write what I think, I do not want to make every reader to agree with me, or to switch someone into thinking like me. All I want is to find people who (a) have similar views and willing to express it, or (b) have different views and willing to offer a reasonable critique of my ideas. People who just call me names do not affect me.

No comments yet

Add a comment as Valentin Voroshilov (Dr. V)
DraftBernie and “People’s Party” is NOT the answer

DraftBernie and “People’s Party” is NOT the answer

This post was published several days after the main post on the 3D party movement was published (https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/3party.html), because I just found out about a “People’s Party” and DraftBernie movement (https://draftbernie.org/; https://twitter.com/DraftBernie; https://www.facebook.com/DraftBernieSanders/).

At first I was very enthusiastic.

But following one of my favored mottoes “Trust, but verify” (for example, https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/Moore.html), I started checking the related websites, and soon my enthusiasm disappeared.

A war is an awful and devastating social occurrence. But there are always people who are waiting for a war, and who are genuinely glad when it happens.

At the top of the list you find … generals.

For a general, his life, his mission is to fight in a war; only a war gives the final satisfaction, self-respect, the proof of the “I matter” feeling.

The “People’s Party” has been initiated by the “former generals” (a.k.a. operatives) of the Bernie Sanders’ political machinery.

What comes to mind first of all is – those people actually did not succeed in making Bernie the party nominee. And this fact is not addressed at all anywhere you look.

This makes me doubt their abilities to lead a political party.

Definitely, they miss a fight; definitely, they want to be back in action. Obviously, they want to use the political weight of Bernie Sanders (who does not want – so far – to have anything in common with the “People’s Party”).

But there is no indication that the people behind the “People’s Party” have a vision very much different from the Democratic party.

The social goals, what is “good” and what is “bad” for the Country are basically a copy of what the Democrats list on their website.

Another of my mottoes says: “Want to make a difference? Start from being different”; which means, start doing something new – for you, what you have not done before (for example, I started a political blog), hopefully (one can only hope!), meaningful and useful.

The “People’s Party” does NOT pass the test on being different.

There is definitely a large number of people who are frustrated, and who are angry at Democrats.

What seems a case is that people at the “People’s Party” want to use this anger and frustration against Democrats.
I am angry, too. Democrats basically handed the Presidency to Trump
But!
First, Democrats are not the enemy. Democrats do have serious issues, but definitely they should be seen as allies.
Second, a mission of a political party is not riding a wave of people’s emotions (even if it seems so), it is not using those emotions in order to gain political power.
The mission of a political party is to coordinate people’s actions, directing those actions to – ultimately – gaining governing power and starting governing according to the ideals of the party.
The problems the Democratic party had, and has, and evidently will be having for a long time (since there is no indication for the opposite) are not because the ideals are wrong, but because the leadership has no vision, knowledge, will, intellect for designing political actions needed for taking over the governing (the leadership fell out of touch from a reality a long time ago; new people are only "new" by name, but not by vision, knowledge, will, intellect).
This post would be much longer if I would go into the details of why the Democratic leadership is incapable of making the transition from the right ideals to the right actions (some info on this is here: https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/trust.html, https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/03/warren.html, http://www.gomars.xyz/op.html/why).
My point is that the leaders of the “People’s Party” are NO different from the leaders of the Democratic party; they also do not offer anything beyond emotional agitation, sound slogans, blaming enemies – all the same arsenal of tools which did not help Democrats to win.
Again, in one sentence: the real reason Trump won is because his team outsmarted both competing teams (R & D). Nothing what people from the “People’s Party” do indicates that they are smarter than Democrats; hence, by the transition law, “People’s Party” will be also outsmarted by the people behind Trump.
The list of “military disasters” at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_military_disasters is a historic proof of a simple fact, that the most important – the core – source of a victory (any victory, for that matter) is making right decisions (the Battle of Chancellorsville is one of many well-known examples: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Chancellorsville).
Everything else is secondary.
Everything else is just factors, which usually are equally available to competing factions, parties, armies (such as landscape, weather, or books, advisers, etc.).
The party which makes less mistakes wins, often even if the odds (man power, money, material possessions) are against the “disadvantaged” group.
Unfortunately, to this very day (04/14/2017) Trumps “central brain committee” still trumps all other “pockets of thinking”.
Maybe we need a help from people from the outside of a regular political circle (or a circus, if you will); people like Bill Maher, Stephen Colbert, Michael Moor – people whose mind is still flexible, elastic, not rigid?
At least to criticize all the ideas coming down for formal and self-proclaimed "leaders" until something new, meaningful, reasonable, and actionable will appear.
I know that Bill Maher, and Michael Moor had been flirting with third parties before. It seems that – like the most of Americans – they do not understand the true role a third party should play in politics. Maybe because of this (and their past experience) they do not see how a first truly third party would function in the U.S.
But at least I will try (I have to) to bring their attention to a new view on the role of the third party, because the current political landscape is ready and just calls for a party #3.
I do believe when "radical" democrats will leave the party and create the 3D party which also will be attractive to moderate Republicans, it only will make the Democratic
party sounder and tougher (less internal quarrels), and the coordination between two parties (Dems and the 3D) will make the opposition to Republicans even stronger and more effective (https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/04/3party.html).

Riding a wave of emotional frustration and anger is no brainier.

People want simple decisions and they want them NOW!

It requires much more effort and time and brain work (for example, long reading, thinking, writing) to analyze all important processes governing social behavior of various social strata, layers, factions, groups, and to design an action plan which would reflect those processes.

If Bernie Sanders will ever form his own party it is not because of DraftBernie. He will never be absorbed by some other movement. And he does not need it; he has Our Revolution. Sooner or later he will have to make his final decision: stay with the Democrats or go solo. In any case the first truly third American political party can become politically successful only if the right people will start making the right decisions.

Today it is not yet a case.
Democratic Party Leaders Have No Vision

Hey fellow Democrats!
Did I tell you that the leaders of our party have no vision?
If not, here it is.

The leaders of the Democratic party have no vision.
I have been writing about it for quite a while, for example, check this:
http://www.gomars.xyz/op.html
And the events of the past Friday confirmed my statement one more time.
Every single liberal media outlet makes fun of Republicans – something in the line: “Republicans had seven years to prepare the ObamaCare replacement, and they couldn’t, ha-ha!”.

Well, this statement goes both ways.
Democrats have known very well that Republicans would try to replace ObamaCare.
And what did they do? NOTHING!
What they should have done is quietly working on a counter bill.

The minute Paul Ryan made his announcement about not presenting the TrumpCare bill,
Democrats had to announce their own bill which would aim to improve those parts of ObamaCare which everyone keeps criticizing.
Instead, Democrats just didn’t vote.
Now they give the advantage back to Trump.
After sulking over the weekend, he will announce on Monday or so, that he will reach to Democrats with a new offer on a healthcare bill.
And when he will do that, it will be HIS initiative, and eventually – HIS victory.
Our leaders do not understand that today Donald Trump presents the biggest threat to our national security.

Anything what makes him stronger only increases that threat.
But our leaders seems following the general sentiment: “Let’s give him a chance”, maybe he will change”.
This link leads to some of the words said about Donald Trump by a respectable Republican, former governor of Massachusetts Mitt Romney:
Including “a con man, a fake”.
Nothing changed since then.
But our leaders do not WANT to see it.
It is like our leaders dug in trenches. When an enemy solder gets to the edge of the trench, they wound him, and they scream “We win! We win!”.
NO, YOU are NOT!
You are still in trenches scared to raise your head above the edge!
Tom Perez sent “me” an email:
Tom Perez, we know that the only reason the bill did not get to a vote is because some of the Republicans did not like it. Why? Who cares! It still was NOT because of you!

Tom Perez, when do you plan to attack?!

Tom Perez, do you even have a plan for an attack?!

Our Democratic leaders became senior pensioners, for whom the best news of a day is the absence of bad news.

It is our duty to tell them how deeply disappointed we all are.

****

An update.

A day later

1. Trump announced his willingness to work with Democrat

and

2. Senator Sanders announced he will introduce a bill to fix issues within ObamaCare
President Trump Changes Tone on Democrats After Health Care Failure

Zeke J Miller
2:45 PM ET

President Trump is "absolutely" willing to work with Democrats on other parts of his agenda after discord among Republicans torpedoed his plans to repeal and replace Obamacare.

White House spokesman Sean Spicer said Monday that Trump is already fielding calls from Democrats who are looking to develop a relationship with the Administration as the focus shifts from health care to tax reform and infrastructure spending.

"We learned a lot through this process," Spicer told reporters.

The health care bill was pulled by House Republican leadership Friday as GOP moderates and conservatives fled from the controversial legislation. The White House and Speaker of the House Paul Ryan have laid the blame on the conservative House Freedom Caucus, which refused to sign off on the legislation.
Senator Warren,

Unfortunately, I cannot attend your town meeting on Monday due my work schedule, but if I could, this is what I would have said.

“Senator Warren,

how come that so far, NO single top Democrat has addressed the TRUE reasons for America now has President Trump?

When one pro-football team loses to another pro-football team it is normal; it is like Gore lost to Bush, they both were political veterans.

But losing to Trump’s team it is like a pro-football team loses to a bunch of guys who had never played football and just met each other before the game.

This requires DEEP analytical work. But NO ONE at the top of the Democratic party does it. Everyone keeps screaming the same slogans: “Trump is baaaad. We are gooood!”

It’s like we don’t know it. It’s like we are so ignorant we cannot see it. It’s like we are so forgetful, we need to be reminded of this every day.

It has not worked before – that is why Trump won – how can you expect it will work now, or in the future?

As a long-time physics/math teacher and just an educated person, I know that people who want to forget history, who do not accept mistakes, who do not analyze reasons for the
mistakes – WILL repeat them again. Hence, in the current state of events, Democrats will lose – again, and again, and again – that includes the Congress in 2018, the next Presidential elections.

Democrats behave like nothing extraordinary happened – like it was just another regular political loss.

IT WAS NOT!!

Thinking such is a clear path to more lost elections.

