

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO PARTS 3 and 4: SOME FAIRLY TRUE STEREOTYPES OF DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS

This General Introduction is about 28 pages. Democrats begin below with “PART 3: DEMOCRATS”.

The term “party” means any political party. The term “Party” refers to Democrats or Republicans. Parts 3 and 4 describe the Parties as of 2018. Later in the essay, I explain original Liberals and Conservatives. I explain how Liberals became Democrats and Conservatives became Republicans. I repeat ideas from this general introduction later in the essay wherever useful.

I describe the Parties by how they get votes, wealth, and power through helping clients. Help includes blocking, depriving, and sometimes attacking the rivals of clients; including real, possible, and imagined rivals. I am not measured and polite but I am accurate and fair.

I do not here decide issues that Democrats and Republicans use to contrast with each other, such as a wall on the southern border, the character of people who get entitlements, the character of business people, White racism, Black racism and privilege, and hyper PC versus hyper “traditional decency”. For example, for Democrats, all authority is evil and all authority figures are Imperial troopers – except when Democrats need the state to insure safe food, get their own children into good schools, promote social justice, control business, pay entitlements, and help nature. All non-Whites are romantic rebels, even sexist racist hater gangstas. Business men are demons that steal God’s manna right out of kids’ mouths. For Republicans, all authority is good, including the Big Brother pro-business law-and-order state, all business firms, and all bosses - except for a few misguided police officers who favor gun control, and except for the whole state, which Saint Ronald proved is evil. All authorities are like Clint Eastwood, Reagan, a Christian bishop, or war heroes – so we Republicans are too – except for all state employees, who are agents of socialism in an evil anti-Right secret state. Business men are the angels who give God’s manna to everyone. All non-Whites are corrupt and are inept at governing. Giving a city or nation to them is like feeding your child to hyenas. All Democrats are baby killers and they love their demonic fang-dripping work. For Democrats, White men seem to govern well only because they use non-Whites and women to make wealth that White men then take to use for corrupt deals. White men don’t govern through rule of law but in a crony system that steals operating money from workers, non-Whites, and women. Whites are successful gangsters only because they kept slavery going into capitalism and they extended capitalist slavery to all non-Whites and most women. Mutual blame is fun but it takes too much space. We couldn’t get to the bottom of it all anyway unless we first went through the issues that I go through here.

Starting in the late 1960s, the Left, including some Democrats, went through a phase of saying science was not objective, not about facts, but merely ideology, part of righty cultural and political domination. That stance was wrong and harmful. Republicans rightly condemned the stance, and insisted science is science and facts are facts. We need facts to deal with real problems and to help business, such as with engineering projects. Now, Republicans deny science and facts, and declare that global climate change

is merely lefty propaganda, part of lefty cultural and political domination; “fake news”. Democrats now correctly insist that facts about nature and climate should guide policy. A fact: not dealing with climate change costs more than dealing with it. Now, Republicans use facts about what guns are, who uses guns when, who benefits from legal gun use how, who gun abusers are, and who victims are, to say they have a rational fact-based gun policy that protects freedom and maximizes social good. Republicans correctly say AR-15s are simply one of many semi-automatic rifles, which includes your buddy’s .22. Republicans correctly say Democrats ignore facts about guns and American culture. In another arena, Democrats rightly say vaccines do more good than harm, and fake news about side effects should not allow real epidemics of measles, mumps, HPV, and flu. Avoiding vaccines for your children while you hope other children get vaccinated is not using freedom but abusing it. Democrats ignore high crime rates among Blacks while Republicans ignore the thousands of people who kill themselves with guns (some suicides would find other means if they had no guns). Republicans correctly say welfare did not end poverty, racism, or sexism, or even help much, but only changed the style. They don’t ask why and what might really be done. Yet Republicans deny that this universe began about 14.5 billion years ago, the planet began about 4.5 billion years ago, and all life here evolved including human life.

Groups accept facts when facts support what they desire for other reasons, and groups deny facts when facts interfere with what they desire. Pretending to argue about facts often is an excuse to argue past each other as an indirect way to dominate. Rather than sift facts and argue particular issues, this essay gets at the underlying reasons why Parties desire this and deny that, almost regardless of facts. Unless we get to underlying bias first, arguing over facts does little good. If we can see the underlying bias first, then looking at science and facts can do a lot of good.

An (1) example shows why it is better to leave particular issues to other essays. (A) I explained in the first part of this essay why some unemployment and bad jobs are inevitable. Inevitable unemployment impacts social groups differently and changes social and relations. (B) So, we need welfare. (C) But any welfare tempts too many people to abuse it, so welfare rolls balloon and spending explodes. Then we are stuck with a lot of people who live off the state and refuse work, we undermine character generally, we can’t afford other state tasks, we have less of our own money, and we foster resentment between groups. (D) What to do? The obvious answer is to limit welfare to people who really need-and-deserve it while keeping off people who don’t need or don’t deserve it. Keep expense within limits and minimize bad impacts. It is not hard to come up with plans, and I don’t review them here.

(2) Continued: (E) All plans must decide the trade-off between making sure we help people who need-and-deserve versus not supporting people who take advantage. We can (F1) contain the mess and so not help a few people who need and deserve it; OR we can (F2) help almost as many people as need and deserve help, especially kids, and so suffer from cheating, expense inflation, and character erosion. We can’t get it perfect. Either some deserving people don’t get help or many undeserving people get a free ride and we hurt America financially, morally, and socially. Too often, it is both.

(3) Continued: (G1) Democrats say “help, pay, and risk” while (G2) Republicans say “contain, suck it up, turn a blind eye, and show outrage”. (H) I don’t mind a real difference except I don’t believe either Party

really cares about what it says. (I) Republicans say “contain and suck it up” because they want to hurt and control Democratic clients, in particular clients that compete with the Republican White-and-Asian working-and-middle classes. They want to keep the White and Asian working-and-middle-classes in the Party. Republicans minimize welfare because to accept any need for it forces Republicans to admit flaws of the economy and resulting problems; and Republicans can’t do that because to accept flaws destroys business as the cure-all. Republicans don’t care much if people that are low on the socio-economic scale have a hard time as long as they don’t starve in public. Republicans doubt that any amount of help will really change anything. Sometimes the doubt is serious with good reasons but mostly it is what they say to soothe themselves. Any spending on the poor diminishes what Republicans and their clients have now and what they will have. (J) Democrats say “help and risk” not because they have big hearts, strive to separate sheep from goats, think big helping is best for America, and that big spending really will cure poverty, racism, sexism, etc. but because Democrats offer crusades and support as a way to get clients. I include Democrats with big hearts but apparently not big heads. (K) Both Parties refuse reasonable plans because those hurt their real goals and expose conniving. Both Parties refuse points-and-facts, and accept points-and-facts, not according to merit but by relevance for other hidden agendas.

(4) Continued: (L) Serious citizens have to wade through half-baked plans made to offer in public but that are not really in contention because the Parties have already decided on other grounds. We waste effort on ideas that were never at issue but only appeared in a symbolic battleground. We waste ideas.

(5) Continued: (M) Most political issues are like this. The middle is not ideal. Some people still lose and some people still gain, often unfairly. There is no way to make it all entirely fair, so there is no one clear middle path that all decent people can see and agree on. The middle is a range of imperfect trade-offs. (N) Resolution requires good faith and compromise, in the best interests of the whole. (O) When parties gain from not showing good faith, not compromising, the middle is not a place to work for what is best but it is the ideal arena to hold symbolic never-ending battles to cover deeper realer fights. “Life begins at conception” and “no assault rifles” are not really about their apparent content. (P) Parties choose a line near the middle not according to what is best for the country but what works for them and clients. (Q) Often, what they call the middle is not even close. It is a parody of the middle. It is a ploy that they sustain because it works politically such as “end all Social Security” or “free full medical care”. (R) That situation is what we have now. That is what dysfunctional nations have.

(6) Continued: (S) You have to think it all through and decide for yourself, often at odds with your own party. (T) To offer a sound plan based on facts, real human nature, and culture, as evident in history, is to let partisans “shit on you” from all sides. (U) All this is “politics”. A simple person such as me takes a while to get it. (V) It is better first to see what really lies below. (W) Then rational people can think out what would work and how to do it, if possible to do it. (X) The same holds for gun control, sex, abortion, drugs, gender, education, climate, Social Security, health care, immigration, international trade, etc.

What remains is really only a long elaboration on these ideas. If you get it now, what follows will seem like repetition. I hope you still continue on.

What's the Fight Really All About?

What is the real fight? Now, why is bickering more important than good solutions that help the whole nation? There are two levels worth fighting for: for security and control. The two levels are linked but here is not the place to go into that. When Republicans and Democrats argue over any issue, they really fight to get and keep security, over who is to get and keep control, and how. You need a powerful ally within your Party-and-class to get control and to give you precious security. Democrats and Republicans manage clients so as to win the game of control and to get security.

We did not fight like this in the prosperous 1950s and 1960s. We fight now because there is not enough security to go around, not enough control to share, and whoever controls decides who gets the precious security. Situations do change. Life now is not like life in 1963; not like the life that Reagan promised in 1982; and not the life that comfortable lefties and righties think is natural and what they say all people could have. Even comfortable people know so in their hearts and they act to keep security and control even if they won't admit it to themselves. I do not here explain in detail why things changed and how. You can get a sense of both from what follows. I explain more elsewhere. Whether people are correct about security and control is not as important as that people believe there is not enough. Still, in the short run of a decade or two, really there is not enough security and control. There would be if we were better governed and educated but that is not likely to happen soon enough.

The bad governing and bad education that come from fighting over security and control help make sure there is not enough security and control, and make sure we get bad governing and bad education, and so on. The problem makes itself worse, and we are not likely to "snap out of it" any time soon.

Why is there not enough security now? Why does that make control so important?

Recall intrinsic flaws and the problems they lead to. Under some conditions, which prevail in America now but did not in 1965, the flaws lead to problems bad enough to cause insecurity, fear, and a serious fight for control: (1) Some real unemployment is inevitable even for skilled willing people. (2) Too many people now are not smart enough, are unsuited by character, or unsuited due to attitudes learned from their group, to live and work in the capitalist world well enough.

While not intrinsic, the following flaws-and-problems work with intrinsic flaws and now play a big role, especially since the mid-1970s: (3) Mismanagement of America's role in the world economy. (4) Rather than good jobs, many jobs are bad jobs with low wages and few or no benefits. Good jobs now often turn into bad jobs. (5) Competition is comparative. Success depends not only on what you have but on how you compare. If others have a bit more than you, they can use that bit to make sure their kids beat your kids. Comparative competition can be contained, but, in the context of the other reasons given here, comparative competition tends to run away. (6) Ecological damage. (7) Expenses have grown faster than income and wealth for most people. Think of housing, medical and dental care, cars, and insurance. (8) The cost of children takes up more income than it did in the 1950s and 1960s. People have to invest a lot in children now, partly because costs have gone up, but also because they need to

make sure their children can compete. A big part of cost increase is to make sure you live in a costly house in a safe expensive neighborhood with good schools, and all of everything is insured. (9) Too many schools do not educate students well enough, either for jobs or for understanding the modern world. Partly that failure is because a significant ratio of students now is not able to learn what they should know but they are only a small share of the failure.

[OPTIONAL: This flaw is intrinsic, works with intrinsic unemployment, and works with bad jobs and mismanagement of America's role in the world economy. (10) Now, people have to live in the business system. People get jobs by making things or doing services. Call it all "making things (goods)". Things get bought by the people who have the jobs making things. Makers of things, and buyers, are two faces of the same mass of people. Together they make a circle that sets how big the economy is and sets who is in or out. Business people play a role but I can't go into that here. All the jobs taken together have to pay enough in wages so the people who have jobs can buy all the things that are made by them – with nothing left over. All the people who buy stuff have to have enough wealth to buy all the things made so that workers can all get paid – with nothing left over. Buyers get wealth from jobs and only from jobs. Workers get wages from what is sold and only from what is sold. At some size of making-wages-selling-and-buying, the circle closes so the people who make things have just enough, using their wages alone, so they can buy all that is made; and so what is bought provides enough for all wages. But there is no guarantee the circle will close at a size so everybody has a job. It might close at 80%, 90%, or 95% of full employment. In fact, around most of the world, but not much in America yet, people are left out. Economists offer theoretical reasons why the circle should move toward full employment but the reasons don't have to hold fully, and, in real life, often don't. When that happens, some people don't find work, and good jobs devolve into bad jobs. Some of the people that are left out are left out for reasons (1) through (9) above but not all people are left out for those reasons. Sometimes the circle is just not big enough even for all educated able willing persons. America has begun to suffer from this problem as America becomes another part of the world economy. The effect will slowly increase here. Sometimes the circle does not close fully at any level but instead back-and-forth swings persist. I don't go into that case here.

OPTIONAL: Imagine this: (a) China could make all the gadgets for the whole world; but then who else would have jobs so they could buy all the gadgets from China? (b) Suppose the circle is closed and all the people have good jobs. Then all construction of houses stops and all the people working housing construction are out of a job and can't buy stuff. Then fewer TVs get bought, and all the people that work to make TVs can't work, and can't buy. Then all the people who supply material to all the business firms that make electric gadgets can't find work and can't buy stuff. So, they can't pay their insurance bills. Then all the insurance workers can't work and can't buy stuff. And so on, until nobody has work and so nobody can buy stuff, and nobody can buy stuff so nobody has work. This is a "crash". It is what nearly happened in 2007 and 2008. The point here is not the danger but to see how everything depends on everything else all at once; and how the circle does not need to close at full employment always. We should be happy that it comes so close in the United States most of the time; and we should give credit to the politicians, civil servants, business people, union leaders, and journalists that help.]

The impact falls differently on groups such as by race, religion, age, gender, couple status, etc. Different impact makes the problem worse, in another layer of self-reinforcement. Politics combines with social groupings to make it yet again worse, in yet another layer of self-reinforcement.

All this leads to fear, jealousy, desperate desire, anger, and hate. The fear, jealousy, desire, anger, and hate drive American politics, and likely world politics, much more than we admit. These bad emotions add another layer of self-reinforcement; since the mid-1970s and then more so with Reagan, maybe the strongest layer of self-reinforcement. Fear, jealousy, desire, anger, and hate now win elections.

What is the great fear? Of not “making it”, of “falling”: falling into the class of people who likely will not get good education for their children; not get good health care; will live in rentals all their lives; live amid noise, dirt, and crime; where schools teach nothing but give away diplomas like confetti; too many girls have kids by age 17; they have kids out of a committed relationship; children die of drugs; families face constant harassment by better-off people, people who insure their status by keeping others down; and where children and grandchildren are doomed to repeat. Fear is more now than before because people know there are not enough factory, office, and food jobs to go around; and, if there were, those jobs do not pay enough to make sure you, and your family, don't fall.

People believe there is a threshold below which you go down and stay down. People believe there is a threshold above which you have a good chance of not falling down, where you have “made it”. People just above the threshold feel frightened and fight like hell to protect the threshold.

Business firms too face thresholds and are likely to go “up or down”. The fates of families and business firms connect but I can't go into the topic here. Small firms are more likely to go down while big firms can stay afloat and seek opportunities to rise. This is one big reason people now ally with Republicans. Big business is where good jobs often are. More accurately, big business is where good jobs were until big business discovered “full time part time” employees, making employees supplement wages with welfare and state-based medical care, and “out sourcing”. Big business now often widens the zone of fear, in another layer of self-reinforcement.

People believe “up or down”, “rise or fall”, and people fear falling, despite the huge wealth of America. Americans can get all the little crap treats that they wish for such as smart phones and skinny jeans but they can't be sure to get what really matters: a good job, health care for families, a good home in a safe area with good schools, respect, and to feel sure nobody can take this away from you and your family. The decent life is not secure despite all the supposed wealth of America.

People that are not securely above the threshold are jealous of people that are. People already above the threshold fear people that seek to rise. People will do almost anything to make sure their families don't fall, including push down neighbors and keep down the poor. People will do almost anything to make their families rise, including push already-down neighbors further down and drag-down-and-step-over the people above them.

In standard optimistic economic theory, and in the promises of both Parties, one family can make it without dragging down another family, one ethnic group can make it without dragging down families from another ethnic group, and one gender group can make it without dragging down families of other genders. In reality, and in the eyes of nearly all the people, that is not true, or not nearly true enough. If one family goes up, then another family goes down; and if one group goes up, then another group goes down. When Democrats promise Blacks, Hispanics, and women that they all can make it, what Whites, Asians, and men hear is “Democrats will take your success and give it to Blacks, Hispanics, and women, and to hell with you”. Blacks, Hispanics, and women hear it too and are alright that they have dragged down others to rise. When Republicans say “everyone can make it in the long run, a rising tide floats all boats”, what Whites, Asians, and men hear is “Republicans will make sure you stay on top by putting off others indefinitely through empty promises”. Whites, Asians, and men are alright that others have to stay down so they can stay up. People repeat aloud and to themselves the idea that the rise of one does not entail the fall of others mostly to ease their consciences about what they did to rise and what they are willing to do to stay on top but they don’t really believe that in their hearts.

In the long run of about a hundred years, if we are well governed and well educated, population levels off, and nothing bad happens, then standard optimistic economic theory is mostly true, most people will be better off, most people might be able to get good enough jobs, one group need not be pitted against all other groups, and we might begin to heal nature. We can already see signs that what used to be the part of the world that was hopelessly undeveloped, the “Third World” and “Fourth World”, is getting better off – although the world is still getting more polluted and is increasingly short of good water. But that general success is a long way off, and it is not what people care about now.