Acting like nothing happened makes Democrats look week, even “ball-less” – from the point of view of the swing “hidden” voters who elected Trump.

You have to demonstrate the will and ability to move on, like Ben Affleck demonstrated it by telling everyone he was in a rehab.

I watch the Democrats and what I want to scream is: “Trump is smaaaart!”, “Democrats are stuuuuuupid!”

Of course, when we say “Trump” we have to mean his all team.

At the minimum (!), check this: “A Sane America” vs. “An Insane America”; The Latter Has Won”: https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/03/sane.html.

(or better this https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/02/4s.html or at least take a look at this 4-minut video: https://youtu.be/OwzKlFpIt_E)

Anyway, Senator Warren, I am sure you will be speaking at the 2017 Mass Dem State Convention. I will be there, too. And I really really want to hear how will you address the issue I describe in this post.

Or, you also will lose my trust in your abilities to lead.

But even more important, you will NOT gain the trust of the people without whom Democrats will never win again.

At this point it is not an issue of facts and logic.

At this point it is an issue of mass psychology and a character.”

P.S. click here for some of the publishing history on the matter.

http://the3dforce.blogspot.com/2017/03/warren.html
This web page represents a compilation of about 90% of my blog posts written a couple of month before or after 11/08/2016. (naturally, some of the themes used in one post had been reused in some other post, but in general about 90% of the most of the post is new)

The list of the post on this page:

**Bye-Bye The Pathetic Democratic Party! (one way or another)**
**Liberals! Stop living in a bubble!**
**What is wrong with being “neutral journalist”**
**Who will be the real President of the United States?**
**Statement of Massachusetts Democratic Committee.**
**Why did Hillary Clinton Lose the Race?**
**What Could Liberals Learn From Physics?**
**Intellectual stagnation, social conformism, and the crisis of logical communication.**
**Liberals, stop whining!**
**American Republicans are just Russian Bolsheviks!**
**The election is just over. What's now?**
**To everyone who has been emotionally attacked, called names, threatened, verbally degraded!**

“A failure of imagination” has lead to 11/08/2016.

**Were Democrats Doomed, or There Was a Path to The Victory, and Does It Still Exist?**
**A mob revolution**
**To Nancy Pelosi**

The newer post are available at [https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/](https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/)

***************

**Bye-Bye The Pathetic Democratic Party! (one way or another)**

There are two distinctly different types of personalities.

Some people accept the reality the way it is.

Others change that reality – for the better or for the worse.

The latter ones have in common at least two very strongly functioning organs:

1) a brain

2) "balls".

The latest events have clearly proved that the Senate Democrats do not have a brain, or "balls", or both.

They had an opportunity to show to us - and to themselves - that they could stand up to
They could have said to Trump: “You have to stop attacking the media, you have to give us a guaranty that all major media will be granted the same access to the White House as before you took the Office, and you have to do it during the White House correspondents’ dinner. Or, you will be addressing your speech to a half empty Congress, with the whole world seeing this.”

Democrats and liberal media keep acting like it still matters what Trump would say.

But to make him to promise something would look at least as a small win for the Democrats, even if he would break his promise afterwards.

Even worse, Democrats and liberal media keep acting like they need to win a war of ideas. They have already lost a war, and was not a war of ideas, it was a war emotions and political machinery.

It is like watching two teams playing a game. The first team plays by the agreed rules (more like just is trying to play). The second team regularly breaks the rules. The first team screams: “Hey, you broke the rules”, and the second team just shrugs (at best).

And there are eight referees, and every time they give a four-to-four decision, which basically keeps the second team to allow doing what it is doing. And the half of the audience is hailing for the second team, and screaming at the referees. And another half of the audience screams at each other: “They cheated again, did you see it, did you see it?”

But the second team scores again and again. And everyone keeps playing and watching like nothing happened.

Many many many movies had proved a simple rule: “Do not negotiate with a person who has "psychopathic" inclinations (that includes terrorists)”. Simply, because that person follows a completely different logic (a.k.a. moral), which, in part, always justifies his or her change of mind. In the best-case scenario, that person thinks something like: “It is not lying, or deceiving, I believed in what I said before, but now I believe in the opposite, so what?”. In the worst-case scenario that person was deliberately lying (“They are my enemies, and to win I must to feed them disinformation”).

But the actual human history also provides many examples supporting the rule.

For example, in 1938 Germany succeeded to make Europeans (France, Italy, and United Kingdom) to sign an agreement, according to which Germany would annex the prats of Czechoslovakia (BTW: with NO representatives from Czechoslovakia).

In 1939 Russia and Germany signed a pact, according to which the countries would not fight with each other (also, they would divide Europe between Germany and Russia).

In both cases, Europeans and Russian did it hoping to prevent Germany from invading their land.

It took years, millions of lost lives, and economic destruction of Europe, to correct the results of those pacts.
It seems, that the Senate Democrats, Democratic Party leaders, liberal media have not learned any lessons neither from movies, nor from history.

Recently there is one word which comes to my mind again and again. That word is “pathetic”.

I drive to work, and I think that the condition of the roads is pathetic.

I read the report on physics teacher preparation, and I find that the numbers are pathetic.

I watch the news, and I see the Senate Democrats, Democratic Party leaders, liberal media doing a pathetic job of understanding what and why is happening, and what to do about it.

And I think to myself, what a declining world.

In my defense: read Cowen, or Brooks.

Bye-bye the Democratic party!

Bye-Bye Democracy at all!

(BTW: someone should write a song with these lines; today it is just a joke, but in a year or two it might become an anthem!).

At least I have an experience in escaping a politically stagnated country.

Canada – you are my plan B (or C; BTW: Australia, New Zeeland, Switzerland, or Finland also look attractive).

There is still little time to form an actual forceful resistance, but to that to happen people need
to accept the fact that just going out on the streets is not enough ("Occupy Wall-Street" - where are you?!).

In order to make a difference the movement must be coordinated and directed (http://www.gomars.xyz/4s.html; https://youtu.be/OwzKlfpIt_E).

Let’s look back, for example, at the Anti-Vietnam War protests.

The Anti-Vietnam War protests had taken place for more than ten years.

The current administration may destroy all the social security supportive networks much sooner than that.

When on November 15, 1969 a half of a million of people went to protest the War, people did not see President Nixon organizing his own rally to excite his own supporters. It was protesters against the Administration.

Today the situation is completely different. Liberal protesters have to fight the Administration, which also has its own social and media layer of a mass support.

Trying using ordinary methods to solve extraordinary problems is just stupid.

There are two clinical terms which we can use to describe the current behavior of many Democrats (especially at the top of the party):

1) idiotic;
2) cowardly.

Well, this is just in a direct correspondence with the absence of the two functioning organs, they – Democrats – have lost some time in the past.

NB. Pleas, pardon my English. My native language is Russian. My official foreign language was German (completely gone by now). I have learned English mostly by listening to a radio, watching TV, and reading (teaching physics does not really help to learn English – you never know why don’t students say a word, because you speak “Russian”, or because they are in the awe for the universe).

***************

Liberals! Stop living in a bubble!
Everyone, who watched in 2015 – 2016 “The Daily Show with Jon Stewart” and “The Colbert Report” should remember that they often used a bubble analogy to describe how disconnected Republicans were from the people of the Country, in that “Republicans are in a bubble”.

Lately, I was watching some late TV shows, and listening to NPR radio.

The TV shows are funny, the radio shows are exposing contradictions and flip flopping in Trump statements.

However, it has become clear to me that liberals are those who live in a bubble.

Laughing is a good thing, and pointing at contradictions or even plain leis is also important.

However, without a deep analysis of the reasons for the past and current events, and without drawing and evaluating for the audience different paths to achieving specific goals, all that laughing and pointing out is no more than an emotional relief.

It is like touring through a historic place, and all your tour guide sais is: “Look, this is big building, and this is a small bulging, this wall it broken, and this roof has a hole in it”, and not a word about people who lived there, and what had happened to them.

The only indication that the November 8th had happened is the word “President” (instead of “Candidate”) the hosts and guest of shows associate with the name “Donald Trump”.

·Look what stupid thing he did again”, or “He lied gain”, or “This is what he said yesterday, but this is what he said a year ago”, etc., etc.

Well, yes, we know all that.

We did our “ha-ha-ha” and “boo”.

http://www.gomars.xyz/op.html
And?
We have known for a long time that Donald Trump is not suited to be the President of the United States.
But he has become such.
What now?
Now it is time for the liberals come out of the bubble into which THEY have been for a long time.
The first thing to do for getting out of the bubbly is to reflect on what they – liberals – have been wrong about, what mistakes have been done, and what changes must be done within the liberal movement as soon as possible.
From here I want to direct everyone to a short post:
·What Liberals Can Learn From Physics”
at www.GoMars.xyz/FS.html
The 1st one from @TheDemocrats who says:
·If it wasn’t for the manipulations at the top of the Democratic Party we would have now President Sanders!”
   . will be the 1st Democrat with BALLS.
So far the count it ZERO!
Basically, Democrats have to admit first they screwed up the elections.
Until then Democrats have NO chance to get back the Congress!
People will NO be trusting them.
On a personal note, I will give NO single penny to any “Democratic” outlet until some TOP Democrat will accept their fault in losing the elections.
https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/02/4s.html
What is wrong with being a “neutral journalist”
Right now, every single news channel is holding panels to discuss the first Presidential debates. One of the most “exciting” questions is “Will Trump look presidential?” In plain words, will Trump be able to hold himself and pretend for a couple of hours that he is a sane person?

What if he will? Will it change a thing?

2016 Presidential election is special due many reasons. That includes that fact that we do not really need Presidential debates this time.

Anyone, who by this time has not made yet his or her mind, is a baby, or a coward, or an ignorant person, or a monk.

Anyone who is still really trying to make a decision needs to spent several hours to watch Fox news, and then some of the liberal TV shows (the best hosts to watch would be Bill Maher, Stephen Colbert, John Oliver, Seth Meyers, Jimmy Kimmel, James Corden, Jimmy Fallon, and Trevor Noah). If that would not help, nothing would, even the debates.
When all TV news was about Hillary’s health, I thought that even half-live, blind and deaf Hillary would be better than Trump. Same day later Bill Maher expressed a similar sentiment when he said that he would rather vote for Hillary’s body double than for Trump.