Faced with this threat, people must promote and defend themselves, their families, business firms, and groups. For promotion and defense, people need political connections and political “hit men”. People act not as free individuals in a democracy but as part of political gangs.

What matters is not what is good for the country but what is needed for the success and security of my family; and, to get success and security, what matters is that my Party has control. If a policy benefits the nation but does not help my family in our search for success and security, then that policy hurts my family because it costs me money but does not help me. There are no neutral or generally-beneficial policies. Either a policy benefits me or it hurts me. Don’t support anything that does not directly help your family. Don’t help any other people, or help the nation as a whole, until you have what you need for security and control.

The result is seething politics. When politics seethe, control is more important and less certain. Leaders will do anything to get and hold control. Followers will do anything to help leaders get and hold control. What leaders do to gain control, and what followers do, makes politics seethe more, and makes battle for security and control harder and more important, in yet another level of self-reinforcement.

Until the Parties can come to grips with what Americans fear, what they will do to get success, security, and control, and what they will do to keep success, security, and control, then nothing will change. Until

Parties can figure out what level of life style most Americans can fairly earn in the world economy, how each American can reach enough of his-her earning potential, each American can feel that he-she has had a fair chance, can figure out how we can get good schools everywhere, how we can share in security and control without hurting neighbors, what fairness means now in the modern world, and how to find nearly all Americans enough fairness, then it will go on the same. It will have its ups and downs but will never get overall better. We can do this but not on the track we are on now.

Suppose you win the fight over guns. Either: (1a) All guns are banned but criminals run rampant, using illegal guns and other weapons such as knives, often in nasty home invasions. Or, (1b) all people should carry guns everywhere including into rowdy bars and family restaurants, and true citizens should keep many guns at home, any kind of gun anywhere including fully automatic. Suppose you win the fight over abortion. Either: (2a) All abortion is totally illegal, even birth control that allows conception but stops implantation (pill, IUD); but hypocrisy prevails and not-poor girls still get abortions but poor girls get stuck with kids starting at age 16. Or, (2b) any woman can abort-or-kill her fetus-or-child at any age of the fetus-or-child; rich girls have an abortion at age 17 as a fashion statement; and unhappy mothers kill the two-year old because it poops and cries a lot. You might feel the thrill of cheap victory but nothing deep changes, the underlying fight goes on, and battles in other arenas will go on over topics that allow us to feel good about ourselves but don't really touch bottom.

This is the modern environment. This is what the symbols are really all about. You might pause to think how to carry out democracy in this kind of environment. How do you make people better here? Do you think a change of attitude is enough?

When people feel secure enough, feel the system is fair enough, feel they will not fall unless they mostly deserve to fall, they can rise after falling, control can be shared, and no disaster will befall if we do not totally dominate, then people are pretty good, act well, and help others, even people not in their group. This is what America had from the middle 1950s to the early 1970s.

Politicians since Reagan have claimed to bring it back with a magic method that does not exist: the free market; business; hate the state; blame Blacks, women, immigrants, Jews, Muslims, and Queers; big minimum wage; guaranteed lifetime income; or free health care and college. They use security and control as a cover to promote what gains power for their Party and its clients while hurting the other Party and its clients. They say they work for the general good when they really work for their group.

When we argue about good governing, I wish we could argue about issues rather than merely use issues to really argue about who gets control and security. To really argue issues, we would have to come to grips first with the topics raised in Parts 1 and 2, in the context of the world economy; and we just won't do that, left or right. Why not?

Of course, more is at stake than security. Political parties fight about wealth and power in arenas that bear only indirectly on security. Of course, health care, education, abortion, gender, guns, etc. are real issues and are worth contending over in themselves regardless of security and control. I do not mean to

slight other issues. But here is not the place to think them out on their terms. We can't know them on their terms until we first see how they figure in the deep battle for security and control. Even partisans who think they care primarily about other issues really care more for the role of other issues in security and control but the partisans don't even see their own confusion. Why do people really fight about guns, abortion, gender, and nature? I do sometimes note relevant points about the issues themselves apart from their relevance to worry about security and control.

Some Partisan Failures, Especially of Vision.

I do not describe Party hypocrisy much because it would take too much space for too little gain. It is not as bad as propaganda paints "the other Party" but it is far worse than it needs to be.

America has had corruption since before the Constitution but distortions in elections grew bizarre after 1979. If we want politics to run better, we need campaign finance reform, campaign ethics reform, term limits, strict rules about lobbying, and to adopt a better version of representative democracy more like what the writers of the Constitution wanted. Along with Barry Goldwater long ago, I think we need to ban business firms, unions, business groups, political action committees (PACs), and most formal groups, from contributing to elections or using ads. Contributions should come from individuals. Information should come from the Internet, books, pamphlets, and journalism. Enforce truth in campaigning. None of this will happen soon. So I let it go. If you search "election reform" you will get suggestions, many of them actually sane and useful.

Here is the greatest failure, at the bottom of other failures: No vision. Not Democrats or Republicans really have an agenda beyond getting and keeping power by using clients. There is no overall realistic view of a good modern America in a better modern world, a world made better by a good America. Neither Democrats nor Republicans serve clients, gather clients, and gather power so as to work for an idealistic-yet-reachable vision of a better America and a better world. They might think they have a vision but that vision does not come out in their acts. They might think they protect social justice, social order, privacy, freedom, rule of law, responsibility, self-determination, decency, the downtrodden, the innocent, and the abused, but that does not come out in their acts either. They might think serving their particular clients necessarily makes America better but it does not. They might think that simply bashing the other guy is heroic, saves America, and justifies ideology; but no. Instead of idealistic-yet-realistic inspiring visions, they offer vague fantasies of "fair America", "socially just America", "great America", "family America", "American Dream", "business America", and "world leader". They use propaganda slogans to entice clients and as an excuse to help clients and hurt enemies. I see little link between their political work, any idealistic-yet-realistic vision of a good America, any idealistic-yet-realistic vision of a better world, and the vague propaganda fantasies.

Both Parties are creepy and the client groups of both Parties are creepy. Many individuals in Parties and in client groups are not creepy; and some are stalwart, heroic, or inspirational such as John McCain, Bob Dole, and John Kerry; but the scene as a whole still is creepy. It has been so at least since Reagan and since the rise of Political Correctness (PC). There is too much hypocrisy, un-reality and anti-reality, lust

for power, thwarting power, hate, fear, and hurting others. There is too little figuring out what is real and what is good, over the long run, for us and for the world.

Yet we can't reject politics and so tend only to our own narrow business. We do live in a democracy and we are citizens with duties. We cannot simply gather the economic harvest from the hard work of our political, economic, and genetic ancestors. "Family first" becomes "family only" and that doesn't fly in a democracy. We have to keep trying, even in the political arena.

In dogma, both Democrats and Republicans accept the ideal of "live and let live" and don't impose their lives on other people as long as others don't make trouble. Both Parties believe in free autonomous people and self-determination. In fact, both Right and Left are intrusive and demand conformity. Both Democrats and Republicans put their group above the free individual and both force conformity. They apply the idea of free person selectively to suit agendas. By applying selectively, they destroy the ideal. Democrats apply the ideal to drugs, sex, and programs such as welfare, yet deny you can freely choose Christianity. Republicans apply the ideal to allow consumers to be duped in markets such as for housing and finance, and Republicans deny a true human can freely choose any religion other than their type of Christianity. Both Parties define what a person is and which groups are right not by any noble ideas of personhood or human social life but by what works in politics now.

You can't be neutral among Righties or Lefties. You can't not-be-a-gung-ho-feminist among feminists. You can't not-be-a-Republican-Christian among Republican Christians. You can't dislike drugs among pot heads or booze among whisky drinkers. You can't defend a woman's right to choose to abort among Right-to-Lifers, and you can't say "abortion might be killing but not murder" among Right-to-Choosers. Lefties get nervous if you go to Christian church every week. Righties care exactly which Church you go to. To Righties, all homosexuals are perverts while to Lefties anybody who isn't a little Queer doesn't know the fullness of Life. Black Democrats also care which Church, reject homosexuals, and don't like that White Lefties look down on all Churches including theirs - but neither Black nor White Democrats can admit the rift. For Republicans and Blacks, if you don't belong to a Church, you are not fully human. Among Lefties, if you don't make the right cracks about Republicans, Whites, and Christianity, then you are not fully human. Among Republicans, if you don't drive a Buick, pickup, Lexus, or Benz, or do drive a hybrid, you are a Lefty elitist and not fully human. Among Lefties, if you are not a hipster, and don't defend everything Black and female, you are a modern Nazi. Among Righties, if you are a hipster, enjoy the arts, or see merit in "women's issues", then you are gay, the old-fashioned bad gay.

"Whatever happens bad, the other side did it. Whatever happens good, we deserve all credit. All good ideas and people come from us; we produce only good ideas and people; all bad ideas and people come from them; they produce only bad ideas and people. If an official on our side has a moral lapse, it is a small lapse and easily corrected. If an official on the other side has a moral lapse, it shows beyond any doubt the total depravity in all of them, their weakness, their inability to deal with issues, and shows that the country will collapse into a Stephen King novel unless they all get out of office right now and we get full power over everything right now. If you ever voted for the other side, you are a naïve mindless conniving selfish dupe and you deserve all the badness that the country inherited because that Party

had power. If you ever voted Republican, you deserve the Great Recession, housing crisis, the war in Afghanistan, deficits, the demoralized FBI, and the collapse of all infrastructure. If you voted Democrat, you deserve North Korea, illegal immigration, Black riots, murder of police officers, failure of Obama Care, and the collapse of all infrastructure.” The saddest part is that most people go along with this crap although they know it is nowhere close to true.

I don't hate either Party. I am disgusted when the real basic stance of a Party is “hate them, get ours”. If a Party member really has thought out an issue, believes his-her conclusion, and acts accordingly, then I respect him-her even when I know he-she is wrong. There is not enough of that honesty. Neither Party has thought out the basic issues given in Part 1 of this essay. Neither Party has offered idealistic-but-practical solutions.

One Big Underlying Bad Motive at the Core.

Whatever people tell themselves, most people act politically primarily to feel better about themselves, to feel righteous, justified, and saved. People act to think they heroically save an innocent being in mortal danger and so justify and save themselves. If they think they have taken a step toward being justified and saved, they “get off”. People would rather feel personally righteous and saved, and have a political orgasm, than do some modest real good. Lust for salvation is better than simple decency. This stance is taken by rebels, people from beleaguered groups such as women and Blacks, by Republicans, politicians, activists, professionals such as teachers and CPAs, the upper middle class, well educated people, poorly educated people, churchy people, atheists, rich, poor, anti-abortion, pro choice people, righties, and lefties. The result is crap. I don't know how to stop people putting themselves and their needs to feel saved and to “get off” first but instead get them to use their brains and true hearts.

Along with feeling righteous and saved, people also help their group, Party, and wallets. They get to feel more secure, ahead of neighbors, and more in control. They get to put down groups that compete with them or that they don't like. It is convenient to take a stance, or carry out an act, that saves you, makes you feel good about yourself, and leads you to worldly success.

I Do NOT Blame the Victim.

Some people will dismiss what I say as “blaming the victim” and will condemn me. They are wrong and I am right. I don't blame the victim unless the victim deserves a share. I know when people-and-groups have been hurt by power. I also know when people-and-groups hurt themselves and when they make it easier for power to hurt them. I see when victims blame others so that they don't have to work hard to make things better themselves. I know when victims would rather play a role than do what really needs doing. Lefties and righties, all ethnic groups, religious, groups, and genders, in all places of the socio-economic system, do this. I know self-serving excuses when I hear them.

Optional: Empirical Assessments: Cost Benefit Analysis and Cost Effectiveness.

-In theory, the difference between Republican and Democratic programs, their successes and failures, is a matter of facts. Carry out a detailed version of “pros and cons”: (A) Decide on goals or on signals of gain such as: greater health; more wealth for people of all classes, genders, races, etc.; advancement by the poor or women; more cohesion of families; security for oldsters; social justice; decency; goodness; or self-determination. (B) Anticipate negative impacts such as undermining character, cheating, hurting nature, pollution, undermining freedoms and rights, crime, congestion in the city, etc.; (C) If possible, put number measures on the positive and negative effects, measures such as gross national product, sick days, infant survival, house ownership, jobs, better jobs, hours lost to traffic, burglaries, drug use, etc. (D) Figure out how to assess the positives and negatives, and how to assess them together. See if positives overcome negatives, or vice versa, and by how much. (E) Then see which Party does better in particular programs and better overall. (F) Think not only about programs in which benefit exceeds cost but compare programs to see in which benefit exceeds cost most. (G) Then the state implements only programs with the most benefit over cost. (H) The U.S. has enough diversity of programs, and programs have been going on long enough, so we should be able to tell which programs work or not, and which work better or worse. Even a contrast between Red (Republican) states versus Blue (Democratic) states alone should enlighten us.

These assessments are sometimes called “cost benefit analyses” and I use the term “CB analyses” for short. “Cost effective” means benefits outweigh costs, as far as we can tell, in the measures that we use. CB analyses represent practicality when assessing programs.

In practice, to conduct CB analyses and then use them properly is hard.

-Besides technical complications, which I don’t describe, we run into the mix of practicality and morality. A program might not yield enough obvious practical benefit but still we should do it because it is right; for example, to give veterans medical care or to make sure all children graduate high school not only with a piece of paper but with some real understanding of the world. A program might provide obvious practical benefit but still we should not do it; for example, sterilize people who have children while on welfare or kill oldsters and people with fatal diseases. Some things we should do but cannot because the cost is too high such as free universal comprehensive medical care. People use practical arguments instead of moral arguments when they think practical arguments are more effective. People argue for quality education through high school not because it makes better people but because it leads to people with better jobs and higher incomes for more national wealth. People argue against gun control by saying legal gun use stops crime (it can, sometimes) when what they really mean is that owning guns is a moral right and they use a gun as a security blanket. People say a policy is really practical for society when what they seek is self-interest. People say the state can make money taxing legal marijuana, and can undermine crime by legalizing marijuana, when what they really want is to get high and to buy clean drugs safely. People use moral arguments when they think practical arguments are not enough. They reject legalizing long-term illegal immigrants whose culture is now American by saying “those illegal immigrants broke the law; and we must respect the law or all is lost; so we must make an example of them to save democracy”. People say humans have a right of self-determination and the state has no right to control drugs when, again, what they really want is to get high. Not every practical argument

must rest on a moral call but most should in part, as when we say we must have a strong military not only to protect the American economy but to protect Democracy and Freedom. The fact that people abuse arguments for and against particular programs does not mean any particular program is poor and ineffective or that it is good and effective.

It takes enormous work to criticize your own mix of practicality and morality, figure the right mix, make corrections, and stick to your understanding despite misguided attempts to undermine it. Few people bother. People are so skillful at inventing whatever argument seems to work now, whatever argument solidifies “our” group, and whatever bedevils “them”, that they rest on that ability and those arguments rather than work out the deep basis for their stances and against other stances.

Partisans never agree on cost and benefit, practicality, morality, or a mix of practicality and morality. So, we get a never-ending march of “iffy” programs and “iffy” results along with their amazing cockamamie rationalizations.

-Even so, CB analyses are worth reading if you keep an open mind and read analyses from both sides. Rather than offer a bunch of such studies, I offer one that caught my eye and is free on the Net: Paul Losleben, 2017, “Fifty Experiments in Democracy: A Critical Analysis of Conservative Governance”. It reads quickly. Find it at www.orcasresearch.org or by searching www.quora.com for “Paul Losleben”. The Quora entry gives a short synopsis, responses to his work, and his replies. Look at his bibliography to appreciate the data he had to work through. Losleben is not an academic but a kind of engineer, which makes his work more appealing. I agree with most of his conclusions. I do not know him and he does not know me. I doubt he would agree with everything that I say here.

A bit surprising, Democratic style programs work fairly often and in fairly many situations. Often, they are cost effective and are the most cost effective. They are not always beneficial, and some costs, such as erosion of character, erosion of the spirit of competition, and promoting class conflict, are hard to measure and are often overlooked. But Democratic programs are cost effective enough so we should take the result seriously. Democrats would have a good case if they knew how to use it to help the country as a whole. This result does not mean the Democratic way of looking at society, economy, and human nature is totally correct. Democrats get good results as much by luck (tech states) as by good planning, and their programs have severe drawbacks such as massive debt due to “entitlements” and massive cheating on programs such as Social Security Disability and Medicare.

A bit surprising, Republican style programs, including the state supposedly not doing anything, do not work as well as Democratic style programs. They are not generally as beneficial and do not generally help the economy as much to stay reliable or to grow. Part of the problem in making this comparison is that many states that have a lower economic base “went Republican” in the 1970s and 80s, and White and Asian people who now have trouble with jobs “went Republican”, so some places where Republican programs prevail started with a disadvantage. Think of Mississippi and the dead parts of the “rust belt”. But that is not the whole story. Republican programs and supposed “non-action by the state” simply don’t deliver the goods. This result does not mean Republican ideals are all junk. Republican ideals such

as personal responsibility and private initiative still have value. We should judge ideals on their merits and proper implementation rather than by their misuse by parties including Republicans.