On one side we have a liar, a shady businessman who had ran his business into a bankruptcy and who does not disclose his taxes using a fake excuse, a person with an attention span of an 8-year old boy, and with the temper of the same boy, but more importantly, a person who has never done in his whole life anything for anybody else but himself just to feed his huge ego.

One another side we have a person who may have done some questionable things – as every other politician in the country – but who has a long record of being smart, and strong, and honest, and who for years has been directing her political energy to help common folks to leave better.

And yet so many people still need to make their mind, even after so many prominent Republicans said they would vote for Hillary.

Some of the republicans are brave enough to state that the will not vote for Trump, but scared to say that they would vote for Hillary: one of the examples was Lanhee Chen (the guest of 404th episode of “The Real Time with Bill Maher”). Wikipedia says about Mr. Chen that he “is an American public intellectual”. I guess, that is the problem with some of “intellectuals”, they do not know what to do when things get “dirty”, a.k.a. complicated (too complicated for an intellectual, evidently).

When the polls show almost 50-50 chance for each candidate to win, not voting for Hillary is the same as voting for Trump – simple as that.

I had been growing up in a country where I HAD to vote every year for the same list of people. Then the Perestroika happened. It was a spark of an actual democracy (which has not survived, though, and is dead now). There was a time when I had to cast my vote choosing between a communist and a drunk clown. I made my choice, because at the time voting stopped being an empty obligation and became a privilege to be responsible.

So, when now I see people saying "I do not like him, but I will not vote for her" I think "What a baby" - a “true” "prudent" person who wants to keep the hands/conscience "clean" - "I am above of all this social nonsense".

They say (and I believe it is true): "In the time of a crisis the "neutral" people are the worst". How does being the “neutral” help with keeping “clean conscience”?

It doesn’t.

***************

**Who will be the real President of the United States?**
Donald Trump is a fighter, there is no doubt about that. I bet, when he started his campaign, even he did not expect the victory (what a shock he must have had on November 8th!). After being featured in nine movies, running a popular TV show, a run for the Presidency of the United State seemed like a natural and final step in his career as an entertainer. That would bring to his huge ego a new wave of attraction he would get from people, which would peak all the attraction he had had during his whole life.

If Trump starts a journey, he goes all the way. His goal is to win. There are no rules. Fight. Hit. Adrenalin.

It is not Trump’s fault that he became the President. It is not even the fault of people who voted for him. The blame must go to the establishment of the Democratic party.

I have a large post on this matter and the rest of this piece is not about it.

I want to address an issue which none of the news outlets addresses. Donald Trump will NOT be our President. Well, formally he will. But in actuality he will NOT.

Have you seen pictures of Obama eight years ago and now? Do you see what to be the President does to a person? The President has to do a hard actual work, which requires 24/7 a huge amount of physical
and intellectual power.

Anyone who thinks that Donald Trump is capable of reading (forget about writing) long and complicated documents is just delusional.

I dare everyone who voted for Trump to take a piece of paper and write: “I voted for Trump because …” and add at least 5 specific reasons. On the back side of this page write “In four years my life will be better …” and write at least five specific improvements you expect to happen in your life. Save this paper and take it out in four years.

The best-case scenario, he will become America’s “Quinn Elizabeth”. Which, as we all know, was the actual plan of his team. When Trump became the nominee, the team was looking for people who would run internal and external political affairs, leaving Trump “making America Great Again”.

The worst-case scenario, Trump will become America’s Leonid Brezhnev, or Boris Yeltsin. Both of them during last years of their reign did not do any actual governing. Trump is already out of the governing – he cannot govern any more even his own Twitter account.

Why do you think the FBI became a “Trumpland”? BFI detail has been watching 24/7 both – Hillary and Trump. They saw who was easy to be manipulated and who not. Hence, FBI was not rooting for “an iron lady”.

When a silent voter casted his (mostly) or her vote for Donald Trump, it was an act of “screaming”: “I exist, you mother f*%^#@rs! I hate you and I want you to go!” . They saw Trump as a “King Kong” who will destroy “those f#$%&*ing corrupt establishment pigs”.

Firstly, I doubt that the same people would vote for Trump if they saw him as a puppet incapable of actual governing. This image could have brought a real opportunity for Democrats to beat Trump – if they were smart enough to see it.

Secondly, there is only one way to fight corruption – it is making a society as open and transparent as possible. This is just a historical fact: the more decisions are getting brokered within a narrow circle behind closed doors, the higher and wider the level of corruption. When a government starts cracking down on media outlets criticizing it – this is it; it is corrupt; and the more cracking down is happening, the more corrupt the government is. People who for four years have been sitting on a couch waiting for crumbs of prosperity would trickle down to them, and when it did not happen channeled their anger and frustration by electing a “Big Gorilla”, have to look in a mirror and ask: “Hey, why didn’t you vote in any local elections, or primaries, or didn’t participate in town halls? What have you done on an everyday basis to make America greater than it is now?”

Anyway, let’s go back to the original question: who will be the actual President of the United States?

Who, despite the fact that NO American voted for him (I am absolutely positive – it will be HIM), will de facto govern the country?

Who will be America’s “Grigori Rasputin”, or possible “Vladimir Putin”? 

10 of 42 10/26/17, 17:10
This is what I would like to hear from the people on a TV screen.

Because, it is very probable, that that person will indeed become America’s “Vladimir Putin”.

I will not be surprised at all if in a year or two Donald Trump gets ill (President’s work is hard, too hard!). For a while Mike Pence will take over the White House. But then the real puppet master will emerge.

Would be nice to get to know him as soon as possible.

***************

Draft

Statement of Massachusetts Democratic Committee.

Like 63.4 million Americans who voted for Hillary Clinton we deeply disappointed in the result of the Presidential elections.

Massachusetts Democratic Committee is aware of many possible reason for the loss in the Presidential elections.

However, Massachusetts Democratic Committee want to stress that the most important reason for failing the Presidential elections is failure of imagination shared by the majority of the party establishment.

We accept the fact that the sign of a high probability of the loss have been presented, but the most of the people involved in the campaign failed to see those signs. Intellectual blindness, or arrogance, complacency, short-vision of the party establishment is the most significant reason which had led to the Donald J. Trump Presidency.

We share the blame as one of the people personally involved into planning and executing the Presidential campaign in Massachusetts.

Our immediate goal is to reevaluate our former approaches to selecting political strategy, as well to selecting people who should take over official position inside and outside of the party.

November 14, 2016

***************

To Everyone Who is Deeply Disappointed.

Why did Hillary Clinton Lose the Race?

Or.

Conformism and Arrogance of The Establishment.

And.

What To Do Now?

Today’s Democratic Party
1. My first president was an idealist dreaming of a perfect society.
My second president was a power-grabbing irrationally acting drunk.
My third president was a former low level army spy.
In a case, you did not recognize them, they were Mikhail Gorbachev, Boris Yeltsin, and Vladimir Putin.
When I realized that my third president was becoming my last president I moved in the U.S.
I never would have thought to have again “Boris Yeltsin” as my president (only speaking English and not drinking).
Of course, I am very disappointed with this. However, as a scientist I find a relief in knowing that social forces do obey social laws in a way very similar to physical forces obey physical laws.
Despite the popular belief, Trump’s victory WAS predictable (all pollsters – go back to school).
What happened on November 8, 2016 was a bloodless revolution of a certain type, called a mob revolution.
It was not the first mob revolution known in the history of mankind (but one of the few of bloodless, at least so far).
Two of the most well-known are: the French Revolution of 1789-1790 (http://www.history.com/topics/french-revolution), and the Russian Bolshevik coup of 1917 (http://www.history.com/topics/russian-revolution).
The designer of the Bolshevik coup Vladimir Lenin studied the French Revolution (among many other studies) and wrote books on the matter. Then he successfully used his theory to design and to organize the coup.
Those books have been available in many languages for about a century. In different countries, many Marxists extremists used them successfully to take over a power. The theory
works like a clock! But only under certain conditions (like any scientific theory). To win a
power takeover organizers have to ride a wave of a deep populace disappointment and to
direct it into actions (hopefully, just a massive voting turnout). That deep populace
disappointment happens when the social establishment concentrates all energy on an internal
power struggle and loses touch with the needs and feelings of common folks.

All mob revolutions had been based on a frustration masses felt due to economic downturns in
the countries. People felt tricked, lied upon, neglected, exploited and powerless. As the result,
they embraced leaders with strong rhetoric and simple solutions. “The system is rigged, those
… (rich, Jews, intelligent, foreign powers, immigrants, …) are our enemies, we have to
destroy them, demolish the system, and start from scratch”. “The International” (the hymn of
Socialists and later Communists of the 19th and 20th centuries) has these words:

- Stand up, damned of the Earth
- Stand up, prisoners of starvation
- Reason thunders in its volcano
- This is the eruption of the end.

Of the past let us make a clean slate.

The latter line describes the typical emotion of people who have been feeling frustration for a
long time. When negative emotions have been brewing for a long time, eventually logic just
gets shot off. People just don’t care anymore about current social structures and what to crash
them. It is like a movie detective who has to let go a criminal and in frustration brakes his
beloved coffee mug against a wall.

If Clinton’s people read the books and knew the theory, they would be on guard and would be
able to develop the right strategy to curb Trump’s enthusiasm.

But that exactly is the problem. Neither Clinton nor her team were able to step outside of a
circle of traditional views on politics.

2. All those pundits, political scientists, sociologists, media analytics professionals, think tank
members, pollsters, etc. have to admit that they have no idea how to access populace mood
and how to predict populace behavior in extraordinary social circumstances. The current
school of polling has completely failed.

One of many pollsters said today on a radio: “Clinton’s numbers were within the margin of
error”. Another one said: “Evidently, many of those who did not show any indication to vote,
voted for Trump.”