-Think of CB analyses as accurate-enough reflections of practicality, of what works and does not, of what works better or worse. In that capacity, CB analyses also reflect something that a lot of Americans want. Believe it or not in our 2019 partisan times, most Americans care less about Party and dogma than about what works and what doesn't. If Americans could vote for programs rather than Parties, and could pick and choose from a menu of programs according to what has been proven to work and not work, in what combinations, that is what most Americans would like. If this kind of welfare works best, take this. If that monitoring of credit cards works best, take that. If this monitoring the housing market works best, take this. If that education works best to train children for modern jobs and to be citizens of a modern democracy, then take that. Whichever Party could figure this out and offer these options convincingly, would win. So, why not? I skip technical reasons and go right to motives and attitudes.

Optional: Attitudes toward CB Analyses.

In theory, Republicans promote CB analyses because Republicans pride themselves on practicality and on having hard heads rather than soft bleeding hearts. Democrats should promote CB analyses because those analyses support Democratic programs often enough.

In practice, CB analyses are like facts to be used as convenient. Despite the truth in any particular CB analysis, both Parties stress what puts them in a good light and what puts the other Party in a bad light, what helps their power and what hurts the power of others. They reject what hurts them, stress what helps, overlook what helps the other Party, and stress what hurts the other Party. Both Parties accept as valid only CB studies that work for them and-or against the other Party, and they reject as invalid all studies that go against them and-or help the other Party. Both Parties use CB studies to promote programs that they already want for other reasons, and to hinder programs that they already dislike for other reasons. Both Parties use morality to defeat practicality, or the reverse, when that ploy helps their true interests. Both Parties use moral arguments over practical arguments when moral arguments pack more punch, even when moral arguments are not the most important or are not fully valid. Each Party commissions its own supposedly objective study, which, miraculously, happens to find that the suggestions of this Party were correct all along while the suggestions of the other Party were wrong all along. Republicans have been more adept at this kind of maneuvering than Democrats.

The public seems to side with Republicans more often, likely because Republicans more adeptly blend-and-choose practicality and morality, and Republicans have the giant "practicality stick" of "success and prosperity through more business" by which to beat Democrats.

I would find Republican arguments stronger if Republicans gave a solid rationale for why they stress CB (practicality) sometimes and stress morality at other times; but Republicans never give an overall framework. They prefer maneuvering for power ad hoc in particular situations. They get away with it often enough so this is a viable political strategy even if reprehensible. Democrats are pathetic in their

overall stance. Their only overall rationale is a vague appeal to social justice regardless of case. Even when a Democratic program is clearly cost effective, Democrats don't know how to sell it; they fall victim to Republican counter claims that the program is not really cost effective despite evidence and that Republican style morality is more important than any imagined Democratic practicality. Democrats have little idea how to blend practicality and morality.

Suppose welfare is not cost effective. According to Democrats, we should still give generous assistance because it is the moral thing to do and because social justice demands using welfare to make up for systematic disadvantages. Suppose welfare is cost effective; in fact, limited welfare often is cost effective not only for the families involved but for the whole community. Ideally, then, according to Republicans, we should do it properly, and they should tell us how. But Republicans say we should still end welfare because it is just immoral to support people when they can-and-should support themselves, it is against social justice for one class or ethnic group to support others, and it undermines character and competitive spirit. The Parties say the same about Social Security and unemployment insurance. Almost without a doubt, limited abortion is cost effective and it prevents moral abuse such as when a woman has a baby that she can't support, and so the woman hurts older children to take care of this new one. Democrats overlook the cost effective argument to stress the moral right to choice; stress avoiding moral abuse; and stress social justice by avoiding the different impact of harsh anti-abortion laws on the various socio-economic classes, on women, and on ethnic groups. Republicans should take the cost benefit analysis as definitive but instead Republicans overlook it to stress the moral imperative of protecting unborn humans from callous murder. Much the same case can be made for mild drugs such as marijuana and for mild vices such as prostitution and some gambling. Similar arguments apply to sports stadiums and nature projects. Alabama does not have a lottery not because a lottery is not cost effective but because enough Republicans are supposedly sure a lottery is immoral. Republican politicians get big support from dog tracks and casinos just as gangsters used to support Prohibition. Republicans think a lottery benefits non-Republicans non-Whites more than Republicans and Whites.

If Republicans believed in practicality, they could not possibly support a wall on the border between Mexico and the United States so as to control illegal immigration. Even the blindest partisan can see there are other cheaper more effective ways. Then think for yourself why the wall is so appealing to whom. It is practical for politicians to pander to some groups even when the groups wish something impractical for the nation as a whole. Yet if Republicans can succeed in building the wall, it shows they have control and can provide security to their clients.

Later parts of this essay explain why Democrats avoid CB analyses in favor of social justice. Later parts explain why Republicans in theory favor CB analyses but in practice are adept at stressing practicality when that works for them and at stressing their version of morality when that works. Later parts of this essay explain why the public often goes along with the Republican view even when it makes the people hypocrites such as with marijuana, birth control, abortion, and nature.

To deal with issues where both practicality and morality apply is annoying, but this dilemma is not bad, in fact it is good. It helps make us human. You have to be clear. You have to accept both arguments.

You have to admit when one is stronger. Don't let politicians, commentators, and preachers bamboozle you. Don't decide one way because secretly it is what is best for you or because it "gets you off" by making you feel righteous, justified, victimized, victorious, or saved. Don't give way to anger, fear, or hate. Be able to give reasons, moral and practical. Make up your own mind. You have to work at it, more than simply watching political TV or listening to the people around you.

I can't suggest one best place to start reading about attitudes toward CB analyses and morality. You might start with "Why Americans Hate Welfare", 1999, by Martin Gillens. It is readable, careful with technique, and explains why it has to be careful. Use that book and the Internet as a guide to read half-a-dozen more studies on attitudes including attitudes in particular groups.

This Essay Comes First.

Analysis of particular issues, and scrutiny of CB studies, need context. This essay gives the right context. This essay comes first. If you don't read something like this essay first, you will get wrong ideas.

My Small Contradiction.

Sharp readers, and readers with a partisan ax, will see the contradiction between saying that Democratic programs on the whole have failed but regions with Democratic-style liberal governing on the whole do better than regions with Republican-style conservative governing. It would be easy to explain away this seeming contradiction. I don't take an "easy out". I say many Democratic programs such as Affirmative Action, much welfare, SS Disability, and school reform, have failed although some programs such as core Social Security, some welfare, public health programs, gay causes, women's causes, helping nature, and helping some education, have done well. Republican claims that all Democratic programs fail are mostly propaganda but Republicans are also partly correct. To explain would require a book. That book would have to come after this essay – another reason not to dwell on particular topics here. So I let the issue stand. I admire your ability to see contradictions. Use your talent wisely and not only to make points for your pre-convictions. Don't worry if you did not see the problem. I took many decades of staring. It takes a long time to remove blinders.

Working and Middle Class People Who "Went Republican" in the 1970s and 1980s.

Many times I bring up working and middle class people, mostly White and Asian, who "went Republican" in the 1970s and 80s, and the young people who took their attitudes. These people changed American politics despite making up only 25% of voters. They elected Reagan, Bush 2, and Trump. By not helping Bush 1, these people let him to fall to Clinton. These people took over state and local offices. They play a role in the Republican Party and American politics similar to the role Blacks played in the Democratic Party and American politics until recently.

I call people in the Republican Party before about 1975, and people who think like them, "traditional Republicans" or "old Republicans". I call people who came in after 1975, and people who think like

them, “new Republicans”. I know traditional Republicans and new Republicans overlap. I know many new Republicans were born after 1975. I knew the year was 2018 as I wrote this and I knew that most new Republicans were not so new anymore.

Ideas that we now call “Conservative” began in the middle 1700s. Contemporary conservative thought differs. I use the terms “original Conservatives” and “Conservative” for early Conservative thinkers until about 1830 and for the thought typical of them. I use the term “conservatives” for Rightist thinkers now and for the thought typical of them, mostly Republicans but including groups such as the Tea Party. I know Conservative and conservative overlap but not as much as you might think. I explain more in the part of this essay on Republicans and in the parts on history.

The main point of this section: Democrats, and some traditional Republicans, see all new Republicans as if they are wholly irrational, two-thirds crazy, haters, racist, sexist, religious bigots, dangerous, and easily violent. Working and middle class Republicans never listen to the hope and compassion in their religion but only use religion as a tool. They fear, and sometimes hate, everyone outside America. They think everyone is out to get America, meaning them. Their only response in international relations is to assert American power and America First. They can be all that but are not only that. They do cause damage when they are in an irrational stubborn mode. They are all that because they are afraid and desperate. They are not all the same. Some are worse, some much worse, and some much better. Many people in this group are as humane as any Democrat, as humane as a Christian (or member of any religion) should be, and they act as they do in a real attempt to make America and the world better. They do not intend most of the damage that they cause except when they put down rivals. The way to get to them is to give them a vision of an America that works for them and everyone according to reasonable standards of fairness. They do not necessarily need an America that dominates the world and makes everybody inside America rich, powerful, and good looking. They need to feel their families can succeed if given a fair chance. They must feel their families won't be forced to fail so as to support the success of other families with less ability, less drive, poor moral standards, bad character, and bad attitudes, but who can connive politically. If the majority of new Republicans could see a vision of American like this that they could trust, then likely they would take care of the crazies among them on their own. Here I urge us to see them as full humans before I too have to fall back into looking at them as stereotypes.

These working and middle class people did not start America, did not originate the ideas in democracy in America. They did not originate ideas about freedom, equality, fairness, rule of law, and good people in proper political offices. America was the child of Liberals, mostly what we would call moderately Left. They had midwife support from people that I call traditional centrist Republicans such as Ben Franklin, James Madison, and Alexander Hamilton, people like John McCain, George Bush 1, and Bob Dole. Still, over the decades, these working and middle class people made America as both a real nation and as an ideal. Without their dedication and work we would not have the good aspects of political America and good aspects of American culture. When they saw truth, they followed truth and they worked hard to build a nation and an economy on truth. They are the backbone of American practices. If they did not believe in fairness, fairness would not now be the highest American ideal. If they did not cherish their Christmas then no American now would cherish the spirit of Christmas. Democracy survives through the

carrying on of good institutions in the hearts, heads, and habits of these people. We owe them for the quality of daily life. More than other groups, they fight and die for freedom and decency. They live the work ethic and teach it. They do the bulk of charity work and give the bulk of charity giving. Personally they care for sick and wounded. Along with all the superficial symbols and rallying points of Christianity, they carry the deep true good ideals of Jesus and all religions. They carry on more of what is good in any religion than of what is bad. Advances for minorities, women, LGBTQ people, protection of nature, protection of all religions, and free speech, would not have been possible if they had not fought for fairness and if they had not taught their children well. It would be a horrible loss to the whole world if political depravity stole them.

These people are important for seeing Democrats and Republicans because they left one Party to join the other. They show what one Party screwed up and why. They show what they seek from the other Party, from politics, and their country. They show that Parties will distort the truth and will use clients to gain power, even at the expense of the nation. These people show how people in general over-react in hard times or in bad situations, how even good people can adopt bad attitudes when they fear. They show why we need to be wary of simple populism and why we should seek representative democracy that better protects us from over-reaction and bad decisions.

These people were hit hard when the world economy caught up to America in the 1970s and 1980s, and when America handled the change badly. They were strongly affected by rising costs, stagnant wages, lack of benefits, good jobs turning into bad jobs, and no jobs at all. They got scared and then got angry. They looked for someone to blame, fairly or unfairly. They looked for ways to recover prosperity, too often by hurting the people they blame, fairly or unfairly. Other people were hurt too, and got scared too, but other people did not learn how to organize, act, and take over a major Party.

If there was a way for all Americans to (a) get what they deserve according mostly to merit, (b) even if some of these Republican working and middle class people had to lose status, wealth, and power, (c) compared to the advantage they had in the 1950s, (d) but slowly, and (e) always mostly fairly according to merit, (f) then new Republicans would go for it. If there was a way for all Americans to “make it” that did not exclude these people, and did not require these people to fall so others could rise, they would lead. If there was a way to make the playing field truly and almost fully level, they would hail it. But there is not enough of any of this. The playing field is tilted not only against some Blacks and women but against many working and middle class Whites, Asians, and men. They want a level playing field without all the bizarre particular tilts that try to make up for each other but only make pitfalls.

The greatest desire of these people is not to return America to the 1950s and 1920s, keep White people on top, keep non-Whites down, and keep men on top and women below. When these people sound like 1957, that echo is how they express their hope for future America. They know future America can't be just like 1957 but don't know how better to describe it. Neither Party has given them the ideas by which to better describe future America.

The first goal of these people is security for their children. This goal is urgent. They want to make sure their children can go to a good school as far as is needed to compete for good jobs. They accept now that women have to work for the family to get this.

They know that any family that falls below a certain point on the socio-economic ladder likely never will rise again, never will be secure again. They have seen the good side and bad side, and they fear and hate the bad side. Enough White and Asian working and middle class people fell far enough in the 1970s and 1980s, and after, that they know their fears are justified.

Anything that erodes a fair chance for their children to get a good job scares the crap out of them. They react violently to any program, idea, trend, ideology, party, or group; based on gender, ethnicity, or religion; that offers a proposal that even hints their kids might not make it when their kids can compete fairly. That is flat, no option. No screwing with our kids.

On pretty good evidence, they are dead certain that the social programs of the 1960s and after failed much more than succeeded. Above I said we can't have a perfect welfare system in which all the people who need and deserve get help and only the people who need and deserve get help. We must choose between (1) some deserving people not getting help so as to stop the undeserving from perverting the system and America versus (2) giving help to all needy and so allowing undeserving people to pervert the system and erode American character; Republicans always choose (1); and these people choose (1) with a vengeance. They see welfare and all entitlement programs primarily as ways to take their money to give to people that do not deserve, so that their money serves to give their conniving competitors an advantage over their children, and at the same time their money undermines the whole country that shed blood and sweat to build. It is better not to have any welfare than to endure this. The same goes for all entitlement programs.

“Not only did the programs fail, but they pushed down our kids even when our kids did not deserve it, and pushed up the undeserving kids of our rivals, at the expense of our kids. That is not tolerable. We cannot go back to that or anything like that. We must get rid of all traces of that kind of anti-American unfairness.”

I agree that many aspects of the programs failed, and programs were often unfair to White and Asian kids, but I do not agree that all aspects of every program are a total disaster. We have to sort through features to figure out what works versus what does not, and to build with that – which we won't do. As long as we won't, then either the view of the White and Asian working and middle class Republicans or the opposite view of blindly unendingly help all self-proclaimed victims must prevail but not both – and both camps know that too.

After long hard experience, they are convinced we live in a zero sum game (what I gain you lose, and what you gain I lose) on any time scale and wealth scale that matters. They must make sure they don't lose. When they see other people win, such as with entitlements, they are sure that they are losing, even if they don't feel the loss right away. So they are also sure their security is fatally damaged.

They are sure the only hope for getting out of a zero sum game without hurting their families is through business and expansion of the economy. This idea is wrong but they are now committed to it. How they got committed to it is the subject of later parts of this essay.

They distort reality as much as they need to distort reality to make sure they do not fall. Their view of the world as a zero sum game is a distortion, and they know it, but it is closer to reality than any other picture offered by any party, and they will live with this distortion. They know business does not always work, and business has to go along with social programs, but they still reject both Democratic control of business and Democratic programs. They know this rejection is a distortion but they will accept it and live with the hypocrisy. They know business is not really free market capitalism, and they live with the gap. They know Trump's idea of business is not the Republican idea, and is nowhere near free market capitalism, but they live with that gap too. They know some social programs actually help – welfare got Ronny Reagan's family through the Great Depression, and now they could not get by without help with sports, police protection, and college tuition. They will fight like hell to keep programs that benefit them (scholarships) even while they fight like hell to kill all other programs, and thus to control their rivals; but they can live with this discrimination. They know that some deserving people don't get help through the state, and that not giving help costs more than it saves, but they would rather focus on the people who pervert the system. To do that, they are happy to call all people who get entitlements lazy cheaters even when they know that many recipients are not lazy or cheaters, and would rather have a job. They know other religions share their core values, people in other religions often act like good Christians, and metaphysical doctrines between religions don't matter much, but still they stress their religion because it is a flag around which to rally and a sieve by which to exclude others. If there is only so much benefit to go around, you have to pick winners and losers. They know the non-Whites and non-Asians legally in the US are not to blame but they don't mind blaming them. They know that even illegal aliens are not the cause of their troubles but they are happy to blame them. They know regulations to help nature are not to blame but they are happy to blame all pro-nature sentiment anyway. They know global climate is changing and that people are the cause but they fear any attempt to help will create a plethora of rules that will harm them far more than help them, likely won't help the planet, will put them at even more disadvantage than they are now, and will make them pay to take care of other people who are more to blame and less deserving. They know the international economy is not mostly to blame but they are happy to see all other prosperous nations as cheaters who have taken advantage of America, to blame those other nations, and to fight back fairly and unfairly. Other nations are the welfare cheaters of the world. They all should stand on their own feet, and, when they do, and America stops helping hold them up, then America will out-compete them all. They embrace whatever demagogue promises them security, even if they know that he-she is lying. To them, all the alternatives are worse. If push comes to shove, they will accept fascism American style.

People that feel insecure or disadvantaged, seek scapegoats to hate, disparage, attack, and hurt. They do this even when to attack others does them little good. Usually they seek scapegoats in the groups that they feel hurt them (even if not so) but sometimes they take any victim. This is how we get attacks on Jews and Jewish synagogues (Temples), ambushes on police officers of any race, and "gay bashing".

The tendency is not limited to new Republicans. If you are Black, walk alone in a Hispanic neighborhood, and vice versa. Watch “West Side Story” and ignore all the romance. Ask a Lefty for an assessment of new Republicans and all Republicans.

The new Republicans have carried this tendency much too far. They hurt people in ways that don’t heal. President Trump, by mocking handicapped people, women, the press, and the victims of gun attacks, makes it all worse and encourages violence.

First, they get violent too quickly, too often, and too hard. Usually they start the fight, and they hit to hurt. They support violent people among them. They are proud of this.

Having condemned their violence, I also have to stress that only a small minority is violent and that many new Republicans deplore violence. They know better than to hurt people. They don’t want their fellow new Republicans to hurt people either.

Second, new Republicans get violent against groups that have not hurt them and that attacking won’t help them or the country. LGBTQ people have never hurt working and middle class people of any Party. Usually LGBTQ people are good citizens, and, as such, help most people and the country. Jews have done far more good than harm. Even if we limit ourselves entirely to the entertainment industry, we are far better off with Jews than without, and even Christmas is far better off with Jews than without them. It is true that some illegal immigrants take jobs that White Republicans might have gotten, and illegal aliens do take entitlement benefits. But how much do you want to make of that? Illegal aliens likely take more jobs from Blacks and legal Hispanics than from White Republicans. Do you really want to punish all illegal immigrants, including ones who work hard on the jobs they supposedly took from White Republicans, and who, over the long run, actually help America and your descendants?

Third, this attitude gets in the way of seeing what the real problems are. It blocks your mind and your heart. You can’t see the flaws in the economy and the problems caused by the flaws. You can’t figure out what to do to make your own situation better let alone make America and the world better. You can’t even figure out how to help the person next door. You become an easy mark for people in power. You become a tool of people in power. As their tool, you help suppress your own group.

Fourth, it makes you a bad person. No matter how good you might feel for a while, you are not doing what you know is good, you often do what you know is bad, and that makes you a bad person. Good Jews, Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, Taoists, and Confucians don’t do this. If you do it, then you are not a good member of your religion. God etc. will condemn you for it, and that punishment is much worse than anything any person could do to you.

All Republicans, especially new Republicans, want Muslims and especially Muslim clerics to loudly and in public condemn radical Muslims and Muslim violence, and complain loudly that Muslims don’t do it. Do Republicans condemn violence when Republicans do it? Do Republicans do it loudly and in public? Of course the answers are “no”.

Most new Republicans do not seek to get angry, hold a grudge, hate, or hurt scapegoats, and they would rather avoid those, but they will do all that when they feel the security of their family is attacked. They rally to a demagogue who offers them justification for their anger, reasons for their fear in the badness of other people, and rationales for hate and for attacking scapegoats.

Democrats distort the world about as much, and often do bad things as a result of their wrong world view. Do you really think the views of all Blacks, White Upper Middle Class College Educated Liberals, and LGBTQ people, are accurate? Have you considered how they are inaccurate and why?

The Republican working and middle class uses issues like gayness and abortion not because it matters deeply to them whether two women kiss or some poor Black girl gets a free abortion but because these issues are symbols of where they stand and of their relations to others. These issues are ways for them to draw lines and are tools to control their rivals. The wall on the border with Mexico could not ever be practical and nearly all new Republicans know it although few would admit it. The wall is a symbol. It is not a symbol about Mexico, Hispanics, or immigration legal or illegal, but about rejecting the chaos of the modern world and building a safe haven. It is a symbol of their victory over Democrats and the non-American non-White non-Asian world. Nobody but a few foolish atheists is waging a war on Christianity. Much of academia and many self-styled Liberals are in fact prejudiced against Christianity, and academia uses Christianity as its scapegoat to mock, but even all that does not amount to a war on Christianity or Christians. The war is a symbol invented by new Republicans to serve as a focus and to intensify feelings and acts.

I am not sure if most new Republicans think that all small moral lapses are the top of a slippery slope that leads to the total undermining of American character and the failure of America in the world. Some of them do think this way although likely not so much because they believe it but because it gives them symbols and an excuse for righteous anger against Democratic clients. I think most new Republicans follow the trend set by the true believers but don't really think America is in great peril of total moral degeneracy, total loss of character, fiscal failure, and military collapse, if all abortion is not outlawed or if we allow suicide in cases of incurable painful illness. Most New Republicans seem to use moral and character decay like symbols and rallying points. In my experience, new Republicans do not respond rationally to arguments otherwise, which is often an indication that the obvious issue is not the real issue. I wish I could give more clarity to this topic.

For reasons that I don't understand well enough but I can see in their effects, people who feel insecure grab at symbols and hold tight. They seem to care more about symbols than about reality. You have to keep this symbol disease in mind when dealing with them. Again, this makes them highly vulnerable to bad leadership, to demagogues, sociopaths, and well meaning half-bright people who have not thought things through but believe they have the solution.

When groups feel insecure, they tend to: (a) see more in terms of groups; (b) draw sharp boundaries between groups; (c) think in terms of us versus them, you are either with us or against us; (d) worry

about homogeneity (all the same kind) and purity in their group; (e) think of their group as all good; (f) think of other groups as all bad; and (g) narrow the size of their group, largely by excluding any people who might not be pure enough. When one group adopts this stance, it leads to other groups having to adopt a similar stance even if the other groups did not at first feel threatened and still wish not to adopt this stance. All these tendencies intensify the points made above. This stance develops not only among Republicans and new Republicans but in other groups. Think of Israel and Muslims. Think of pure bloods versus mud bloods in Harry Potter. Russell Wilson, quarterback of the Seattle Seahawks, because he does not talk like a jive ass fool but talks like an intelligent educated member of the upper middle class, was criticized for not being Black enough. Mixed race children among Blacks have to go out of their way to prove they are really Black. In old Western movies, think of cowboys hating Indians but hating “half breeds” even more. In gangster movies, Martin Scorsese and Francis Coppola stress how important it is to be Italian, in fact Sicilian. During their troubles, only some Irish people were really Irish people. At first, the Irish were not Americans. It takes great leadership to get people out of this stance, and America has not had that among Republicans or Democrats.

New Republicans know that not helping, and that positively hurting, Blacks, single parents, women, immigrants, and other disadvantaged groups, pretty much dooms those groups to life at the bottom. They do not want that miserable fate for them, but, if it has to be, then it has to be. Better them and their kids than me and my kids.

New Republicans know that not helping, and positively hurting, Blacks etc. goes against their religion, usually Christianity, and against the best spirit of America. They are unhappy about that. It makes them feel bad. They would rather feel bad than take the chance that their kids won't make it. If they have to de facto keep other people down so as to make sure their kids make it, then that is what they have to do. If God gets angry at them about it when they die, then so be it, but at least their kids and grandkids will be alive and doing well enough.

Like most people, including Blacks and women, who have to do something hard, borderline immoral, and-or borderline irreligious, working class and middle class Republicans develop bad rationalizations and they enhance their general ability to lie, rationalize, and believe some outrageous crap. “Keeping Blacks down and hating Muslims is not prejudice, it is based on reality that those idiot Democrats won't see. Anybody with one eye could see how much Jews and Blacks control America, the America that we built and our parents built.”

When people feel bad about something but have to do it anyway, and have to lie to themselves, they do it all the harder (double down), and they become vicious too. They will not let any simplistic do-gooders guilt them out of what they must do. They develop a general bad attitude about the issues and wear a continual “chip on their shoulders” much like constantly angry Blacks. They get violent.

Again: All groups do the same, in their own ways, to their own extent but always too much, including Democrats, Liberal professionals, feminists, LGBTQs, Blacks, Hispanics, Roman Catholics, Protestants, Muslims, Hindus, Jews, Buddhists, and atheists. Again: Not all new Republicans are the same. To treat

them all the same is to do the same bad thing to them that you accuse them of doing to others. Some new Republicans are as good as you and your group. Again: The best antidote to badness in them and in you is to seek the truth and to find practical-yet-idealistic ways forward.

When New Republicans do feel secure, can help others without hurting their own children or hurting the future of their class, they can be real sweethearts, as good as any people in the world ever. They help not only fellow Republicans but all Americans, even immigrants, even illegal immigrants. They give to charities even though they know recipients are likely to be in other groups. They help people all over the world through their donations of money, stuff, good ideas, and, in the case of many soldiers, with their blood, limbs, minds, and lives.

Is that true of other groups? Is it so of your group? Do you give only to Black causes? Jewish? Muslim? Christian? Women's causes? For Nature? Do you give to, and work in, groups such as United Way that try to help all people of all backgrounds?

Democrats pretend to be flabbergasted when Republicans find the roots of the Republican view in the religion that most Republican's share, the religion that served as half the basis for America, Christianity. Democrats pretend to be amazed when Republicans see close ties between religion, morality, society, the state, personal acts, and group acts. Democrats pretend this is all contrived rationalization and mere ideological tool. In fact, the Republican attitude is natural. Except when people have inherited a long struggle to keep apart church and state, and to find secular reasons for behavior and institutions, we tend to see acts, church, state, society, and morality all as one thing; and to see ourselves as having the one-and-only true religion, way of life, and state. Non-Christians do it. Democrats and atheists do it but with a near-religion such as Social Justice. I repeat that the view is natural. It takes much education and hard reasoning to get people to see otherwise and to act on the basis of other better ideas. In America, it takes more work because America has strong roots in Christianity, America succeeded, and America's success validates its mix of Christianity with old Liberal thinking. If denying that religion-state-society-morality-and-acts are one big thing (modern secular world view) works worse than seeing them all as one big thing, then people won't adopt the modern secular view, and people will stick to the old world view that links church and state. If Democratic programs fail for working and middle class Republicans, as they have, then people won't adopt a modern secular view and will hold the old view that mixes religion with everything. If the modern secular view is as bad as the Democratic programs appear to all working class and middle class Republicans, then Republicans won't embrace the modern secular view and they will reject Democratic programs. They will go on seeing close ties between their religion, the state, etc. and the Republican Party. They will do so even if it contradicts the ideals of Christianity and Democracy that they supposedly hold.

Rather than feign bewilderment that Republicans continue to believe in old religion, Democrats need to figure out how to convince working and middle class Americans that Democratic style programs work well enough, Democratic programs do not go against any major religion, and Democratic programs go along with the best ideals in all major religions. Democrats can do that only if Democratic programs do in fact work well enough. Democrats need to show people how the Democratic secular view grew out of

old Christian-and-old-Liberal matrix and how it really is better for the modern world. Democrats need to show how their programs embody and bring to life deep important ideals that all decent people share, and how their programs do so in a practical way. None of this is likely to happen soon.

Is every feminist a half-crazy hysterical man-hating bitch, bent on using PC to eviscerate everybody she doesn't like? Do feminists who act like that represent all women? (a) Is every Black man a wannabe gangsta who carries a cheap gun, hates all Whites, is waiting to rob you, and will die young in a shoot-out in a parking lot? (b) Are all Blacks self-trained experts in making false claims of discrimination so as to gain unfair advantage? Do Black people who act like (a) and (b) represent all Blacks? Do those Blacks represent all Blacks even if there are far too many of those Blacks? Is every member of every boy band, and every hip-hop "artist", really a sensitive radical rebel who cares more about art, romance, and social justice than making money? Does every Democrat hate all business and want to forcibly fleece the rich to give to lazy conniving pseudo-poor parasites? Is every journalist a tool of some bad group?

Then not every working class and middle class Republican is a racist sexist fascist Brown Shirt gun-toting state-hating-yet-also- authoritarian pseudo-religious hypocritical zealot who would rather follow a bad sociopath (Trump) than find out what the world really is like and help America to live in the real world. They act like that when they don't have anything better to believe in. If you want them to act better, then give them something idealistic-yet-realistic to believe in. Likewise, if you want Blacks and women to act better, give them some workable yet idealistic reality.

Even if too many new Republicans are a little bit too nuts for my comfort, still:

(1) Enough of what they say has enough truth in it that we should pay attention. If they say programs don't work and are unfair, we should listen. If they say we need to get in touch with the roots of our deep values, we should pay attention. If they say programs that were designed to help such as welfare and Affirmative Action are being abused, and now cause more harm than good, we should listen and really think it out for ourselves. If they say PC distorts human nature and really causes more harm than good, we should listen and think out what best goes along with human nature and social justice.

(2) They are not all that crazy all the time. Even the ones that seem crazy to Democrats, such as those that go to gun shows, are not that crazy most of the time. Most of them are pretty decent people most of the time, and it is not hard to call on their decent side in a pinch such as a natural disaster. They feel appeals to social justice but disagree that what you propose really is social justice over the long run. In their own way, even some superficially gangsta Blacks are the same. Think of Blacks that show up at rallies because they want to do something for their people and for America but they don't throw bottles and would never throw bottles.

(3) Even in the group of hard-hit working and middle class Republicans, only a minority is really as crazy as the left wing media shows them, and as they come off on right wing media. Most are compassionate and respond to rationality. They would never show up at a White Power rally in any capacity. They are happy to give help, and to work alongside anyone of any race, religion, or gender, in any private charity,

or in a state aid effort, such as in a disaster. They go along with foolish Republican politics because they just don't see what else to do. They are like "churchy" Blacks and middle class Blacks who hear nothing but "blame the Whites" all the time but still often overcome that poison in their daily lives.

I don't always state explicitly when a Republican idea, policy, or program caters to these people, uses these people, or inflames their bad emotions for political gain. I don't always state explicitly when a Republican idea etc. is not really about what it seems to be about, such as the wall on the Mexican border, but is really only a way to use new Republicans in the political power game. I hope you can use your experience and imagination to fill in the details.

Sometimes Turnabout is Fair Play.

Use similar ideas to assess Democratic clients, especially those you dislike. If some Democratic clients do seem a bit crazy sometimes, then why? What sense and nonsense is in their claims? What are they afraid of? Who are they afraid of? If they won't back off their craziness, then what do you do? What roles do practicality and morality play? What is the sane middle and how do you get there?

To what extent have the inaccurate attitudes of Democratic clients shaped the ideas, policies, and programs of the Democratic Party since the middle 1950s?

If you are not a Republican, pretend you are. How do you feel when you are in a social setting where you know it would be awkward to express your conservative ideas, where you will meet with Lefty scorn and face a barrage of supposed counter-arguments that really don't hold water? Do you enjoy parties? Is that what your workplace is like? Is that what most college classrooms are like? If you are a fairly old-fashioned strong Christian, how does it feel to keep your mouth shut most of the time? You can't tell of your faith in Jesus and in the ultimate justice of God. How does it feel to know that strong Christians, and conservatives, have to watch what they say so they don't get the short end of promotions, business deals, business relations, acting jobs, and local politics? How does it feel to know you have missed out on promotions, and that your salary is less than co-workers, even though you do the same work and you do it better? How does it feel to know that, if you live in a nice neighborhood, most of your neighbors will secretly laugh at you, you will never be fully accepted, your children will never be fully accepted, and your children might not marry as well as they should? How does it feel to know that college admissions committees might not accept your child, or not give as much in scholarships, if your child openly says on his-her application how much Jesus has meant? How does it feel to know that a liberal judge might rule against you or put you in prison longer?

That is how gays feel, all the time. That is how many women feel, nearly all the time. That is how some Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, Africans in America, and other minorities feel. That is how Muslims feel much of the time. Feeling this way sometimes is part of being human but how much is too much, so we should do something to help, as did the Good Samaritan? The best act is to treat them as you wish to be treated, or at least not treat them as you wish not to be treated.

You think Blacks who ambush the police are evil and should be stopped. You think Blacks who go to rallies to openly hate Whites and the police are crazy, dangerous, and evil. You want Muslim clerics to loudly publicly condemn Muslim terrorists. In fact, Muslims do condemn Muslim evil, but we don't pay attention to that. You think the craziest people among these groups represent all people in the group. Then why don't you see the craziness in rallies for White Supremacy and in the policies of Trump? Do you really want those people to represent Whites, Asians, and Republicans? You think following someone like Al Sharpton is crazy. Why don't you see the craziness in following a sociopath whose ideas hurt America, Trump? Why don't you think about and condemn what is wrong in your Party? Use the same standards on you that you use on them. I praise Republicans such as John McCain who did this.

Do you really want to do to all of them what some of them have done to you? Didn't Jesus tell you not to do that? Didn't Jesus tell you what better to do? Didn't he tell you to take the plank out of your own eye first before you judge the mote in their eyes? These are fair questions to ask of Christians and of any religious or moral person.

Learn to see from several sides. Jesus wants it. Some Lefties actually learn to do this and not only to parrot the idea as PC babble. If Lefties can do it then why can't Righties do it?

Ping Pong.

Why are there almost always only two major parties in the United States, England, France, Germany, Canada, and in most nations that actually work? Why are there so many parties in nations where formal government does not work well such as Italy and old "banana republics"? Why, in many dictatorships such as in much of Africa, are there two major parties, with many fringe parties, but the two parties operate much differently than in successful nations? Why, in a successful two party system, is one party almost always left and the other right? Why do the two parties almost always oppose each other even over issues that don't seem to provoke opposition and issues that seem otherwise not to matter?