If the “margin of error” included the losing scenario, did you warn your client? Did you even
know that the losing scenario was within the “margin of error”? Did you consider a scenario
with a large percentage of hidden voters? Did your polls show a possibility of the last-minute
voters? Did you even try to assess how many last-minute voters might exist? Questions can –
and should – go on and on.
Right after Trump’s nomination it has become extremely clear that this election is far from regular, the social landscape is highly abnormal. It should have become self-evident (like it has now) that current technologies of social predictions work only for regular social events and cannot help with analyzing this race. Instead of asking "Who will you vote for?", right questions would be "What do you talk about when you are in a bar with your friends?", "What are your fears?", "Describe the leader you want to see in the WH?", etc. The problem is that no one from social-analytical establishment – on both sides – really saw how distorted the social landscape was, hence no one tried to developed methods which could capture those hidden abnormalities and irregularities. Well, now they have four years to figure it out.

3. For the Democrats this loss is the result of “a failure of imagination”. November 8 2016 is Democrats’ 9/11.

Number 1 reason for this loss is the arrogance of the Democratic establishment. They saw how Trump just broke the establishment of the Republicans, but they didn’t believe that this could happen to them, they didn’t even consider this option (instead of thinking “I know I am right” they should have asked a question “What if I am wrong?”). That is why they didn’t try to listen to Trump supporters, didn’t really try to understand their motives, just dismissed them as “deplorables”. If they did, maybe they would see that in addition to “deplorables” there was – and still is – (a) a layer of people who felt tired of hard living and just wanted to feel for once as a winner (sport team psychology); (b) a layer of people who felt ignored and wanted to feel relevant (teenager psychology); (c) a layer of people who did not want to be pushed to vote for Hillary merely because “Trump is bad” (rebellious psychology: you want me to do this – here is the opposite!).

Currently I am an Independent.

During the Primaries, I voted Democratic. I was walking to the voting booth ready to vote for Hillary. I loved Bernie Sanders, but I knew he had no chance to get the nomination. And in the last second with a pen in my hand I changed my mind and voted for him. Yesterday I voted for Hillary. But I am sure that lots of people just could not force themselves to vote for her. We will discuss soon why couldn’t they do it. But the fact of the matter is that no one in the democratic camp even thought of this possibility and hence no one even tried to work with it.

Arrogance results in rejecting any ideas which do not belong to an established set of views. That is why Hillary’s team has been using the same old playbook used by Obama. I do not watch news on a regular basis. Lately, when I did – randomly and sporadically – I saw Trump and crowds of people speaking out, or I saw Hillary on a stage with celebrities. If you see these images again and again you get an impression of who is with people and who is above. But Hillary’s team did not try to dig into a psychology of undecided voters. They just kept pushing the “bad Trump” agenda.

We – humans – love our independence, we do not like to be forced into something to do, even if that is for our own benefit (ever tried to make your kid to eat green stuff?). We want to be convinced, not forced. We do want to feel as a winner. If we feel frustrated for a long time our logic just gets shot off. We react like a movie detective who has to free a criminal and brakes his beloved coffee mug against a wall. We just stop caring about consequences of our actions. We just want to break something to feel just a little bit better, do something unexpected, out of
order – to feel power again. And this part of human psychology is very well known. However, even when the polls showed a big and sudden (!) drop for Hillary, which was a clear indicator of something unexpected, her team did not try anything from the outside of the playbook they used.

You cannot treat unexpected using methods established for well expected cases.

Arrogance results in surrounding yourself only with people with whom you feel yourself comfortable, which means, talking only to people who confirm your views. During my Russia days, I watched Putin’s closest advisers expressing views almost opposite to the boss’s. Maybe it was just a play, but maybe it was a deliberate politics. What I see around me now is a strong motivation to avoid any disagreement. No one wants to have any discussion if there is a chance to be criticized. Everyone wants to talk only to people with whom one feels comfortable. Conformism within Democratic establishment is the real reason of “a failure of imagination”. But the same conformism has taken place in all social establishment strata, including government, science, education. People within the same circle do not argue with each other, do not criticize each other – that would mean for them that they do not belong to the same circle. The only arguing these days, or years, is happening between opposing camps.

This division is clear when you watch or read news media. Different media outlets have very different audiences, which do not talk to each other. For more than a year late show hosts laughed at Trump, mocked him and his supporters, but for the last couple of months they’ve been communicating to the same group of people, who made their mind a long time ago (hence, didn’t help to grow the number of Hillary’s voters). These hosts also mocked Hillary, but for her singing, or dancing, or dressing. No one mocked her for not trying to step out of her circle and to reach out to people with unorthodox ideas.

Because no one wants to hear unorthodox ideas.

Because that would require unorthodox thinking (a.k.a. thinking).

Much easier to rely on names.

If a big fish establishment name says or writes something – we publish or promote it.

The result is – The Boston Globe (just as an example) has not published any interesting view, any unexpected opinion, any unusual examination, because who would read something extraordinary (a.k.a. outside of ordinary), if the most of the readers represent that establishment which representatives got published in The Boston Globe?

4. Republican establishment did not see a large stratum of people who brought Trump to the win. Democratic establishment did not see the same stratum of people who could bring Hillary to the win. That stratum is not composed of the obvious Trump supporters, who truly believe in his ability to build the wall, who hate minorities, LGBT, and abortions.

A typical representative of this “hidden” social stratum said on a radio, that her brother is a gay, in her school they have and love many people from minorities and immigrants. Why did she vote for Trump? Because she felt ignored. Establishment was busy solving their own problems and simple folks got neglected, left on their own.
The meaning of this is simple:

(A) If I vote for Trump it does not mean I am a bigot or hate immigrants.

(B) My vote for Trump is me screaming – I’m hurting and I want to be noticed!

The first statement represents a form of a psychological escape tactic – by doing this (voting for Trump) I do not do anything immoral.

The second statement is the expressions of fears and feeling of being trapped and helpless. Those fears come from many sources, like dying local economy, stagnated wages, rising cost of leaving, seeing other social forces growing up in power (yes – immigrants taking jobs, minorities whose life matters). Hence – revolt against the current status quo; the current system does not work, we need to break it.

Vladimir Lenin wrote books and successfully used his theory to organize and to win the Bolshevik coup of 1917. I doubt that Trump’s or Hillary’s teams read those books (which is another sign of being conventional). But Trump was following his gut feeling, replaced his team three times searching for people with similar gut feeling, and who, like him, were able to think outside of the ordinary set of ideas (for good or for bad). Hillary relied on people using the same old strategy, which was her own strategy.

Arrogance of Hillary Clinton pushed her to enter the race. Then her arrogance made her say: “We have seen that our nation is more deeply divided than we thought”. This is just silly (at the minimum). We all have clearly seen the big division in the country. Hillary did it, too. But she hoped that this division would be in her favor. That did not happen.

Arrogance of the Democratic establishment led to nominating the worst possible candidate.

Party culture led to that no other valid candidate, including Biden (!), risked to challenge Hillary’s party rank. Only one outsider stepped in, but due to arrogance of the party apparatus he was outmaneuvered. And even with all this arrogance Hillary still had a chance to win, if she and her team would be able to step outside of the playbook they used for the campaign. Instead they just have been running ahead like horses with blinders (in this case a narrow-sightedness is worse than a short-sightedness; hope this explains the picture – this how I see today’s Democratic party).

5. Whose fault is it? What do we do now? (Two beloved Russian unanswered questions)

Previous parts of this piece answered the first question.

The answer to the second one comes automatically.

Everyone who cares about the future has to become an active Democrat.

Has to participate in all local party events.

Has to vote out all current selected party officials and replace them with new ones.

Remember the lady on a radio who voted because she felt ignored and neglected?

I bet she has not been voting for a long time, she did not go to primaries or local elections.
She did not want to participate in routine social activities, did not want to read various analytical articles and to participate in lengthy discussions. All she and many others want is having “a strong and fair king” who would make all important decisions to make their life better but without making them to participate.

Well, everyone who cares about the future needs to do just the opposite.

That lady also represents “whites without college degrees” who brought Trump to a victory. She does not see the big disconnect in her own logic. Yes, she personally is not a bigot and does not hate immigrants. But she elected a person who on his own just incapable of being a good political manager (yes – this statement is based on personal view of “political management” and facts about Trump). Hence, like it has happened in the history of mankind many times before, he will be an object of constant manipulation. He will not be managing the country, but his circle of influence will (among so many historic examples, check this one about Grigori Rasputin: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grigori_Rasputin).

But to see that, one needs to know a history, and to know basics of political management, and just management, and just be able to derive relatively long logical conclusions, and act upon facts and reason instead of upon emotions.

All these skills come from good education.

All these skills come only from good education.

This is why the 2016 Presidential elections has been a testament of the U.S. educational system.

This is why the number one goal for all activists across the country should be fighting for making education great! (not again, though, because so far it has not been great, so – just great).

**************

**What Could Liberals Learn From Physics?**

Below is the transcript of my 4-minute video: https://youtu.be/OwzKlFpIt_E

Hello I’m Dr. Valentin Voroshilov.
What I have here is a 200 g weight, a 500 g weight, a cylinder made of iron, and a bar magnet.

And of course, if I use a magnet, I can lift the weight; it is not strong enough to lift a 500 g one,

but the iron cylinder doesn’t do anything at all.
Why? What’s the difference?

Well if we look inside of an iron cylinder and a magnet, we will see atoms and electrons. And the simplest model which helps to understand the difference is: they both have billions and billions of tiny magnets inside, but in the bar magnet those tiny magnets are all aligned; each tiny magnet exerts a tiny force, but because they all point in the same direction, they exert a strong force, strong enough to lift the weight.

But here all tiny magnets point in all possible directions, and they cancel each other out. That is why this bar doesn’t produce any force.

How can we change this? Well, we need to align all those tiny magnets in the same direction.

To do that we can apply an external field.

Like, if we take this coil or a solenoid, and we connect a battery, in that case what we see, this magnet now is strong enough to lift a five-hundred-gram weight.
What lesson can we extract from this simple experiment?