There are some good reasons for all this. We would gain insight into Democrats and Republicans if we were to see them in this bigger context. They are part of a human dynamic and they are channeled by that dynamic as much as by their official ideologies and programs. But I can't go into the topic here. This essay tries to give the background that you would need to go into party relations in terms of this general human dynamic on your own in other literature.

Annoying Attitudes.

Most members of most groups have a feeling of "we know something that you don't, and we are better than you because of the secrets that we know". Almost all groups have some advantages and some disadvantages, things work out equally overall, this feeling does not matter much, and sometimes it is fun. Hockey players think they know what real sport is all about, and so do golfers, as with both sides in Adam Sandler's movie "Happy Gilmore"; but nobody cares which side is right, and we can get fun out of both sides. Every group of friends thinks it goes to the coolest concert, movie, bar, play, football game,

or tennis tournament. Every national cuisine and every cooking club in the world knows magic secrets that make its food the best. This feeling can be annoying in religion when people in various religions all think they know what is really going on, and all the other guys don't, so everyone should follow us and nobody should follow them. Usually we can live with that too.

The same is true of political parties. Democrats know secrets about human nature, social life, social justice, and political life, which somehow are obvious and hidden at the same time. A lot of people just can't get it, Republicans just can't get it, and that makes Democrats better than Republicans. Anybody who can sense the secret should go along with Democrats while totally avoiding Republicans. Anybody who thinks Democrats might really be "in the know" and suspects Republicans are less in the know also should totally follow Democrats and avoid those thick-headed thick-"souled" Republicans. The same is true of Republicans about Democrats. There is no real content to what the Democrats or Republicans know and the other guys don't know. In the end, there is only self-reinforcing attitude.

The Democratic attitude is like the hipster attitude of being "cooler than thou", which finally comes down to a bad fashion statement. It is like Black people who think they know some deep truths that White people just can't get, truths evident only in Black art and Culture; or women who know truths men just can't get; and those truths, Black or woman, happen to be the pivotal ideas-feelings in the whole universe. The mass of Democrats "get" their politicians like fans get their pop stars.

The Republican attitude is like the sibling who is two years older but thinks he-she is a "person of the world", with deep discerning, automatically knows everything that needs to be known, has full rights to dictate to younger siblings on everything from breakfast cereal to sex, and younger siblings must comply or they are idiots and they deserve what they are about to get – let's just hope they don't drag down the whole family with them. It is the attitude of "man-splaining" (which women do as much as men but the style differs). It is a TV preacher saying we should love each other like Jesus loved us except for Jews, Muslims, "the Gays", and those who vote the wrong way.

Martial arts schools like to claim they have secrets and their secrets make them automatically better than other styles, so you have to study with them and have to avoid rivals. The good ones know better and say so. Any good school will tell you the most important secrets are hard work and willingness to learn, which includes willingness to take some knocks. Cheng Man Ching, a highly skilled teacher of Tai Chi (Chuan), including Tai Chi for fighting, said, "There are no secrets", and he meant it. Republicans and Democrats should listen. (His name is spelled different ways. He is easy to find on the Net.)

Not everybody can understand everything but most of us can understand what we need to know about politics IF we can look past our own interests. There are no secrets. There is no basis for the attitude of Republicans or Democrats. Get over yourself. Don't be snide or condescending.

PART 3: DEMOCRATS

Introduction and Synopsis: No Core Vision, the Center Will Not Hold.

-Democrats say they want to help people and nature. To help, you have to be starkly realistic about the problems, what causes what, what helps and hurts, in the short run and long run, not only in the near arena but throughout society, what can be done, what can't be done, the character of the person, the character of his-her group, and the character of various groups in greater society. You have to balance morality and practicality. You don't help a drowning person by offering him-her a shot of aged whisky or a new video game. To offer only crappy help can be worse than no help. Yet Democrats are not realistic enough, have faced decades of evidence that they are not, know they are not, and still keep at it. Albert Einstein defined insanity as doing the same thing over and over expecting a different result. His words apply less to social life than to physics but still apply well enough. How Democrats are not realistic falls into a pattern. Why are they unrealistic in those ways?

I hope that my comments here, and the comments of other people, would push Democrats to be more realistic and so more deeply helpful. People and the planet need some real help. But my own sense of realism leads me to doubt.

-The Democratic Party has not had a vision of a better America, a better world, and the role of America in a better world, since the late 1960s. Even then, that vision was flawed and failed.

To people inside and outside the Democratic Party, even when charming, the Party has little grace. Even when some leaders are charismatic, the Party makes sense, its programs clearly work, and it is the only party that can appeal to a sense of humanity, the party lacks the grace that makes people commit. Any success seems to serve a particular client rather than give all people access to grace. Without a general view, even with success, the Party cannot have the grace that people need.

Not all Democratic clients are compatible with each other. Democrats cannot have a single realistic yet compassionate vision because to do so would alienate some clients, and Democrats wish to keep all clients. Without a single realistic yet compassionate vision, the Party can have little grace.

Liberals started in the 1600s by trying to make sense of society, social institutions, governing, and the place of individual people in various groups and in society as a whole, so as to make better states and better people. Liberals had to have standards for assessing when things made more sense or less sense. Along the way, starting before 1900, Democrats got so confused that now it seems they have neither consistent sense nor any believable standards.

Because Democrats don't have any single world view, they cannot assess: goals; when programs, ideals, and pleas make more or less sense; when to change or not change; which sides to take or to oppose in which issues; which groups to support, ignore, or reject; which causes to champion, ignore, or oppose;

the priority of groups and causes; the extent to invest, or not invest, in particular groups and causes given overall needs; and how to govern well.

Democrats define who they are as much by what they oppose as by who they are positively. Democrats decide which group to embrace, ignore, or reject as much by the value of the group as a political client than by the intrinsic merits of its case in the context of other cases. Democrats decide which cause to champion, ignore, or oppose as much by its use in getting and holding clients, by who opposes the cause such as Republicans, and by its use in politicking, as by the intrinsic merits of the cause, in the context of other causes, in the world of 2018. Democrats oppose racism and racists, embrace any group which can claim to be a victim of racism, and reject any old stereotypically racist groups such as Whites regardless of their current attitudes; but Democrats don't really have a grasp of racism overall and don't really have a plan for how to deal with all of racism and all of its problems in the current world rather than in the imagined world of 1955, and Democrats will not be honest about the extent that we can deal with racism and its problems through politics. Democrats simply deny that reverse discrimination is at all possible. This situation is common in politics. Republicans painted themselves into the same type of corner on the diagonally other side of the room but their situation differs somewhat.

"Business does it all, screw anybody who is not solidly in the business system" is not enough to serve as the world view of a political party. Still, Republicans get away with claiming it for reasons that I describe later. Democrats don't have even that little. Instead, Democrats have a vague confusing sense of social justice. Vague left leanings, and willingness to take up almost any cause or any client, are not enough. Being critical of authority and of all political order is not enough, especially if you wish to use the state to right all wrongs, even if being critical of all authority it is fun. Being sure that all business people are robber barons out to cheat all working people is not enough even if it is fun. Being sure all minorities, women, groups that do not succeed well enough, and groups with issues, are victims of the ruling class and deserve financial and legal support forever, is not enough. Fighting the system and "the man" is not enough. Being a rebel is not enough. Loving nature and having a big heart are not enough though both are good. Being for individual freedom and self-determination is not enough unless it is part of a world view with religious and-or philosophical roots, and Democrats have not had that in a long time.

Democrats say "social justice" is in short supply, it is a good enough goal to bind a party, and it is a good enough idea for governing well. I agree we need more social justice but the idea is not enough by itself to bind a party or to govern well. Even to use social justice as one focus among many ideas by which to bind a party and govern well, the idea would need deep clear roots in views about people and society, and Democrats don't have that.

Different groups in the Party see social justice differently. Their priorities are not the same. Each client puts itself at the top of the abused list and so should get care first with the most resources. Not every group can be at the top and no group can get all the resources it wishes. When groups don't get what they wish, they get jealous. Unless the Party can define social justice so as to settle differences between groups, settle priorities, and allocations, the idea of social justice cannot bind the Party or serve as the core for governing. To define social justice well enough to settle priorities and allocations, the Party

would have to use ideas beyond vague social justice, such as limited resources, mixed flawed human nature, and group character, it would have to acknowledge differences between groups, and it wishes none of that.

Besides confusion over social justice, groups in the Party see differently and they contradict enough in their views that they would not be under the same umbrella if they did not need a cover party to work for them. These people are all not close enough to get along well enough: Blacks, Hispanic, White and Asian working people; middle and upper middle class people who feel sympathetic to the downtrodden; women; people who care about the planet; and LGBTQ people (gays). American Blacks see abortion in ways that are not compatible with feminist pro-choice women. Blacks see gay acts and people as deeply immoral and socially disruptive, a view that is not compatible with LGBTQ people and middle and upper middle class White and Asian people. Environmentalists see a huge dire threat that must be met before raising the positions of Blacks, Hispanics, or women if helping them requires we exploit nature more. Old people want to make sure they live decently and get full medical care. White-and-Asian working-and-middle-class people left the Party when, to them, the Democratic idea of social justice became “give the Blacks all that they want first, no matter how long it takes and how much it costs, even if no long-term good comes of it, make the Whites and Asians pay for it, and make White and Asian children give their jobs to Black children”.

Without a clear working vision at the center, the Democratic Party has defined itself partly by how it is not Republican. Not all Republican ideas, programs, and critiques are false. Not all Republicans are bad guys. Defining the Party against them leads Democrats to exclude much that is useful. Defining yourself negatively doesn't work in the long run. It lets the other guys set the agenda. It leaves out groups that you would like to have such as the working class, middle class, and business people. It requires that you demonize the other side to make your side angelic and appealing. It requires that you criticize practices that really are overall good such as business. It requires that you demonize people that do the practices that really are overall good people such as business people. It required that Democrats in effect look down on Christianity because most Republicans are Christians.

Because the Democratic Party takes many groups and many causes, it cannot give enough to each to make sure each succeeds once-and-for-all. It puts on band aids to keep a group in the Party. It uses band aids, and only band aids, for decades. Nothing is ever settled or done. Groups and the people in causes stay in the Democratic Party because Republicans won't give them anything and so there is no option, but groups and people are not happy. The fate of national health care in general, and of Obama Care in particular, is one case. Black bad performance in schools and the economy, and Black crime, is another case. The environment is another. Abortion likely will be another when eventually the Right makes it effectively illegal again.

The lack of once-and-for-all success is partly because Republicans take away funding that the Democrats had set aside for problems. Republicans always succeed at leaving only enough to meet the bare legal minimum, band aid money, and never enough to deal finally and successfully with problems.

Inadequate funding hurts but that is not the only reason or the most important reason that Democrats don't solve problems once-and-for-all. The Democratic Party can't tell when a group-or-cause succeeds once-and-for-all, when a cause limps along, or fails, because the Democratic Party does not know what really ails the economy and the country on a deep level, what causes problems, and so how to fix them. The Party doesn't know why problems keep coming back despite funding. The need to take in many groups blinds the Party to the needs to seek root causes and to work from a deep level. If the Party did look deeply and act accordingly, it would lose some groups. The Party would rather evade deep thought by offering ongoing band aid help, and so keep as many groups in the Party as it can.

Not looking into root causes, combined with the need to recruit many clients at minimal cost, means the Democratic Party offers second-rate or third-rate analyses of issues, analyses that nobody can accept as coming from a deep understanding of economy and society. Clients accept Democratic words because clients hope to gain, not because they believe the words. Who really believes we can give everybody a free college education and, if we do, that everybody will automatically get a good job and achieve the American Dream? Who really believes that more welfare, more programs, more marches, or more "racial awareness", can permanently cure the problems of Black people in America? Who really believes the answer to Black-on-Black violence, Black lack of self-respect, and dismal Black schools, is attacking the police?

The Democratic Party cannot offer a comprehensive and fairly self-consistent view of the economy and society. The Democratic Party cannot tell the simple truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, candidly. It has to expand, placate, avoid, waffle, and weasel. Most of what it says is superficially true, but the ideas come out skewed enough to be unsatisfying. This problem of non-truth is common to all politics. It might be part of the definition of a political party. American Democrats are not much worse than other parties and are not worse than Republicans. Still, avoiding deep truth is not what I want, I dislike it, it is not what most people want, they dislike it, and it is not enough.

The Democratic Party is trapped in a bad vicious circle. The Party cannot offer a comprehensive fairly self-consistent view of the economy and society because it cannot afford to lose groups and the people behind causes. Always, some groups find something to dislike about a comprehensive fairly consistent view even if they like most of it. They hate looking in a mirror, hate that they are not first, hate that they don't get enough funds, and don't get enough political support. That much antagonism is enough for groups to threaten to withhold support in upcoming legislative votes, withhold support in elections, threaten to leave, or really to leave as did working and middle class Whites. If enough groups threaten or do leave, the Party is weak, and having a real deep true view did nothing. If the Party offers a weak shallow view that glosses over contradictions, enough groups will stay in the Party to get some things done half way. But, with a weak shallow view, the Party can never get enough done to solve problems once-and-for all. So, because the Party keeps many various groups it cannot offer a big fairly consistent world view by which to solve problems once-and-for-all for at least some groups. Because issues don't get solved once-and-for-all for anyone, groups are always unhappy and always looking for an excuse to demand, threaten, or leave. Because Democrats can't solve problems once-and-for-all for at least some

groups, there are always problems looming and always groups that need Democrats. To keep groups, the Party can't offer decisive deep analysis of the society and the economy. And so on.

Anybody who lives in a parliamentary (British style) system is familiar with this situation. Italians think this is normal by the time they are four years old. Still, it annoys Americans. I think people born after about 1980 in America sense this situation and most of them dislike it.

The Republican Party has its version of this same scenario but its version is not as acute because they can unite various groups and activities well enough by using "business" as a cover.

What follows is expansion and commentary on the above. New sections begin in bold. Sub-sections begin with a dash to start new topics.

Ignorance of the Economy.

-Democrats don't understand a real modern capitalist economy well enough.

After decades of watching, I still can't tell what ideas of economics various Democrats believe in or that Democrats-in-general believe in. (a) Sometimes they believe in standard optimistic economic theory that there is a lot of wealth for all and everything will turn out alright. (b) Sometimes they believe there is a lot of wealth, and we could have enough for everybody, but the people-on-top have distorted the system so that it serves the people-on-top and keeps working people down; all we need to do is fix the system once-and-for-all such as with free college for everybody; and then everything will be great for everybody all the time after. (c) Sometimes they think the economy has intrinsic distortion that people on top have managed to capture, and we need to un-distort the system and keep managing the system carefully and deeply for all the time after to make sure a gang of rich people does not capture it again. Then everything will be alright for everybody as long as we keep managing. (d) Sometimes they seem not to have any economic ideas other than "there is enough for all the downtrodden, don't worry about the rich, and we should do anything we can to grab as much as we can". (e) Despite complaining about unfairness, none seem to accept the economic arguments that I gave in Parts 1 and 2 about flaws and problems, or the sketch in the Introduction above. (f) Politicians tailor their message to the audience. Confusion on the economy leads to confusion about social relations. Confusion about the economy is both a cause, and a symptom, of lack of vision.

Strangely for the Party critical of Big Capitalism, Democrats don't understand how a real business fails or succeeds; the role of the state in markets; the role of the state in how a business succeeds or fails; and the root economic causes of unemployment, bad jobs, and sustained profit. Democrats don't know how underlying causes affect the economy, economic problems, and society. They don't know the economic roots of class. They don't appreciate the impact of deep economic flaws on social groups such as based on ethnicity and gender. They don't appreciate the relations between socio-economic class with those social groups. They don't seem to know where profit comes from, what profit is earned and what is unearned, what is fair or unfair, and what is good or bad. They don't see that flaws of the economy are

both the root of problems and that flaws impose limits on what they can do to address problems. They don't appreciate the attitudes that make a modern capitalist economy run well and they refuse to see the kinds of attitudes, the group cultures, that won't work. They don't appreciate how much attitudes are rooted in particular social groups. To quote myself:

"Again: These days, people can make a living only inside the capitalist business system, and this limit includes people who think they are outside the capitalist business system such as pop artists, gangstas, professors, doctors, and pseudo-rugged guys who drive big pickup trucks. You have to get a job. Even CEO's really only have jobs. Despite the support that many small business owners give their employees, the first place people look for a good job is in a big firm. People see big firms as the first line of defense against going down. People don't love big firms but they don't see the point of always attacking them either. People want a working relation with big firms. They want to use big firms reliably as a resource. Google figured this out. This is a big reason that people since the 1970s have turned to Republicans and have accepted the Republican mantra that '(big) business does it all automatically for everyone'.

As individuals and parents, Democrats see this, and they help their own children find good jobs where the good jobs are. As a Party, Democrats are blind. They treat all business, especially big business, as the enemy. They do not think out how to make a working relation with business that is acceptable to young people. 'A working relation with business' does not mean 'let business do whatever it wishes including run the state', as with Republicans. Americans have yet to figure out a good working relation with business for our world. If we really want to lead (control) business so that it does more good than harm for the most people in the modern world, then we need a good working relation with business. Democrats could lead the way better than Republicans because Republicans are committed to be the servants of business; Democrats could bring labor, the common people, and business together in ways Republicans cannot. But Democrats are not leading the way to a good relation between business, labor, and the people. They are not even looking. They are not getting across to young people that we need this relationship and that we can find it."

Democrats fall back on simplistic ideas such as that most profit is unfair and really belongs to the people (they are not Marxist but populist and simplistic). All business people get more than they should. We can always take more from them to give to the poor and to use in our programs. Democrats blame bare prejudice alone for sexism, racism, nationalism, and religious bias. They never see how groups add to their own malaise. They only blame wealth and power. I do not slight prejudice and self-perpetuating-wealth-and-power but they are not enough to explain all that happens. We cannot undo prejudice without working on economic causes at the same time. We can't use wealth for good if we don't know how it is made, held, and used in general. We can't lessen the effects of deep economic causes unless we know how a real capitalist economy works, good and bad, and we are ready to keep it healthy. We can't work on the effects of deep economic causes unless we appreciate capitalism and the good that it does. We can't take too much from the economy. So we have to know what might be too much, and, for that, we need a good idea of how it all works. We have to see that the character and attitudes of a group do affect how people in general treat the group, and affect how well the group does in a modern

economy; and we have to see that groups do need to control bad character-and-attitudes and do need to cultivate good character-and-attitudes.

Sometimes some Democrats seem to see that the economy has intrinsic flaws and that not all problems are caused by the bare greed of business men (sexist on purpose) and their corrupt political lackeys. But then the insight goes nowhere, or goes into schemes that contradict the basic idea of inner flaws, and so into only schemes that can't work. Democrats routinely come up with schemes for full employment that they should see can't work, or could work only for a while, and would cause harm if we tried to sustain them. I do not review the schemes. Democrats routinely propose a high minimum wage that cannot be sustained and will cause more harm through inflation than good. They do not look through the problem of bad jobs and low wages to see what causes them. I am not sure why Democrats half-way see flaws and problems, do see the obvious results, but will not accept deep underlying causes and deal with the results properly. It is easy to see why Republicans will not see deep flaws and the problems that the flaws lead to, and I explain later. Sometimes I am afraid Democrats don't want to really appreciate the flaws and problems because then they would have to change their whole attitude toward programs and the economy. They could not offer schemes for abundant help to everybody who asked. They would rather pretend they can help all clients fully right now than to face the truth and tell clients "we have to take care of Jane first and only then can we get to Joe, if there are any resources left over". This kind of self-induced blindness is not big hearted and it is not long-term social justice. I hope Democrats are simply confused and ignorant. They can't see there are no permanent one-off solutions. So they try to do what they can without stopping to sort it all out.

Democrats think they can tinker with the economy as much as they like so as to sustain their programs without also harming the economy, without eroding its ability to sustain programs, and without eroding its ability to sustain general quality of life. They think they can give to every cause and every self-styled victim without eroding the ability to give to causes and victims generally, and without damaging the general economy. Ironically, Democrats think Republican business has built an economy so strong that Democrats can rely on the Republican economy for all Democratic ends, including ends that harm the economy. Democrats are wrong. The economy will not hold up to everything that Democrats wish from it such as free broad medical care and free college. We cannot afford everything. Democrats are not deliberately bad-minded in wishing unending bounty from the economy. They are like pioneers in a forest, thinking that, no matter how much they cut, the forest will always be there and always will have enough for every need; then they are surprised one day to find it is all gone.

A Bunch of Issues Together to Show Democratic Confusion about the Economy.

What follows seems like a lot of issues but they all come together and there is no way to deal with them separately. They have to be dealt with together in a single management strategy. Neither Democrats nor Republicans have addressed these issues except in stereotyped inadequate ways. Republicans say "business can cure it all" while Democrats say "take from one to give to another". That won't do. As you read, ask why Democrats and Republicans fail.

Reminder: In a zero-sum game, what one family gains another family loses. In a positive sum game, people and families usually mutually gain from interacting (trade, hiring, working, wages, making, giving services, buying, and selling); what one family gains another family does not usually lose; especially over the long run. Ideally, a capitalist economy is a positive sum game, for nearly all people, especially over the long run. Historically, over the long run, for most people, a capitalist economy has worked as a good positive sum game, much better than alternatives – but not for all groups equally and fairly enough.

Democrats can't make up their minds if: (a) Americans are in a zero-sum game. (b) We are in a zero-sum game only for the short run or we are in it permanently. (c) The short-term game covers the whole economy or only some groups such as the working class or women. (d) We are in a zero-sum game due to intrinsic flaws in the economy; due to problems that come from flaws; the conniving of rich powerful people; the conniving of working, middle, and upper middle class Republicans; the conniving of people that get "entitlements"; or a mix. (e) We are in a long-term positive sum game. (f) The zero-sum game is only a short-term problem in the middle of a long-term positive-sum game OR the zero-sum game is the permanent real situation, at least for most people. (g) Suppose the zero-sum game is only short-term in the middle of a positive sum game. Then Democrats don't know what to do about the problems caused by the short-term zero-sum game while we wait for it all to get good for everybody. These are not theoretical questions filled with merely academic terms such as "zero-sum" and "short term". They go to the heart of how the economy works and about social relations within the economy.

Since the middle 1970s, income and wealth have gone more to people who already have them and less to people who don't have much income or wealth. The rich get richer and the middle class gets poorer. This is one reason why people feel so insecure and why people fight for control and security. Working and middle class Republicans feel it now as much as do typical Democratic clients, are as afraid, and will do their own nasty deeds to get control and security. A bad distribution of income happens when a few rich people control most of the wealth while most other people don't quite "get by" or are just able to get by. Third and Fourth World countries faced this situation. Income and wealth now are fairly "badly distributed" in America and the bad distribution is worsening. From now on, when I say "distribution of income" or "distribution", I mean "distribution of income and wealth" unless noted otherwise.

A "good" distribution occurs when income is nearly equal between most families but not necessarily fully equal. I cannot here go into details and I hope people use their imagination. America had a good distribution of income and wealth until the 1980s.

A good distribution has a big middle class. The working class is more likely to be middle class and to feel middle class. America had that in the 1950s and 1960s. Often a good distribution reinforces itself. Too often, a bad distribution also reinforces itself. A bad distribution leads to the feeling of a zero-sum game and to the bad feelings and bad social relations typical of a zero-sum game. It fosters strong bad comparative competition. A good distribution often supports a positive sum game in which every family gains in the long run; a good distribution helps people feel they are in a positive sum game; and a good distribution leads to better social relations. Comparative competition never goes away even in a good distribution but a good distribution makes people feel they need not fear falling if they don't stay ahead

of all neighbors in all ways all the time. I don't know of any research but I think a good distribution and the feeling of fairness go together while a bad distribution and the feeling of unfairness go together. A good distribution usually leads to more total wealth using the same resources as does a bad distribution. So, even rich people should prefer a moderately good distribution to any bad distribution.

The distribution of income comes directly out of how the economy works. The incomes of mechanics, lawyers, and clerks depend on how the whole economy works. Flaws in the economy and their related problems affect distribution. Recent problems such as bad jobs and big rising costs affect distribution. Flaws, their problems, and recent problems support a bad distribution, especially if the economy is not well-managed, has suffered a shock, or has "gone bad" for various reasons. If (a) the economy is well-managed, (b) flaws and problems are not big compared to the overall economy, (c) people feel the flaws and problems are small, (d) people feel managers can keep the flaws and problems small, (e) people feel that overall things remain fair, and (f) people feel all children with talent can rise enough despite flaws and problems, then (g) small flaws and problems are not a big issue. Small flaws and problems can even help a good distribution because they keep people aware. This is what America had until about 1974.

Now that America has developed a solid start toward a bad distribution, the flaws and problems support the bad distribution, and the bad distribution supports the flaws and problems.

Bad and good distribution serve to frame other issues in the economy such as big rising costs and group antagonism, and to show the bad response so far from our Parties.

Two big forces in the bad working of the American economy and the bad distribution of income now are (1) big rising costs, especially (2) the costs of helping children to succeed. These costs eat up income for most people, and eat up any increases in income for most people. Because these costs rise so fast and so steadily, even people that should otherwise feel they have "made it" still feel the pressure of big rising costs, and feel more insecure than they would have in previous decades. Big rising costs make the middle class fear. Big rising costs put a sharp edge on comparative competition and add a big share to making us all feel we in a zero-sum game. Now that the distribution of wealth and income has become bad enough, big rising costs work with bad distribution so that they make each other worse. It is very unlikely that we can get out of a bad distribution into a good distribution unless we stop big rising costs. We cannot simply meet big rising costs (pay more) as they get bigger. We have to drastically slow down the cost increase or stop it altogether. To do that, we have to know why costs have increased.

To create a good distribution of wealth, especially after it has gone bad, politicians and managers have to know how the economy works deeply and how that plays out in particular situations. Now, they have to know how the flaws and problems of the economy work under the bad distribution of income that has developed in America, in the context of big rising costs. This is what neither Party will figure out, at least in public for voters. Neither Party knows the roles of unemployment, bad jobs, and big rising costs, and their impacts. Republicans won't see it because they benefit from the bad distribution or because they fear Democratic clients-and-programs more than they fear the bad distribution of wealth and big rising costs. I do not here guess why Democrats won't see it. Democrats seem only dimly aware of the

impact of big rising costs on the working and middle classes, on relations of those classes to everyone else, and on the need to halt big rising costs. By not studying how the real economy works, how flaws and problems play out for America in the world economy now, Democrats insure we can't get to a better distribution and a better America through any of their programs.

The Democratic Party solution to bad distribution essentially amounts to redistribution: take wealth from one group and give it to families in other groups, hopefully to families that need it the most and can use it best. Redistribution is not necessarily bad and it happens in all governments. A progressive income tax (the higher the income, the higher the rate) redistributes wealth on purpose – at least when high income people can't find ways out of paying their share. A progressive income tax usually is a good way to redistribute income and wealth when the difference between the rates paid by rich and poor people is not too large. A sales tax is highly "regressive"; it redistributes wealth from the poor and the working class to the rich; and it is bad. Programs such as welfare and SSD are redistribution programs even if we don't see them like that. Subsidies to farmers and ranchers are redistribution. Tax breaks usually are redistributions, often from the working class and middle class to business. When people don't like a particular redistribution, they call it forced and unfair. What you call it depends on whether you give or get, and on how much.

Insurance programs, including unemployment compensation and Social Security, might or might not be redistribution programs depending on how the plans work and on how the economy works at any given time. Usually they are a mix of something I can call "pure insurance" without redistribution with some moderate redistribution.

(In pure insurance, nearly all people in a pool face about the same risk and are expected to need similar benefits if they need benefits. Think of a big neighborhood of middle class middle aged people all with similar sedans all in the same ethnic group all getting car insurance. When subgroups in the pool face clearly different risks, and-or subgroups likely will need different benefits, then some redistribution is inevitable. Even here, it is not necessarily bad. Think of young people supporting old people in various ways, of medical insurance firms accepting pre-existing conditions, or of people who never get cancer helping support (only moderately) people that do get various cancers.)

When national programs do include redistribution, they usually redistribute from the secure working class and middle class to insecure members of those classes and to the poor and the lower working class. Social Security redistributes in that way and also redistributes from the upper middle class to the other classes.

To anticipate: State sponsored insurance programs alone cannot cover or stop big rising costs. State sponsored redistribution programs alone cannot cover or stop big rising costs. The combination of state sponsored insurance and redistribution, as in national health insurance such as "Obama Care", cannot cover or stop big rising costs. Big rising costs have to be stopped by other independent means before an insurance program or redistribution program could work. Otherwise, insurance and-or redistribution programs will increase costs "big and fast" and they will redistribute funds "big and fast" from working

and middle class people to insurance firms, medical care providers, lawyers, and schools. They will not help the people they intend to help. Neither Party has a handle on this situation although Republicans do talk of putting limits on the law suits that help support big rising costs.

Continued modest state-run redistribution can take the bad edges off a basically good distribution and help keep it good, which is how we used state-run redistribution in the 1950s to the 1980s. Continued state-run redistribution on a big scale cannot make up for bad distribution. Ongoing redistribution on a big scale only briefly covers up deep underlying problems, weakens the nation, and sets the stage for a bad fall. This is the problem that countries got into such as Ireland, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Brazil, and Venezuela.

The upper middle class and the upper class often get out of paying much in redistribution programs. So, Democratic programs to deal with big rising costs in practice mean forcing redistribution from working and middle class people to Democratic clients. It is very unlikely this will work. It will not end the bad distribution of income, and not end the ties between bad distribution, flaws and problems, and big rising costs. Democrats could use modest redistribution to solve these problems only if they accepted a better version of how the economy works, including the flaws and problems, and only if they could figure out why costs are big and rising and how to stop it. It seems they will not do this. Particular candidates do sometimes mention controlling costs but I have not seen a plan that seems to understand what is going on and that might realistically work. I am not sure why Democrats do not offer a way to stop big rising costs at the same time that they offer redistribution, and independently of redistribution. Maybe they fear losing votes and funding from people in health care, education, and law. Nobody can cure big rising costs, unemployment, and bad jobs by using redistribution from the working and middle class to clients of the Democratic Party, or with forced redistribution in general from anyone to anyone.

Democrats, and most sane Republicans, see that there would be enough wealth for most people to feel fairly secure if competition were not so comparative, wealth was well distributed, we had good schools in which success was based on ability, and we could stay that way. To get that way and stay, we need the economy to run well at a deep level. We would like to go from our current looming bad distribution back to a better distribution. We can't go from a bad distribution to a good self-reinforcing distribution just by forcing fairly large-scale redistribution, especially if we do so along lines dictated by group fear, group rivalry, the needs for security and control, and politics. That way leads to nothing better and it makes new problems over old ones. That solution does not lead to a self-reinforcing good distribution. We have to see how the economy works to produce the bad distribution. We have to see the flaws and problems and how they play out in the modern world. We have to think of how to adjust (manage) the economy to let people that they get what they earn-and-deserve, to feeling the economy is mostly fair. That way, we might get a self-reinforcing good distribution.

If we forcibly redistributed all wealth so every person in America started with exactly the same wealth, we would not stay that way. We would not get a self-reinforcing good distribution. Very likely, in two generations, we would end up with much the same as we have now but perhaps with other groups on top and other groups below. "Same as it ever was". "Meet the new boss, same as the old boss". Likely,

we would not be able to produce much wealth at all, and we would be eaten by rising China and India. Only if we redistribute wealth in a way that people can accept as half-way fair, address the deep flaws and problems, make education better, and so change how people get income, enough to matter, can we move to a good distribution of wealth that is self-reinforcing. Even then, we will not, and should not, have total equality. We will still have some rich people and some poor people – but not too poor. We can avoid the worst problems of sexism, racism, and other bias. Neither Party is close to being able to think this through and come up with a good plan.

To deal with bad distribution, bad jobs, rising costs, fear, and jealousy, Democrats offer programs of fairly large fairly forced redistribution such as free broad health care and free college for all. Most old Republicans and rich Republicans want none of that because they benefit from today's bad distribution. New Republicans want some redistribution but they fear Democratic schemes because they punished new Republicans in the past and did not benefit new Republicans. Old Republicans are at odds with new Republicans over this issue. So far, the Trump wing has fooled new Republicans into no redistribution, or into bad plans, by using fear and by using promises of a better future under Republican non-plans and bad plans.

Everybody can see that bad distribution is bad and can see that good distribution would be better, but we still don't have good distribution, and things are getting worse. Democrats don't explain why we don't have a good distribution. They don't explain how we got into this bad distribution other than to blame the rich and their political servants. They do not refer to how the economy really works. They do not refer to flaws and problems to show how those are a strong force in making bad distribution. So, Democrats can't explain how we got here and how to get out of it and stay out. They can't explain how to get into a good distribution and stay in. They don't see that, if we forcibly redistributed wealth so all of us started more equal, but still with the basic flaws and problems of the economy, as those flaws and problems play out in the modern world, soon we would be in the same situation. Democrats do not see that it is not a matter of how much total wealth we have, or even how wealth is badly distributed now, but of how the bad distribution of wealth, security, and control is an intrinsic part of the system when the system is not well managed, how it got off on a bad foot, and how flaws and problems now play too big a role. Democrats don't know how to manage well because they don't accept the deep reality of how it works. They simply blame all Republicans and all business. They simply want to take a lot from people who do have and give a lot to people who don't have. The people who don't have wealth like that idea but that idea can't hold up in the long run.

Using the idea of zero-sum and positive sum games helps show how Democrats overlook the conflict, fear, and anger that are inherent in our economy now, and show Democrats ignore that their schemes too often magnify bad feelings and relations. Both Democrats and Republicans promise a positive sum game but Democrats are not clear on how. Republicans say business can give it all to us but they are wrong. The feeling of being in a zero-sum game now reinforces being in a zero-sum game.

Democrats use the resentment of the working class and of marginal groups, mostly non-White and non-Asian, against people who are secure, so that Democrats can gain clients, votes, and power. Democrats

don't seem to see that using this anger validates the idea that we are in a zero-sum game in which what Democratic clients gain must be lost by working and middle class Republicans. If you don't explain well and clearly why some people are below the threshold of security while others are secure, and can't offer to help the worse-off to rise other than by forced large redistribution of wealth, then you must be saying that the people who are already secure got it unfairly and keep it unfairly, and you must be saying that they must fall for other people to rise. Even if you don't intend to say that, you do say that, and that is how people hear "more equality and a better world through redistribution".