Well, in a social world, social forces work in away very similar to physical forces work in a physical world.

If you have been following the Presidential campaign, you should remember, that as soon as one Fox News anchor would say something, the next anchor would repeat it, and they would repeat if again, and again, and again.

Liberal media used to make fun, they used to laugh at conservatives.

Well, we are liberals, we are so creative, we don’t need to repeat the same things again, and again, right?

But, who’s laughing now?

Nowadays, liberal media are happy to report about every single outburst of a “resistance”.

Clearly, they have forgotten the fate of “Occupy Wall-Street” movement.

They keep laughing at conservatives for repetitiveness of their news and analysis.

They don’t understand that conservative media generated that media field that aligns all the conservative movement in one direction.

Liberals just keep laughing.

Well, they just happy to have a material, I guess.

They are happy to have a job.

Well, the question is for how long?

If anybody would like to know how liberals can start aligning their forces in one direction, please, check my open letter to four senators.

www.GoMars.xyz/4s.html
Intellectual stagnation, social conformism, and the crisis of logical communication

We live and have been living for a long time in the crisis of logical communication. People do not try to understand what other people say. People try to recognize what other people say. If one hears something similar to one’s own views, one accepts it. If one hears something contradicting one’s view, one stops listening and at the best starts ignoring the opponent, at the worst tries to destroy the opponent (“he/she is dangerous, is a threat, my enemy!”).

Lately, I have been watching many late-night shows. Take Bill Maher, for example. He had
many high ranking Republican guests supporting Trump. Their conversations usually went like this: Bill “Trump is bad”, opponents “But people are hurting”; “But Trump is bad”, “But people are hurting”, “But Trump is bad”, “But people are hurting”, …

You get an idea.

It was funny, and smart, but not deep.

It was assumed that the phrase “People are hurting” was used as an excuse for supporting Trump, for being on his team. No one tried to analyze if people have really been hurting and how wide and deep and painful that hurting was.

I have mentioned in this post (http://www.teachology.xyz/HCL.html) that when people feel a pain for a long time the logic just gets shut, and appealing to logic just does not work anymore.

When we see this kind of conversation without listening on TV, this is just a tip of an iceberg.

Talking without listening is happening on all social levels.

Someone tells you that he or she thinks this and this about that. You ask one simple question “Why?”. At first you get a weird look, meaning “Isn’t this obvious?”. “Well, maybe it is obvious to you, but not to me. By the way, do you remember these two statements you just made? They contradict each other.” This usually bring the conversation to its end. You have become a pariah (at best). People do not to you anymore. People start avoiding you. Because you make people feel – Silly? Uneasy? Uncomfortable?

People have stopped talking to people with whom they feel themselves uncomfortable.

All kind of people: scientists, educators, managers, official, politicians.

OK, I have to make a small correction.

People have stopped willingly talking to people with whom they feel themselves uncomfortable. When scientists, educators, managers, official, politicians are forced to talk to each other, they do – but without listening.

I have already describe how wide spread political conformism lead to Clinton’s loss.

If people representing the Nation’s intellectual establishment cannot really reason with each other, or just cannot reason, what to expect from a regular guy?

If people representing the Nation’s intellectual establishment do not hear each other, it is just natural that they do not hear a regular guy.

And a regular guy said – “basta”!

The signs of the crisis of logical communication are everywhere.

When you talk or write to someone the logic of your words is not important any more. In order to get through you have to pass to filters. If what you present is very much similar to the ideas of the receipting party, you get through the first filter. Then you are judged: “Who the heck is you?”. If your persona presents any use for the receipting party and you are
comfortable to deal with, you are in. You are now one of the pack (more at http://www.teachology.xyz/sc.html).

The first filter filters out all people with unusual ideas. The second filter filters out uncomfortable people. And here we are. Intellectual stagnation.

It is nothing new that intellectuals get broken down in factions and concentrate their energy on keeping status quo, instead of searching for new ideas. Unfortunately, intellectual stagnation greatly affects education on all levels. No one teaches to think, to reason any more, instead “my textbook must become your bible”.

I understand that this picture represents some exaggeration of the actual state of education, but it is done on purpose.

The result of 2016 Presidential race is – in a great part – a testament of the current educational system.

“Whites without college degrees” brought Trump to a victory. They did not see the disconnect between their personal goal (more jobs, better life) and their action (voting for Trump). It is unfortunate when people mistakenly make a decision which goes against their own benefits. However, it is even worse when they know that, and make the same decision anyway. There is a tale: The God tells a guy “Tell me what you want and I will give it to. Anything you want! But know, that I will give twice to your neighbor”. And the guy said “Take out one of my eyes”. This is how much he hated (envy?) the neighbor. In this election many votes had been based on hatred (due to different reasons). But in the end, people voted for a person who on his own just cannot be a good political manager (yes – this statement is based on personal view of “political management” and facts about Trump). Hence, like it has happened in the history of mankind many times before, he will be an object of constant manipulation. He will not be managing the country, but his circle of influence will (among so many historic examples, check this one about Grigori Rasputin: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grigori_Rasputin).

But to see that, one needs to know a history, and to know basics of political management, and just management, and just be able to derive relatively long logical conclusions, and act upon facts and reason instead of upon emotions.

All these skills come from good education.

All these skills come only from good education.

It also means that when graduates of some educational institution do not know a history, and do not know basics of political management, and just management, and just cannot derive relatively long logical conclusions, and act upon emotions instead of upon facts and reason, that educational institution does not give a good education. Period.

In the former USSR every school student had to take a world history courses starting from the 7th grade (and BTW: also the best subject to train logical thinking - physics). Every college student had to take various philosophy courses. They had to study Marxists philosophy, of course, but also the world philosophy in general: Plato, Aristotle, … Obviously, all those
courses were biased toward “Inevitability of the Communists World Revolution”. However, a reasonable person was able to detect that bias. If one takes that bias out of an equation, one has left with very valuable philosophical, historical and social views (what to do after that is a different question). Those views help to understand reasons behind past and current social events, and even to identify the trends and – maybe, just maybe – start doing something about it, if those trends are dangerous.

In this piece [https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/11/09/trump-won-because-college-educated-americans-are-out-of-touch/?tid=hybrid_experimentrandom_3_na](https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/11/09/trump-won-because-college-educated-americans-are-out-of-touch/?tid=hybrid_experimentrandom_3_na) Prof. Charles Camosy writes that “college-educated Americans are out of touch”. If so, the reason for that is that college educators are out of learning.

They do not want to learn how to teach better. Many are too deep into the research they do and have to fight for each grant-delivered penny; for them teaching is the last thing on the list of things to think about. Others cannot accept the fact that they may not be already perfect teachers, that they have to constantly work on improving their teaching methods. And there are many who are just incapable of changing their teaching (too old, too stubborn, too arrogant).

Unfortunately, as we see now clearly and painfully, decades of reformation of education have not made much of a difference.

That is why we **MUST** start reforming the way we reforming education – at all levels!

These posts detail what have to be done in this direction:

**Education reform needs a new paradigm:** [http://www.teachology.xyz/np.htm](http://www.teachology.xyz/np.htm)

**What Infrastructure Do We Need to Build to Promote Education Research to a True Science?** [http://www.teachology.xyz/30uS.html](http://www.teachology.xyz/30uS.html)

***************

**Liberals, stop whining!**

[https://youtu.be/JaC1-U8LIY0](https://youtu.be/JaC1-U8LIY0)

**Great point, resonates with what I told to my friends all along**
You can’t say to anyone anymore “No, I think you are wrong”. You will hurt feelings and people will be avoiding you till the end of life. No one will discuss issues, steps, actions, if that conversation will make them FEEL uncomfortable.

You have to say “I see your point, it is very interesting, clearly you put a lot of thoughts and effort into it, may I ask you for just a minor alternation, just to help to escape some possible confusion some people – not many, but just one or two, but we should care about all of them, right? – may have”. There is a difference between people who voted for Trump, and people who MADE him the President. The latter ones voted for a guy with balls. That’s it.

The meaning of the words coming out his mouth was absolutely irrelevant. The guy had to have balls to say all those things, and “we all tired of trying to not hurt anybody else’s’ feelings; I also have balls, I am with balls, he’s with balls, we all are with balls, let’s use our balls, who cares about ball-less people!” BTW: it means one simple thing. If it wasn’t for the arrogance of the top leaders of the Democratic party, we would have now President Sanders.

***************

American Republicans are just Russian Bolsheviks!

When I came to the U.S. I wanted to become a part of the greatest democracy in the world, so I decided to register as a member of a political party. After checking the general ideas of the two largest parties I decided to become a Republican. In Russia there was only one political party and in order to become a member, one had to get through a lot of scrutiny. The first surprise was that to become a party member here in the U.S one has to do one thing – make a small payment at least once a year. That was easy. So, for a number of years I was a dormant Republican. The Hell broke during 2008 Presidential elections. Firstly, I personally liked senator Obama as the best of all candidates from both parties. Secondly, I started getting a lot of crazy letters from RNC, with internal contradictions, or no logic at all. Those letters brought a lot of plain lies, they assumed that I was a stupid uneducated person who is angry and they wanted to make me even more angry (remember, it was the time of a financial crisis and a lot of people were very angry already, including me). The authors of the letters clearly did not want me to think, they did not reason with me, did not lay out arguments. I saw patterns of brainwashing and emotion manipulation. Very similar patterns, indeed. Very soon I
realized that RNC was using exactly same technologies Russian Communist Party has been using for decades. Among many common themes were “Everyone hates us and we must defend ourselves even if we need to sacrifice our individual freedoms”, and “We must have a strong leader”, “We are the only people who know the truth, all others are liars and influenced by our enemies”. Anyway, I do not like being manipulated (one of the reason I left Russia; and one of the reasons I recognized the patterns), so I quit being a Republican (but I have been getting that kind of letters for a long time; in hindsight, I should have collected them).