To lessen the fears of Republicans, to give Democratic clients hope, and to soften the moral feelings of Democratic clients about taking wealth from others to become secure themselves, Democrats say we are all in a positive sum game, with a lot of wealth, in which we all gain and we all can make it. They say there really is enough wealth for all, and that taking from some to give to others will not reduce the total amount of wealth and will not hurt the people from which we take wealth. Democrats ignore the flaws and problems and ignore how we got into a bad situation to begin with. They ignore the roots of distribution in how the economy works at a deep level. They say, with so much wealth just hanging around, Republicans don't have to fear the rise of any Democratic clients. Republicans can and should help all Democratic clients rise, and then we will all be better off. Democratic clients can accept support with a clean conscience by taking wealth without feeling they are taking anything away from anybody else.

If this were all true in the modern world, then the distribution would not be so bad to begin with, and we would not have to redistribute. If we are in such a good positive sum game, why do we also have a bad distribution that feels like a zero-sum game? How did we get here? Why do we stay here? Why have some Democratic clients fallen below the threshold and why do they stay there so long? Why can't they make it on their own? Why do they need so much help for so long? Why has so much long-term help not totally finally solved the problem by now? Why do people feel like they are in a zero-sum game and why do people feel repressed?

Likely possible answers: (a) Democratic clients have problems with attitudes or abilities, rooted in the culture of their group(s). Helping them without addressing their intrinsic problems will not change anything but will only lead to making them wards of the state, to be paid for by other people who have made it. (b) The economy has intrinsic flaws and problems that lead to social divisions or reinforce social divisions, and can't be overcome simply through more welfare and even more bad education. (c) People on the top have developed a system of control, using the potential in (a) and (b), or they simply developed control regardless of (a) and (b).

This situation does not yield a lot of surplus wealth that can be moved around from haves to the have-nots, resulting in no harm, and helping everyone. Even with much total wealth, in this situation, due to comparative competition, big rising costs, the large wealth needed to make sure your children do not fall, and because of the fear due to already-bad distribution, there is not a lot of "loose" wealth floating around waiting to be moved from haves to have-nots. There is wealth but it is not available in the way Democrats seem to think it is. In this situation, it is not possible to help some clients without hurting

other people, at least in the short run that matters, at least not in our current situation of politics and education.

The facts that (a) some Democratic clients feel much resentment, and (b) the new Republicans fear Democratic clients that want to take their wealth, means (c) the situation already is so bad that simply redistributing wealth will not work. The fact that so many people need Democrats means Democratic schemes alone already cannot work. Democrats will not see this. New Republicans sense this situation but don't know what to do or want to do nothing.

Democratic clients either (a) seem to know their rise requires the fall of some already-successful families and the Democratic clients are fine with making others fall so they can rise; or (b) clients don't care that others have to fall so that they can rise; or (c) clients do not bother to learn about the economy and so don't know whether other people have to fall so their families can rise, and likely don't care. Any of the alternatives is bad. Rhetoric about us all living in a positive sum good game in which we all do well must be seen either as Republican propaganda, and so why do Democrats need it? OR it is Democratic mere propaganda that skips over the reality of economic flaws and economic conflict, of limited wealth due to comparative competition, rising costs, and the need to invest in children, and so the idea serves not to guide the nation but to cover aggression by Democratic clients.

In this situation, families that are already above the threshold have to see Democratic politicians and their clients as a direct threat. Especially families that are not far above the threshold must be afraid of Democratic politicians and their clients. It is sad that this is so but it is so.

It would not have to be so if we were better educated and if we faced economic realities openly, but we have drifted into a situation in which we didn't do that and now we can't. Now we are stuck with nasty comparative competition, big rising costs, expensive children, fear, and anger. Still, doing better is not a pipe dream. It is painful to see we really could have done much better but we are locked in a situation in which we can't do much better. Neither Party is on the right track for getting us to do better.

I still am not sure if Democrats appreciate that costs have risen big and fast not only for the poor but for the working class and middle class, big rising costs play a big role in bad distribution, and big rising costs helped convert our economy from a positive sum to a zero-sum game. I still am not sure if Democrats appreciate how afraid people are in the supposedly secure working class and middle class, how much these people fear their children will not "make it". I still am not sure that Democrats see that the plight is real despite the apparent wealth in America. Unemployment, bad jobs, and big rising costs make the situation precarious despite steady modest pay. I still am not sure if Democrats appreciate that these people see any attempt to take any income away from them as another big rising cost and a direct attack on their security. Maybe because now the Democratic Party is made up of well-off upper middle class people and poor clients, leaders simply don't see the situation of people around the falling point, the situation of the working and middle classes, don't appreciate the role of big rising costs, and don't appreciate that redistribution can't solve the problems.

Democrats seem not to see that, in this situation, promising to help Blacks, Hispanics, and women, must seem like a threat to Whites, Asians, men, and women that are in successful families. When Democrats use anger to recruit particular clients, they do seem to see the implied threat. "You have a right to be angry and your anger will have good results even if the anger of White men produces only bad results". But in other arenas, Democrats seem not to see it, or they see how ugly that tactic is, and they fall back on the positive sum game in which all families magically win through Democratic redistribution. "You have a right to be angry but you don't have to be angry because really America has huge wealth to go around and we can give it you". You can't have it both ways. People in the Party and outside it see that Democrats do try to have it both ways, and nobody wants to ally with leaders who do that. At the least, if you-and-your family does make it to security, and other groups complain, will Democrats then take from you to give to them?

I still do not know if Democrats do see that they seem like a threat to successful families but don't care because that is what they must do to gain clients, or if Democrats really don't see that their (not-very-realistic) promises to the have-nots must come off as threats to most families. This confusion is as much a problem as trying to have it both ways. Again, confusion comes from a lack of vision and it reinforces a lack of vision.

I would love to see a Democratic plan that realistically took into account all the factors mentioned here: unemployment, bad jobs, big rising costs, rising and falling, the threshold, fear, group conflict, a good distribution of income, bad and worsening distribution of income, zero-sum games, positive sum games, the good use of insurance and redistribution, and the limits of redistribution. I would love to see a Democratic plan that took real notice of the flaws and problems of the economy as they play out in the modern world for Americans, a plan that would really help the country. I just have not seen that.

Whenever a Democrat says "In the richest country the world has ever had, I don't know why X group can't get the care that it needs and deserves", "We really can have it all", "Dare to hope", or "Yes we can", that is a sure sign that the Democrat doesn't know how the economy really works, doesn't know if we can afford the help, doesn't know what we have to give up to get it, and has not figured out which group comes before and which comes after in the order of Democratic helping. We might be able to afford giving particular help but we might not. The Democrat might be a wonderful person with a big sincere non-bleeding heart. But he-she doesn't know if we can afford it, has not put this need in the context of all needs, and has not put this need in the context of the whole economy.

Saying "In the richest country in the world..." etc. is also a sure sign the Democrat has not thought out the need and any Democratic program in the context of real human beings and real human behavior. The Democrat does not see the different attitudes of different groups, how they affect programs, how those attitudes persist, and how they might change. The Democrat has not thought out the effects of helping on recipients now and in the future, on other people who are tempted to abuse the program, and on national character. In fact, Democrats do know better but for ideological and selfish reasons Democrats wrongly assume people will always act up to the best ideals and that programs will always

work because people always act up to the best ideals. This attitude is not primarily hope in good human nature but is primarily deliberate lying and a big dose of self-delusion.

“Put up or shut up”. If I say that neither Democrats nor Republicans have a realistic plan for these issues as a cluster of issues, then I should be able to come up with a realistic plan. Of course I can. Everybody who criticizes is sure he-she has a much better plan. I offer suggestions in other writings. It is enough here to make clear that Democrats and Republicans don’t have a good sense of what is going on and don’t offer anything but the same old defeated clichés: “Take from groups to give to another, there is more than enough for all, but, if there isn’t, we will make sure you get yours” and “Business can lead us to heaven, see what it has done for me”.

Make Sense Again.

-Original Liberals wanted individual behavior, social institutions, and society, to make sense. Democrats now are not Liberals in that way. They could only be Liberals in that way if they could offer a coherent and appealing view of “make sense” and of sensible society as a whole; but they can’t. They can’t do so because to do so would mean losing clients that they need.

Original Liberals appealed for change from behavior and institutions that do not make good sense to ones that make better sense. Original Liberals were champions of change to make better sense, not for the sake of change itself and not without thinking of the good and the bad that might come of particular changes. Democrats take on the mantle of champions for sensible change, but really they are not. They want change that benefits their clients and benefits their relations with their clients, not change that always makes greater sense. They promote changes so their clients do better, such as accepting non-standard families and accepting soldiers of non-traditional gender, but Democrats do not promote those changes as making more sense than older forms such as the ideal nuclear family or the straight-man-only army. They promote those particular changes because clients with non-standard families, such as Blacks, and with non-traditional genders, are powerful now. Democrats are not really the enemies of old annoying order or champions of new better order. They are champions of any change that benefits their power relations regardless of new or sensible.

Democrats are content with an old institution even if it does not make sense when the old does not hurt clients, sometimes helps clients, and a change would not help in politicking. Democrats gerrymander when they can. Democrats love the old neighborhood boss, especially in ethnic areas where White upper middle class Party heads can’t go. Democrats support the unrealistic American middle class and working class nuclear family when they wish to lure back the White working class or wish to appeal to successful immigrants. Now that PC is tradition, Democrats protect PC and back up women and Blacks who use PC. Democrats are fine with the anxiety that PC makes. Democrats see reverse discrimination as the new norm and they urge us to live with it.

-If Democrats did accept how taxes and the economy work, they would fight all sales taxes and most tax breaks, yet they do not fight those and often promote them. At least, Democrats should make clear that they know that poor and working class people suffer as a result, but they don't do even that much.

(A) Throw Money; Tax and Spend.

-The sections that are labeled by a letter show how the lack of ideas about human nature, society, the economy, and the attitudes of various groups (subgroup culture), can lead to problems. They show why we needed the critique in the sections above and in the numbered sections below.

-Republicans accuse Democrats of trying to solve every problem simply by throwing money. Instead of making sense, getting to the bottom of issues, accepting human nature, finding practical management solutions of problems based on deep knowledge, Democrats throw money. Throwing money does make some clients happy. To get money, Democrats levy ever-more taxes, especially on the working class and middle class. They "tax and spend", or, really, "spend and tax".

This charge is partly true but not as much as Republicans say. It would take me too far afield to get into details of when true and when merely slander, and to what extent. Although not completely true, the charge is true enough so Democrats should be ashamed and should think why. If Democrats did know the economy and society, and did wish to make sense, this charge could not be brought against them. The facts that Democrats have this tendency, if not as bad as Republicans say, and even if Republicans also throw money, shows Democrats don't know the real economy and real class system. Face the fact that there are some things mere money can't cure.

(Democrats do not usually aim directly to tax the working class and middle classes but their taxes have that effect because Republicans let the upper middle class and the upper class out of paying taxes, even when Democrats try to stop Republicans. Democrats do not usually explain this effect of taxes when they promote their programs.)

Republicans also throw money, tax and spend, aim benefits at clients, and tax Democratic clients to pay for Republican programs; but their schemes are not as visible; and Republicans keep just enough hope for the middle class and upper middle class so people don't see Republican schemes as "throw money" and "tax and spend". For example, in effect, Republican plans for IRAs, 401Ks, tax breaks, and much of the defense budget, are "tax and spend" with the burden falling on the working and middle classes. Republican anti-drug, anti-gambling, and anti-prostitution laws are a huge tax and spend program that does little good but does support business with taxes paid by working and middle classes. Republicans convinced people that Democratic schemes for tax and spend do not yield results worth the effort while Republican schemes do even though that is not true. After decades of social programs and corporate welfare, people are still more likely to see all social programs as a dead loss and yet to see all corporate welfare as a net gain even when that is not true.

A few examples of when Democrats try to throw money can help. The examples are fun and are half-made up but they do show Democratic lack of thinking and Democratic attitude. They show what people fear. They also show that real Democratic thinking is not crazy yet. As you read these scenarios, first get a chuckle, but then think what you would do. Think why Democrats and Republicans don't do that.

For more fun, imagine the Republican opposite action on these issues and similar issues. For example, Republicans would tax so as to hire special teachers to teach their version of Christianity to all school children and hire special teachers to teach Christianity to all adults who are not Christians. They would hire special teachers to teach gun use in grade school. They would waste tax money by putting armed guards in all schools and by making schools into fortresses.

=Far too many American schools are bad. Even when they are not "failure factories" they still produce far too many kids who can't read well enough, can't continue to learn job skills, have bad attitudes, and can't really pass tests. Democrats would make sure every child in every district gets the same funding no matter how poor or rich the parents are and the district is. That is one way to equalize everybody, to do away with class differences. Force people in rich districts to pay extra taxes that are used in poor districts so that the funding at all districts the level of funding in rich districts. Spending more money on children this way would pay for itself because every child would get a good job and every child would eventually pay more taxes.

Spending more money alone would not solve the problem. Some schools produce bad students due to lack of money. Many schools could use more resources. But likely the biggest reason, especially now with computers and the Internet, is bad attitude by parents and the community. Bad attitude can't be fixed with more money. Democrats need to think how it can be fixed.

Even if everybody had a PhD, not everybody could get jobs. People need the right kind of education for their skills, for the job market when they graduate, and for the job market in the future. Spending more on schools does not necessarily produce these skills.

=If any particular school in any district continues to perform poorly, then simply give that school more money and more money and more money until it does perform up to standards.

=Give a free college education to everybody.

=All men are sexist. Re-educate us all. Keep a publicly paid sexism monitor in all workplaces with four or more people. Return to the days of chaperones, but paid with taxes.

=All non-Black people are racist. Re-educate us all. Keep a publicly paid racism monitor in all workplaces with four or more people. Black people are never racist at all in the least.

=All police are prejudiced against all Blacks and mistreat all Blacks all the time in every situation; even Black officers mistreat Blacks. Force all police officers to be re-educated. If needed, arrange for a non-police officer to ride in cars when the police patrol a Black area, even if officers are Black. Support any Black person who wishes to sue any police agency or person. Continue these practices even if no improvements are made in the quality of Black schools, in crime rates in Black communities, or in the general attitude toward crime and the police in Black communities.

=People mistakenly think rich people are rich only because they are talented while poor people are poor only because they are not talented. People don't appreciate socio-economic class, especially how it replicates itself. Pay teachers to teach all children that class is entirely and only a successful plot of rich people to keep themselves rich and to keep the poor down. Make sure teachers teach everyone that rich people use social groups such as Blacks, women, and single parents as tools to make sure that rich people stay rich and powerful. These ideas would be taught in school to children. It is just as important to teach them out of school to adults. For that, we would have to hire special teachers.

=Health care costs are out of control. We should have public health insurance, for everybody, that covers all costs regardless of age or illness.

=Provide everybody with a nice house on half-an-acre of land.

=Raise the minimum wage to \$30 per hour.

=Provide a guaranteed lifetime income.

=Make work. Make jobs. Even if a person has little aptitude, won't develop a skill, and has a bad attitude, make sure he-she has a job. Make sure the jobs pay \$30 per hour.

=Provide people with unemployment compensation (insurance) for as long as they do not find a job, even if they search for thirty years. Provide enough compensation so that a person and his-her small family can live decently continuously.

=Pay Black people reparations for slavery regardless of when their ancestors came to the United States, regardless of whether their ancestors were ever slaves, and regardless of all the Americans who never owned a slave, fought against slavery, came after the time of slavery, or whose ancestors came after the time of slavery.

=Provide free day care for all working parents, including all single parents.

=Provide free cars to all low-income people.

=Provide free cell phones to all low-income people and their children. The children need cell phones so the parents can keep track of them.

=Provide free health care, housing, and catch-up education for all immigrants, legal and illegal. The idea is that immigrants who get a good start like this are more likely to become good tax-paying citizens, and their children are more likely to become good Americans. It is not relevant that this level of support to immigrants gives them more state support than the state gives to the working and middle class people who would pay to support the immigrants.

=Provide a free translation service for all people who do not speak English, the service to be on call for all non-English speakers at almost all times, not only for situations that involve interaction with state agencies such as immigration or the police but for situations such as when talking to teachers or when shopping.

=Provide free breakfast, lunch, and dinner, composed of good healthy food, for all children, to be given at their schools. I, Mike Polioudakis, support this proposal.

=Provide free high-speed broadband cable or satellite connections to every home and apartment. I, Mike Polioudakis, support this proposal as well.

The Republican answer to many of these issues is not individual initiative as Republicans claim but to give tax breaks. Of course, only business firms, upper middle class people, and rich people really get much benefit from tax breaks, and they don't suffer much to begin with, while the poor and working class effectively get no help and they have to pay for the tax breaks; so tax breaks often only make the problems worse. Alternatively, briefly, the Republicans offer no solution and don't care about the issues above as long as they, their children, and people like them, continue to do well.

(B) Over-Regulation.

Labor has always needed protection from bosses and owners. Nature has always needed protection from exploiters. Tenants often need protection from landlords; although, having lived where tenants "trash" places, are bad neighbors, and don't pay their rent, I think landlords and good tenants often need protection from bad tenants more than bad tenants need protection. House buyers need legal protection. Day care centers have to take good care of children. We like our food and drugs safe. We don't like speeding our children to the ER. Nobody wants a housing mortgage scandal, as brought to us by de-regulators beginning with Reagan. Democrats usually were pioneers in rules that protect people and nature, and that make life run more fairly and more smoothly.