I observed again a very similar behavior in 2008. But this election year was the craziest of all. I already posted a couple of posts on similarities between the current attempt (at least as it is seen today) of a mob revolution in the U.S. and some of the mob revolutions in the past. That includes the fact that all of the mob revolutions are based on emotional manipulating and directing people’s anger to an uncritical support and destructive actions. Here I want to add a couple of more.

The majority of people supporting an odious leader do not want to participate in an everyday social building. They want to have “a strong but fair king/tsar” who would rule with “an iron fist”, mercilessly eradicating all enemies (of course the “king” will never turn onto his current supporters, or will he?). Those people are looking for an easy way out, they want somebody else doing the work for them – like reading, thinking, comparing, analyzing, communicating, compromising, writing documents, etc. However, the history proves that the new “king” never does what he promised, and just uses the opportunity to strengthen his power by getting rid of anyone who disagrees.

Another group of people who support an odious leader is ones who are just looking for a personal political gain (of course, when it happens, it will never go away, or will it?).

It has been interesting to see how many prominent Republicans lined up behind a candidate they all initially ridiculed – not as a candidate but just as a human being. And now they all praise the same human being they ridiculed and laughed at. Did they change their views about Trump as a human being? Of course not! But they swallowed their feelings anyway. One might wonder - why? The main answer is – because they have become afraid of being pushed out of the politics by the aggressive Trump supporters who brought him up the ranks. To the public those high-ranking Republicans say that they do it “for the Party”. Some of them may say it even to themselves – a common version of self-manipulation (no one wants to admit the lack of integrity – even to themselves).

However, even this phenomenon is not new in the history. For example, in 1938 in Russia, more than a dozen formerly prominent party and government leaders were charged with espionage and treason, and with killing other prominent Russian leaders. Eighteen persons out of twenty-one were executed (including Nicolai Bukharin who for many years was one of the closest allies of Josef Stalin). The most astonishing thing was that they all confessed to the bogus offenses. In personal letters found and published much later many made a statement that they confessed (not because of being tortured, because many was not) to preserve the Party unity, because they wanted to avoid the Party to be broken into factions fighting for the power, especially in front of looming war (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Case_of_the_Anti-Soviet_%22Bloc_of_Rights_and_Trotskyites%22).
In hindsight, that practically finalized Stalin’s path the Russian throne.

I do hope that Donald Trump will not win (when I student asked me who did I vote for – I said: “For the lesser of the two evils”). However, I hope even more that the Republican party will be broken in factions, and the aggressive, racist, faction of “deplorables” will eventually shrink down (like KKK did) taking with it all the current Trump endorsers. But the healthy part of the party will eventually reconstruct itself as a true conservative movement – because the democracy needs two strong parties (at least) to function.

BTW: many of those who in 1938 manufactured bogus trials soon were purged, too.

**************

The election is just over. What's now?

The election is over. I am very disappointed with its outcome. If you are with me, you should ask yourself a hard question – why did it happen? And you should give yourself a difficult answer – because Democratic party establishment failed to recognized the importance of thinking “outside the box” (bad teachers?).

Democrats must replace the majority of the party establishment with new people, who accept the need for a radical reformation of the party.

You may ask, how is this related to education reform?

The connection is stronger than you may think.

Now it should be self-evident to almost everyone that the current social situation in the country is far from ordinary – we can call it extraordinary :) It is impossible to solve extraordinary problems using ordinary approaches established for solving ordinary problems.

Solving extraordinary, unusual, unexpected, even bizarre problems require invention of new
approaches, which, in turn, requires a new kind of thinking.

Of course, there always have been, are, and will be some “Amish people of political world”.

But if you are not such a person, you should agree that social reformation in the country must take a different direction. Pedaling harder and harder in the same direction is just stupid.

What should be that new direction? We do not know yet. We have to find it together.

We have exactly same situation with reformation of education. Decades had passed without any real change in the outcomes. That is why I have been calling for reforming the way education is being reformed. That is why I started this campaign. And one more thing.

-Whites without college degrees” who brought Trump to a victory do not see the big disconnect in their own logic. Yes, personally they might not bigots and do not hate immigrants. But they elected a person who on his own just cannot be a good political manager (yes – this statement is based on personal view of “political management” and facts about Trump). Hence, like it has happened in the history of mankind many times before, he will be an object of constant manipulation. He will not be managing the country, but his circle of influence will (among so many historic examples, check this one about Grigori Rasputin: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grigori_Rasputin).

-But to see that, one needs to know a history, and to know basics of political management, and just management, and just be able to derive relatively long logical conclusions, and act upon facts and reason instead of upon emotions.

All these skills come from good education.

All these skills come ONLY from good education.

This is why the 2016 Presidential elections has been a testament of the U.S. educational system.

This is why the number one goal for all activists across the country should be fighting for making education great! (not again, though, because so far it has not been great, so – just great).”

The latter was a quote from a larger version of this post.

Don’t just take my word. Read the post and scrutinize the logic. And if you agree, support my campaign.

***************

To everyone who has been emotionally attacked, called names, threatened, verbally degraded!
I have spent my day off reading, thinking, writing, reading again, thinking again, writing again.

Today especially interesting reading was Facebook replies to comments to posts. It is time consuming, but once in a while it is time worth spent.

To everyone who has been emotionally attacked, called names, threatened, verbally degraded!

Know this.

There is such a science, called “psychology”.

And this science has proved as a fact, that everyone who was emotionally attacking you, called you names, threatened you, and tried to verbally degrade is a looser.

This is a fact.

Everyone from that side hates you and others because they hate themselves, but cannot accept this. When they look into a mirror they see a person who does not have much of a respect, who has not achieved much in life, for whom the only way to feel better about themselves is to put someone down.

What should you do about it?

Nothing.

Or almost nothing - it is up to you.

First, stay calm. Do not get provoked. If you feel an emotion, do not react, take a walk.

But if you want to write something back, write something cold, or even sarcastic.

Every time when you write something smart, those guys get more and more wound up, and eventually just got tired.

In a way, the more obscenities you are getting, the bigger is the victory of your side.
If your page got showered by vulgarities – you win big league! “a failure of imagination”

**************

“A failure of imagination” has lead to 11/08/2016

For the Democrats this loss is the result of “a failure of imagination”. November 8 2016 is Democrats’ 9/11.

Number 1 reason for this loss is the arrogance of the Democratic establishment. They saw how Trump just broke the establishment of the Republicans, but they didn’t believe that this could happen to them, they didn’t even consider this option (instead of thinking “I know I am right” they should have asked a question “What if I am wrong?”). That is why they didn’t try to listen to Trump supporters, didn’t really try to understand their motives, just dismissed them as “deplorables”. If they did, maybe they would see that in addition to “deplorables” there was – and still is – (a) a layer of people who felt tired of hard living and just wanted to feel for once as a winner (sport team psychology); (b) a layer of people who felt ignored and wanted to feel relevant (teenager psychology); (c) a layer of people who did not want to be pushed to vote for Hillary merely because “Trump is bad” (rebellious psychology: you want me to do this – here is the opposite!).

Arrogance results in rejecting any ideas which do not belong to an established set of views. That is why Hillary’s team has been using the same old playbook used by Obama. I do not watch news on a regular basis. Lately, when I did – randomly and sporadically – I saw Trump and crowds of people speaking out, or I saw Hillary on a stage with celebrities. If you see these images again and again you get an impression of who is with people and who is above. But Hillary’s team did not try to dig into a psychology of undecided voters. They just kept pushing the “bad Trump” agenda.

You cannot treat unexpected using methods established for well expected cases.

Arrogance results in surrounding yourself only with people with whom you feel yourself comfortable, which means, talking only to people who confirm your views. During my Russia
days I watched Putin’s closest advisers expressing views almost opposite to the boss’s. Maybe it was just a play, but maybe it was a deliberate politics. What I see around me now is a strong motivation to avoid any disagreement. No one wants to have any discussion if there is a chance to be criticized. Everyone wants to talk only to people with whom one feels comfortable. Conformism within Democratic establishment is the real reason of “a failure of imagination”. But the same conformism has taken place in all social establishment strata, including government, science, education. People within the same circle do not argue with each other, do not criticize each other – that would mean for them that they do not belong to the same circle. The only arguing these days, or years, is happening between opposing camps.

What happened is a mob revolution. There are books which describe how to use masses with this type of thinking in order to take over a power. Vladimir Lenin wrote such books, and successfully used his theory to organize and to win the Bolshevik coup of 1917. I doubt that Trump’s or Hillary’s teams read those books (which is another sign of being conventional). But Trump was following his gut feeling, replaced his team three times searching for people with similar gut feeling, and who, like him, were able to think outside of the ordinary set of ideas (for good or for bad). Hillary relied on people using the same old strategy, which was her own strategy.

Arrogance of Hillary Clinton pushed her to enter the race. Then her arrogance made her say: “We have seen that our nation is more deeply divided than we thought”. This is just silly (at the minimum). We all have clearly seen the big division in the country. Hillary did it, too. But she hoped that this division would be in her favor. That did not happen.

Arrogance of the Democratic establishment led to nominating the worst possible candidate. Party culture led to that no other valid candidate, including Biden (!), risked to challenge Hillary’s party rank. Only one outsider stepped in, but due to arrogance of the party apparatus he was outmaneuvered. And even with all this arrogance Hillary still had a chance to win, if she and her team would be able to step outside of the playbook they used for the campaign. Instead they just have been running ahead like horses with blinders (in this case a narrow-sightedness is worse than a shortsightedness).

Everyone who cares about the future has to become an active Democrat.
Has to participate in all local party events.
Has to vote out all recently selected party officials and replace them with new ones.
Also, check my last campaign update at https://www.gofundme.com/teachology

***************

Were Democrats Doomed, or There Was a Path to The Victory, and Does It Still Exist?
That's funny how everyone is jumping on the same wagon explaining to us what happened AFTER it has become already obvious. What is it – the need to still feel being relevant? "I wasn't the prophet, but now I have a clear vision!"

That includes so-called political pundits and various late show hosts.

I know I wasn’t exactly right, but I was close. I was almost right on almost everything. Well, besides who wins the election. But, please, please, please don’t kick me out. Please, let me keep my well paid job!

In the aftermath of the Trump’s victory we see a storm of publications trying to explain why did this happen (one example is here https://www.propublica.org/article/revenge-of-the-forgotten-class).

In particular, almost everyone blames pollsters.

But what about people who tried to warn and was not heard? Who should be blamed for not listening to those people?

Turns out, there have been people who used logical reasoning and warned about Trump’s win.

Prof. Allan Lichtman
After reading this piece in Washington Post about Prof. Allan Lichtman I posted short comments.

1. I agree that Trump’s victory was brought by voters who for years have been feeling economic and social pain. For those voters Hillary symbolized at least four more years of that pain.

2. But I disagree that Democrats were doomed and could not do anything.

First, Democratic party establishment selected the worst possible candidate. 

3. However, even with Hillary running, Democrats still had a chance to win if they would address the sources of the pain many “regular folks” felt. Instead, they based all race on a “Trump is bad” banner. Fixation on Trump – that was what brought Hillary down (and this is why they did it: https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2016/11/intellectual-stagnation-social.html).

She and her surrogates and all the pundits and hosts should have used a different line of attack. Instead of attacking personal traits of Trump they should have been attacking obstructionist policies of the Republican congress, like “Why do you feel your pain? Because you do not have good jobs! Why don’t you have good jobs? Because Republicans blocked all infrastructure projects, which could give here and there millions of jobs! Why did Republicans do that? Because the do not want to associate anything good with Obama. But if we keep the White House and take back the Congress, we will make Americans’ work again!”.

4. I agree with the statement that Trump will not last as the President. 

But I disagree with the reason.

The fact that he is unpredictable is not important. He is a big baby and a smart person always can find a way to manipulate with a big baby. No one will even need to impeach Trump. The true reason for he will not finish his term is he does NOT want to be the President! Here never had!

Below I want to extend my comments.

We got ourselves in a very serious situation. There is no way to just scream out of it, or joke out of it. Having a discussion is important, but only if we try to find a common ground on what to do now (https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2016/11/intellectual-stagnation-social.html).

After we agree (more or less) on reasons why Trump won, and on what danger his victory brings, we have to stop pointing fingers at each other “it was your fault”, and start acting. Some people will have to leave their current chairs; new people should run the party.

Who?

People, who share the view on reasons why Trump won, on what danger his victory brings,
and on what to do now.

I offered my view on the matter in the series of posts at https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/ (now almost all for them are presented on this page).

Here I only add a couple of new points.

1. Many of the people who voted for Trump do not follow logic. 

It is really interesting/funny/sad/ridiculous/hilarious/ that many Trump voters did it because they felt forgotten and economically degraded. They didn’t realize however that they have been screaming “take care of me, give me good jobs” to people who have been saying all the time “we give you an economic freedom, now it’s your turn, go ahead and make your own money!”, or “wait until billionaires get so much money so some of it will spill over to you”. 

Ironic, isn’t it?

Our takeaway from this is simple: it is impossible to reasons with those people. If we want to penetrate their irrational barrier and make ourselves understood, we will have to find correct means to address to their emotions directly.

2. One of the emotions many Trump voters share is “I am”, meaning “I exist”, “I matter”. 

This can be used be calling them to a dare. “If you are so confident, do this!”

-Do you consider yourself strong, smart, honest? Do you stick to your decision? Well, the difference between responsible decision making and just “f@#$k it and forget it” (a.k.a. decision faking) is what we do AFTER that.

I consider myself a responsible educated, smart, and honest person. When I make a serious decision, I can provide a list of parameters, and for those parameters - critical values, which I will use to asses if my decision was right or wrong. Why? Because, as an honest person, I cannot assume that I am always right. But, as a responsible person, I need to know how to asses in the end was I right or wrong?

Do you consider yourself strong, smart, honest, responsible? If yes, you have to do the same. That is why I challenge you!

I may don’t understand your logic, or disagree with it. I might be blind, or brainwashed, or just stupid.

It does not matter, because it is not about me. It is about you – everyone how voted for Trump.

Do you consider yourself smart and honest and educated and confident enough to take a dare?

Take it!

Take a piece of paper and write down “I voted for Trump because …” and add at least five specific reasons. On the back side of this page write “In four years my life will be better …” and write at least five specific improvements you expect to happen in your life in four years. Save this paper and take it out in four years. Or just put it on your wall and look at it every day.
Of course, only if you are so confident in your vote.
And in four years you will be pointing your finger at me laughing and saying “I told you so, you moron!”

Or not.”

3. It has become a common place that not all Trump supporters are racist, or bigots. Should we fear only those who are, or all of them pose a threat?

Those who are radicalized would love to bring Inquisition on all who disagrees (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inquisition). What should we expect from the moderates?

In fact, if history teaches us anything, moderates may be even more dangerous that open radicals/extremists.

If a college educated science teacher, defends a person who is easily ready to misplace millions of people based on their ideology, what to expect from folks chanting “Lock her up”. Radicals want to destroy everyone who disagrees. They just want to use a force, and a force is the only force they understand (sorry for tautology). But – they understand it clearly.

Moderates what to bring light to “people in darkness”.
There are millions of them – moderates, as well as people who they consider to be in darkness.

Many of the moderates see themselves as messiah and think of themselves as unique in their mission.

That only means, of course, that they don’t know the history.

This simple story has been repeating itself again and again.

First, you get a very bright idea. Then you become confident that everyone must share this bright idea. Then you decide that the end justifies the means.

And one historic blink later we see people in concentration camps.

Because “they were too damn stubborn to accept our light”.

You are a moderate Trump voter, you read this, and you think “This is bulls@$t, I’m a good guy”.

Well, do you think that the guy who was pouring liquid lead into “witch’s” throat, or the guy who was killing Jews in gas chambers thought “I am so terrible person, I am so awful, that is why I kill them”?

I am perfectly aware of the fact that Trump supporters do not present a uniform social layer.

But I am absolutely convinced that many of them – if allowed – would love to lock up millions of immigrants and minorities in ghettos. The only reason they will not do it is the resistance coming for the opposite camp.

But every moderate Trump supporter needs to realize that right now they all are in the same
camp with those radicals and extremists.

And we have to remind them this fact again and again.

4. What to do know?

Firstly, there are always people who say – everting is f@#$ed up, nothing can be done, just go with it. There is no reason to argue with such people – it is useless; it is just a waste of time. If you want to achieve some goal, and someone else wants to achieve a similar goal – the first thing to do is to have a discussion about how to achieve that goal.

Unfortunately, having a good and productive discussion is not as easy as it seems (I have a large post on this topic: “Intellectual stagnation, social conformism, and the crisis of logical communication, or how to start thinking again”.

But it is possible if all participating parties have the same goal, which is NOT “to make America think as I do”, but “do the best to make America understand what I mean.”

It is a common misconception that the goal of every discussion is to convince everyone that you are right.

No.

The goal of every discussion should be to present your logic and to understand the logic of the opponent and then to find the parts of the two logics which are the same or similar. Looking for differences is less productive than looking for similarities.

Sometimes similarities are too small and differences are too large to start building common actions. But hopefully if the ultimate goal is the same, there is still some room for a cooperation.

Unfortunately, not everyone can cooperate/collaborate.

No one is perfect, everybody makes mistakes. One of the very important quality of a person who can collaborate is an ability to admit his or her mistakes. If a person cannot say “I was wrong”, no way that person can collaborate with people who have some disagreement with his or her ideas. If a person cannot say “I was wrong”, trying to work with this person is usually a waste of time.

When we meet someone for the first time, we heavily relay on the first impression.

However, it is important to get beyond it.

When we look at someone for the first time and think: “If I don’t like you; why would I listen to you?”, very often we mean: “If I don’t know you; why would I listen to you?”

One of the best techniques to get past the first impression is to get to know each other, to learn about each other roots, dreams, setback. Of course, it takes time, but it worth it. To save time, people can prepare a short essay about themselves and exchange those essays ahead of a meeting.

Maybe you and I will never meet, but I still have prepared my essay about me.
An extended information about me is available on my sites:

www.TeachOlogy.xyz

https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/

https://www.gofundme.com/teachology

So, here I just want to present a short version of my story and my vision.

I was born and grew up in Russia, which at the time called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I had a very good career and a good prospective, but after Putin rolled back Gorbachev’s freedoms of speech I decided to move out.

I wanted to become a part of America’s democracy, and initially I joined the Republican party. I left it when I realized how similar the Republican party is to USSR’s Communist. In part, one of the most important similarities between the U.S. Republican and USSR’s Communist parties is that both parties want to impose their political and social views on others. The ideology in both parties is “You can do whatever you want, you can have your economic freedom, but only if you follow OUR ideology”. Both parties want to control what people think. And their ideology is always more restrictive than democratic one; it prescribes more what people CANNOT think and do, than what people can think and do. In democracy restrictions only come from rights of others; democratic idea is that you can do anything you want until your action starts limiting the freedom of another one. In democracy, if you have a conflict you cannot just impose your will, you have to negotiate. However, both, the U.S. Republican and USSR’s Communist parties want to impose their world view on everyone around, and lock in chains (figuratively, of course – or not) everyone who disagrees. And that is why I left.

I believe that I was brought to this world for a reason.
I have a mission!

That mission is teaching!

I have been teaching physics for many years. Well, also algebra, geometry, trigonometry, problems, solving, logic. But lately, mostly physics.

And I am good at it. I can teach physics or mathematics everyone who is willing to put some effort in it.

Because physics and teaching physics is based on a very straightforward logic. And I can show that logic very clearly and explain all the logical steps which will lead to a solution of a given problem from any textbook.

What happened before and during the election day also has its own logic. I saw that logic and tried to warn.

Unfortunately, people in the Clinton’s team did not see that logic and did not want to hear anybody from the outside of their circle.

Now, we cannot teach that logic to people who did not see it in the first place.
We have to replace those people.

That is why, everyone who cares about the future of this Country has to become an active Democrat.

Has to participate in all local party events.

Has to vote out all recently selected party officials and replace them with new ones.

I told to all my friends that Trump would not be the President. But my reasons were more than just "Trump is bad". I saw historic precedents and a strategy which could be used to stop Trump.

We all make mistakes.

My mistake was that I was expecting from people in the Democratic party establishment to be smart enough to see what I saw, or to hear what regular folks tell them.

I was wrong.

And now I have to do something about it.

I do not want to move again in a different country. This is not the solution for me this time. Hence, I have to get involved.

This is what my logic tells me to do. Get involved. Get on a new mission.

My new mission is to form a coalition or a movement within the Democratic party, which would be able to bring the reforms needed to "make the party viable again!"

Ambitious? Maybe, but it is better to "aim high" than to regret again.

We could call this coalition "New Democrats" (do not confuse with young democrats, because you do not have to be young to be new; take Bernie Sanders, for example).

Within this coalition we have to map all the upcoming elections. We have to prepare our own candidates, and our own policies. Probably, people who have been selected to their position less than 4-5 years ago may stay (but still have to be scrutinized), but people who have been in the ruling layer for a long time have to go, their time has passed. We may need to setup our own Super PAC (“New Democrats for America”) to finance our own website and a paper. The party needs a “new blood”, and those new Democrats will need to lead an internal party “revolution”.

And then when it happens we take the party to the new heights.

What about my old mission, teaching physics?

It does not go away.

The result of 2016 Presidential race is – in a great part – a testament of the current educational system.

"Whites without college degrees” brought Trump to a victory. They did not see the disconnect between their personal goal (more jobs, better life) and their action (voting for Trump). It is
unfortunate when people mistakenly make a decision which goes against their own benefits. However, it is even worse when they know that, and make the same decision anyway. There is a tale: The God tells a guy “Tell me what you want and I will give it to. Anything you want! But know, that I will give twice to your neighbor”. And the guy said “Take out one of my eyes”. This is how much he hated (envy?) the neighbor. In this election many votes had been based on hatred (due to different reasons). But in the end, people voted for a person who on his own just cannot be a good political manager (yes – this statement is based on personal view of “political management” and facts about Trump). Hence, like it has happened in the history of mankind many times before, he will be an object of constant manipulation. He will not be managing the country, but his circle of influence will (among so many historic examples, check this one about Grigori Rasputin: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grigori_Rasputin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grigori_Rasputin)).

**But to see that, one needs to know a history, and to know basics of political management, and just management, and just be able to derive relatively long logical conclusions, and act upon facts and reason instead of upon emotions.**

All these skills come from good education.

All these skills come only from good education.

It also means that when graduates of some educational institution do not know a history, and do not know basics of political management, and just management, and just cannot derive relatively long logical conclusions, and act upon emotions instead of upon facts and reason, that educational institution does not give a good education. Period.

In the former USSR every school student had to take a world history courses starting from the 7th grade (and BTW: also the best subject to train logical thinking - physics). Every college student had to take various philosophy courses. They had to study Marxists philosophy, of course, but also the world philosophy in general: Plato, Aristotle, … Obviously, all those courses were biased toward “Inevitability of the Communists World Revolution”. However, a reasonable person was able to detect that bias. If one takes that bias out of an equation, one has left with very valuable philosophical, historical and social views (what to do after that is a different question). Those views help to understand reasons behind past and current social events, and even to identify the trends and – maybe, just maybe – **start doing something about it, if those trends are dangerous.**


**If so, the reason for that is that college educators are “out of learning”.**

They do not want to learn how to teach better. Many are too deep into the research they do and have to fight for each grant-delivered penny; for them teaching is the last thing on the list of things to think about. Others cannot accept the fact that they may not be already perfect teachers, that they have to constantly work on improving their teaching methods. And there are many who are just incapable of changing their teaching (too old, too stubborn, too
arrogant).

Unfortunately, as we see now – clearly and painfully, decades of reformation of education have not made much of a difference.

That is why we **MUST** start reforming the way we reforming education – at all levels!

This why reforming the way education is being reformed must become one of the important parts of the New Democrats’ platform.

These posts detail what have to be done in this direction:

**Education reform needs a new paradigm:** [http://www.teachology.xyz/np.htm](http://www.teachology.xyz/np.htm)

**What Infrastructure Do We Need to Build to Promote Education Research to a True Science?**: [http://www.teachology.xyz/30uS.html](http://www.teachology.xyz/30uS.html)

Answering my questions in the title of this paper:

**Were Democrats Doomed?** – NO

**Was There a Path to The Victory?** – YES

**Does It Still Exist?** – YES

***************

A mob revolution

In his latest “Real Time with Bill Maher” Bill described the Trump movement as a right-wing coup. I call it a mob revolution. This is not the first one mob revolution in the history of the mankind. Three of the most well-known are: the French Revolution of 1789-1790 ([http://www.history.com/topics/french-revolution](http://www.history.com/topics/french-revolution)); the Russian Bolshevik coup of 1917 ([http://www.history.com/topics/russian-revolution](http://www.history.com/topics/russian-revolution)); and the 1932 German Federal elections ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/German_federal_election,_July_1932](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/German_federal_election,_July_1932)).

All mob revolutions had been based on a frustration masses felt due to economic downturns in the countries. People felt tricked, lied upon, neglected, exploited and powerless. As the result they embraced leaders with strong rhetoric and simple solutions. “The system is rigged, those … (rich, Jews, intelligent, foreign powers, immigrants, …) are our enemies, we have to destroy them, demolish the system, and start from scratch”. “The International” (the hymn of Socialists and later Communists of the 19th and 20th centuries) has these words: ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Internationale](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Internationale)):

"Stand up, damned of the Earth

Stand up, prisoners of starvation

Reason thunders in its volcano

This is the eruption of the end.

**Of the past let us make a clean slate**.
BTW: All three mentioned mob revolutions had eventually led to the establishment of a dictatorship

(Napoleon Bonaparte, Joseph Stalin, and Adolf Hitler).

Who is the next?

Just saying.

To Nancy Pelosi

Hi, I'm Dr. Valentin Voroshilov.

Yesterday Nancy Pelosi made a statement.

She said that the reason for Hillary Clinton’s loss was the email scandal generated by the FBI director.

This is the kind of BS which makes even me want to vote for Donald Trump.

By the way, BS stands for “Beyond Sense-making”.

Let’s assume for the moment that Pelosi is correct. That would only mean that Hillary Clinton's campaign was so blipping weak that this scandal tipped it over.

In reality of course that wasn't the case. In reality people who embraced this scandal weren’t going to vote for Clinton anyway, and the people who were going to vote for Clinton just shrugged it off.

And the number of undecided flip-flopper voters couldn’t be so large to make a difference.

You see, that at this point it is “she said he said” situation.

The difference is - I have no money, but she does.

Well, National Democratic Committee has the money which it can use to run a nationwide survey to find out how many people really changed their vote because of the email scandal.

They could but they wouldn’t because they know the result we’ll be against the statement made by Nancy Pelosi.

I understand that all she wants is to cover her behind.
But this is the kind of behavior which repulses regular folks like me.

Yesterday I also attended the celebration party.

I thought it would be a meeting where Democrats discuss policies, but turns out it was really just a party.

Representatives from different groups, mostly unions, celebrated upcoming holidays.

I’ve met several interesting and nice people.

When I talked to a seasoned activist I asked him why did Hillary lose? He didn’t Say a word, he did this.

**Index finger up, palms over eyes, palms over ears.**

This is a clear proof that people on a grass root level perfectly understand why Hillary lost.

Two days ago, I also met **Young Democrats for Massachusetts.** I was delivering a letter to the new Chair. I was late, he was gone, but I met Young Democrats. They were not really young, biologically speaking, thirty something. They were really surprised to see me. When I asked for two minutes of time, they said, okay but next time please call.

They were so tense.

Those guys really have to work on how to deal with unexpected guests.

That’s it for today.

Thank you.
“A Sane America” vs. “An Insane America”; The Latter Has Won (so far)

No one would disagree nowadays with the statement that about 90% of America is harshly divided between two large opposite “clans” (groups, strata). The remaining 10% flipped the election toward Trump, but soon may swing in the opposite direction (BTW: the Trump administration is doing everything in its power to prevent this from happening, Democrats should do everything they can to make it happen, but Democrats so far have no idea how to do it).

This phenomenon is not new. One can find a lot of press on the issue, for example, fine reading:
- The Atlantic (This election has divided Americans like few in history; https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/11/making-up-is-hard-to-do/501146/);
- The Associated Press (Divided America; https://www.ap.org/explore/divided-america/);
- Politico (Trump’s divided state of America; http://www.politico.com/story/2017/01/donald-trump-divided-america-233652);
- 538 (Purple America Has All But Disappeared; https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/purple-america-has-all-but-disappeared/).

The division is being described as “economically succeeded vs. economically depressed”, or “Republican vs. Democrat”, or “liberal vs. conservative”, or “1 percent vs. the 99 percent”, or “rural vs. urban”, or “white men against the world”, or “intellectuals vs. non-educated”, and more (e.g. see AP).

Those descriptions are correct, but none of them is the one every politician needs to address before anything else.

Those divisions do represent the fundamental basis for another one, which is the most important division America faces today – which is between

“A sane America” and “an insane America”.

BTW: “a sane person”, “an insane person” are clinical terms.

The reasons behind “SOCIAL INSANITY” have been presented in this paper:
https://teachologyforall.blogspot.com/2017/02/4s.html (and also the ways for dealing with it).
In order to move on, “a sane America” must admit first of all that it has just lost to “an insane America”.
Then “a sane America” must admit that (a) it has no idea how did it happen; (b) it has no idea what to do now.
Everything what “a sane America” is trying to do now is based on the assumption that the opposition is also “sane”.

**No one ever can solve a problem and achieve a goal while building the actions on a wrong assumption!**

That is why “a sane America” also must become “a smart America” (BTW: “sane” and “smart” are not the same terms); start from this 4-minute video:

https://youtu.be/OwzKlfptl_E.

P.S. click here for some of the publishing history on the matter.
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