People see Democrats as obsessed with regulations, as, for example, when Democrats use regulations to protect a minor endangered species, force auto makers to get 60 miles out of a gallon of gasoline when that result might not be possible, or force airlines to accept all self-declared "comfort" animals so that people can lie and take pets in the cabin. People see Democratic regulations as another version of bad political correctness. People see Republicans as heroic de-regulators who simplify business and life by removing the idiotic clumsy regulations of Democrats. There is some truth to this view but not much.

Mostly it is another case of successful propaganda by Republicans because they know where to go, what to say, and who to say it to, and what all to avoid. A deeper issue is why so many people wish to believe this even when they know it is only half true.

Republicans regulate as much in their own way but people don't see Republican regulations in the same light. Republicans regulate moral issues that they present not as bad arbitrary rules but as rectitude. Republicans are why women could not choose about their own bodies for over a hundred years, and now, likely, again will not be able to choose. Republicans brought us Prohibition and organized crime on a large scale. Republicans brought us silly drug laws and so enabled the largest growth of organized crime since the 1920s. Republicans prohibited gambling and so enabled overall organized crime more even than with booze and drugs. Republicans enforce rules that keep tenants from suing landlords, keep patients from suing doctors, and keep victims from suing the corporations that were careless and greedy. Republicans used to pass no-gun laws for towns. Republicans used to keep counties "dry" and still keep Sundays "dry". Republicans did not allow local governments to give needles to junkies. Republicans did not allow sex education. Republicans did not allow accurate education about science, about scientific results (climate change), and about religions other than Christianity. Republicans used to pass codes about skirt length and how much of which body part could show. Republicans passed laws against any sex but standard missionary sex between a male husband and a female wife. Republicans passed laws against extra-marital sex between all consenting adults regardless of gender and position. Republicans aggressively add laws that exempt their favored religious views from clear general public obligation to pay taxes such as for health care. Democrats are the ones who de-regulated a lot of this.

Exactly who regulates what, and how much good comes from regulating or not regulating, would take a large book to assess correctly and likely the result would not be accepted by most people. So I don't try here. I am annoyed by some regulations from both Parties. I am glad about regulations when I eat food or take a drug and I know it is safe. I wish more things would be regulated such as noisy dirty neighbors, and I don't care which Party passes the rules. Think about which rules you really could live without when you start whining about regulation. Do you really want your neighbor to roar around in his-her quad runner at 2 a.m.? Do you really want your child to drink antifreeze? Do you really want the last wolf and last bear to die out? Does that make you a Democrat? Then why is it that Democrats seem more willing to try to do the decent thing through rules?

Maybe the biggest single case of modern regulation, with the least success, over which people disagree the most, is Affirmative Action in all its manifestations such as allowing minority students into schools for purposes of "diversity" even before better qualified White candidates, and hiring and-or promoting non-White candidates before longer-serving and-or more qualified White candidates. After years of practice and lawsuits, AA has worked primarily to help women but hardly to help Black men or Hispanic men. After seeing AA almost my whole adult life, I think it has not helped and it has done more harm than good. It cannot change the schools and attitudes of non-Whites, at least not enough to help with the problems it is supposed to help with. We gave it a long real honest try, and it failed, except for women. Even with women, AA succeeded mostly with White (including Jewish), East Asian, and South Asian women rather than with Black women. Why? I think the root cause of its failure is not dogged

determined White discrimination against all other groups. We have to look at other factors such as how the economy works and the attitudes of various social groups. We cannot solve the other problems by regulating what happens at the end of a long process with roots in how capitalism works both for good and ill and with roots in the attitudes of social groups. We have to think why Affirmative Action might succeed with women but not with other groups, and we have to work on the problem from that point and from how the economy really works.

Here is a case to think about, it bears on the issue of “tax and spend”, and is more fun: White refined sugar is much closer to a drug than to food. Even when white refined sugar is added to food, it is closer to a drug. Imagine adding alcohol, heroin, or nicotine to foods. I think white sugar is about as addictive as heroin or nicotine (heroin and nicotine are about equally addictive). White refined sugar certainly has as many, and as bad, effects on health as heroin, nicotine, or alcohol. White refined sugar has as many bad effects on society as heroin, nicotine, or alcohol. Only if small amounts of white refined sugar are added to large amounts of many other real food ingredients, as in some cookies, is white refined sugar useful for cooking. White refined sugar in any soft drinks is a disaster. We are a nation of sugar junkies, with all the expected results? What to do?

I would let adults eat and drink what they wish but pay for problems of obesity, diabetes, heart, teeth, and cancer with higher rates of medical insurance; not let children eat and drink what they wish in a public facility such as schools or sports matches; and let parents feed their children what the parents wish but pay for problems of obesity, etc. with higher rates of insurance. I know people can't resist the temptation of sugar delivery systems such as sodas, candy, and chocolate, I certainly know I can't resist chocolate, but I don't think we should try to control that particular widespread addiction with a plethora of laws.

We should evaluate other drugs in the same way that we evaluate refined white sugar.

Republicans won't let people kiss genitals or smoke marijuana but they will let people stuff the mouths of children with white sugar. They rationalize selective permissiveness by asserting freedom of choice but they won't let people choose how they wish to have sex and with whom. The obvious difference is that Republican business can make a lot of money through selling sugar and foods dosed with sugar but less with other drugs and with sex.

Democrats wish to regulate every form of sugar delivery. In particular, they wish to limit the size of soda cups everywhere, the size of bottles and cans for sodas, and allow only water and milk-with-no-added-sugar to be served in schools. I support serving only water, milk, fruit drinks, and vegetable drinks with no added sugar in schools and any at publicly supported event such as a sports match. Would we allow people to sell cocaine, heroin, or alcohol there? I do not support limiting the size of soda cups, bottles, or cans. Maybe we have to tax sugary sodas, candy bars, and ice cream as we do nicotine and alcohol to help pay for the health costs and social costs, and to help control the costs of health insurance. Maybe parents have to teach their children about the dangers of white refined sugar just as about the dangers of cocaine, racism, sexism, voting Democratic, or voting Republican, and parents have to rely on their

good training to support good judgment in their children. Maybe parents have to expose their children to good food, teach their children to enjoy good food, and trust the training. Maybe parents have to expose their children to various tastes of sugar just as they do alcohol so their children are not seduced by getting the forbidden fruit elsewhere.

(C) Level Playing Field versus Forcing an Equal Outcome; Rules as Disguise.

Affirmative Action represents what Republicans correctly accuse Democrats of doing: trying to equalize outcome rather than trying to make the playing field fair, trying to use complaints about fairness to help some groups while hurting others, and using rules to hide what Democrats are really doing. Republicans rightly complain that all the rules don't help and they do make it all more confusing. The result is not an equal outcome but erosion of fair play and its benefits. The result is not equal outcome or fair play but forcing some groups to subsidize others, as when Whites subsidize Blacks or hard-working women subsidize welfare. Democrats use rules to disguise that they are trying to force equal outcome; and to disguise that they force some groups to subsidize others. Democratic rules all sounds good but end badly. Unfortunately, this charge seems too often true of cases such as welfare and education, so this charge undermines all use of rules by Democrats even for good ends such as to protect nature. This situation obscures when we should focus on outcome or focus on level playing field, and it obscures how long we should focus on outcome or focus on level playing field before moving on to something else or before deciding that doing nothing is the best response.

Life is not fair. We can only try to make it fair enough. I recommend the movie "Harrison Bergeron" written by Kurt Vonnegut (original story) and Arthur Crimm, and starring Sean Astin. I recommend the short novel "The Warden" by Anthony Trollope.

No set of rules ever makes an unfair situation absolutely fair. At best, adding rules only makes the first situation closer to fair. Trying to force life to be fair often makes life more unfair and it wastes a lot of resources that could better be spent in other ways to improve life for everybody. In "Skyfall", Daniel Craig as James Bond said it takes more wisdom to know when not to make a shot than when to make a shot, when not to kill than when to kill. Adding more rules to try to make the previous rules fairer only succeeds through one more step at best, and it usually quickly makes the situation a lot worse. It takes much wisdom to figure out which few simple rules to use to make a situation fairer, if that can happen at all. It takes more wisdom to know when not to use rules. It takes even more wisdom to add a few more simple rules to the first rules, or to know that step can't be taken. It takes much courage to stop, without covering up, to face the situation realistically, and maybe to take a different approach.

It takes wisdom to know when interfering to make life more fair is warranted. It takes more wisdom to know when to interfere to make an equal outcome. It takes a lot of wisdom to know how to interfere to make an equal outcome or to make a more level playing field, whichever you decide to do. It takes even more wisdom to know when to stop trying for an equal outcome or stop trying to make the playing field more level. Facing a plethora of rules usually makes applying any wisdom even harder.

Democrats do not seem to appreciate that rules are rarely equal and rarely lead to either equal outcome or to fairer play, not even rules proposed by Democrats or by victimized clients. Democrats seem to think that somehow their rules are fair and their rules affect all people equally even though that is not true. When Republicans and critics point out that Democratic rules are not fair and do not lead to an equal outcome, the Democratic response is to add more rules. The more rules do not make the situation fairer but only make it more confusing and make it easier to make some groups subsidize others. This is why health care bills are routinely several hundred pages long. This is why attempts to help nature are routinely several hundred pages long. This is why business firms can usually weasel out of the rules designed to control them.

For example, when Democrats wish to protect old growth timber, they hear about the people in the timber industry who lost jobs but the Democrats seem not to hear or not to care. If they do hear, their answer is to add more regulations. It might really be worth saving the old growth timber even at the cost of jobs for people now but, if so, Democrats should make that fact of real life clear rather than pretend they can make it fair by adding more provisions.

In some cases, we do and should try to make an outcome equal enough, if not absolutely equal, rather than worry about making the competition fair enough. We want all children to have enough food even when the parents are poor; and we know not every child should be able to eat organic high-priced food. We want all children to have decent medical care even if not all children can go to high-priced hospitals for desperate care for terminal cancer. We want all children to have a decent shot at an education that matches their skill and personality.

This essay is not on the problems of fairness and equal outcome but it is worth noting two points that bear on how Democrats act and on how people see Democrats.

First, unequal outcome does perpetuate itself (class society perpetuates itself, and race, gender, and religious bias perpetuate themselves) regardless of fairness. Rich people stay rich regardless of talent or merit while poor people stay poor regardless of talent or merit. The playing field is not level, and the tilt makes a serious sustained difference in outcome. For a long time, Black people, non-Protestants, and women, really did do worse despite talent and effort. Sadly, rules, no matter how well-intended, and how deeply piled up, don't help much. This result is like sports teams that keep on winning, or keep on losing, despite league rules that try to move to parity. This is like the few symphony orchestras that stay great despite the decline of their cities, at least for a few decades.

At the same time, talent and merit do help some, they do produce some reward. Lack of talent and lack of merit do hurt. Even rich people who lack talent and merit for generations do eventually decline. A bad attitude hurts more than unfairness. We wish that human life worked so that talent and merit, and lack of talent and merit, produced results fast enough, and fairly enough, so that the self-perpetuation of privilege or lack of privilege did not cause so much damage. Human life does not work that well.

The problem is to know when to go after self-perpetuation, when to wait, or when to leave well enough alone. The problem is to know if going after the self-perpetuation actually leads to worse results or to worse unfairness. The problem is to know if we should go after self-perpetuation by trying to make the playing field more level or if we should go after self-perpetuation by forcing a more equal outcome. If we go after the unequal playing field, should we use rules to do it? What rules? How many rules? Will many rules actually make it worse? If we go after the unequal outcome, should we use rules to do it? Would forcibly equalizing all wealth and income now (the Great Republican Nightmare) mean all wealth and income into the far future would depend only on talent, merit, and attitude? Democrats seem not to understand this problem of what to go after and how.

Second, no matter how well-intended, rules are biased and more rules lead to more bias. Sometimes the new bias is better than the original bias but sometimes it is worse.

Rules that one Party touts as fair can really serve to help one group over another, and people figure that out. Trying to equalize outcome often seems merely a disguise to force one group to pay for another group rather than actually to make the outcome fairer.

Because Republicans and their clients quite commonly benefit from a not-level playing field, unequal outcome, and self-perpetuating difference, their stock answer is “do nothing” even while they promote rules that benefit Republicans and their clients.

Republican rules about fees on checking accounts, bank accounts, and credit cards don't serve to make financial services fairer, or serve to help consumers, but serve to give financial institutions a great deal of power and profit. Republican rules that supposedly promote choice really only bewilder consumers, give business firms a big advantage over consumers, and make sure advertisers make a profit. Rules that supposedly help consumers find a better mortgage only helped financial institutions to sell mortgages like internet fake coins, and so helped create the financial crash of 2007.

Because Democratic clients typically lose from self-perpetuating unfairness and bad outcome, their stock answer is “Intervene to force a level playing field and an equal outcome, and do so through rules and more rules. Use the rules to benefit our clients and to make the other guys, the bad guys, pay. Keep this up forever, even if things don't get better.”

On the Democratic side, if Affirmative Action has not worked after decades, then how has it equalized the outcome, made the outcome fair, or made the playing field fair? It enabled reverse discrimination. It shifted resources from the mostly White and Asian working class and middle class to Blacks and other Democratic clients. This objection is not idle and it is not merely a cover for Republican backlash. Democrats do need to consider whether the primary goal is to make the field fairer (absolute fairness is not possible) or to make the outcome equal. They have to consider if either goal is worth the cost. They have to consider how really to go about either goal, what really would work. They have to think if rules on top of rules are the way to go. They have to consider the ultimate effects of rules, if rules help some groups more than others unfairly. They have to consider how much the losers will resent the winners,

and if that social cost is worth any gains in fairness and outcome. They don't do that. They regulate and throw money.

At this point, the logical step is to consider why the playing field remains unfair, how to make it fairer, if making it fairer is enough or if we also have to make the outcome more equal, how to make the result more equal without really making it all unfair, how a forced more equal outcome can eventually make the playing field fairer, and how long to keep it all up before declaring victory or failure. Here is not the place to go into the deeper issue.

Underdogs and Outcastes, Nothing at the Center.

-Democrats are traditional champions of underdogs, including ethnic minorities, immigrants, believers in religions other than Christianity, women, oldsters, and nature. Underdogs look first to the Democratic Party for support regardless of how much of their world view they otherwise share with the Party. It is good that groups feel they can go to Democrats but that good effect does not mean what happens is good overall. Democrats do not choose which cause-or-group to champion by its intrinsic appeal and by how much good it will do for America overall, balanced against the costs of fighting for the cause and of dealing with the issue. They choose by how the group-or-cause fits into the overall Democratic stance and how much benefit fighting for the group gains for the Party. All parties do the same thing including Republicans.

This situation is not always bad. Without it, we would not have had anyone fight for workers, Blacks, gays, women, alternative families, consumers, social freedom, and artistic freedom. Much the same is true of how good books and music get published and promoted. Good art has to succeed in a mass market full mostly of mediocre forgettable work or we don't read the good work or hear the good work. We lose out on some good material (everything I write) because it can't succeed in a mass market but we also get William Faulkner, Star Wars, jazz, the Beatles, Bruce Springsteen, and Nirvana.

On the other hand, being the champion for all underdogs causes problems. First, not all groups have problems simply because they are minorities or underdogs. Problems come from many places. Not all groups with problems are underdogs or even victims. Not all groups are pure victims that need to be un-victimized (saved). Groups add to their own problems. Even if other groups, the economy, or society, is a big part of the problem, often the attitude of the group-in-pain is a big obstacle to making things better. Even if the attitude does not make things much worse in itself, it can channel thinking and block good thinking so that the group in pain does not see the best response. Democratic support actually enables all these forces. Rather than the group figuring out what is wrong, its part in the mess, and what it can do on its own, it takes an attitude of loud mouth victim and expects the Party to cover. I cannot go into specifics here without turning this essay into a fight over attitudes by Blacks, Hispanics, protectors of nature, women, men, etc.

Second, most groups under the Democratic umbrella know they are not fully compatible with at least some other groups under the umbrella. Even if they have no open conflict, they have little in common.

When was the last time Blacks showed up to help nature or labor leaders showed up to help Blacks? Hispanics do not show up at rallies for “Black Lives Matter” and Blacks do not show up at rallies to support Hispanic families or to save nature. Blacks and Hispanics do not give money to United Way but only to their own churches. Blacks and Hispanics fight over jobs and “turf” all the time.

To keep groups together, the Democratic Party cannot craft a strong and unified vision of America and the world, as noted above. The lack of vision allows the Party to invite in anybody but the lack of vision also makes the Party weak. Various groups know that they, and other groups, are with Democrats not because they believe in the Democratic vision but because they need the power and help. Their loyalty is more to their own cause than to anything in common with other groups or with being Democrat, like the alliance of parties in Italy. They do not trust other groups or rely on them. They are happy to ignore other groups or even to take actions that hurt other groups. For example: environmentalists demand strong standards for pollution, standards that lead to fewer jobs especially for unskilled labor; Blacks and Hispanics fight over jobs, “turf”, and drug turf; and women, especially White well-educated women are by far the biggest beneficiaries of Affirmative Action. The lack of a single solid vision might give the Democratic Party some flexibility to adjust to changing conditions but it loses more than it gains. The Democratic Party can never adjust well to new social, political, economic, and cultural realities because it cannot delve deep enough into those realities.

(0) Politics and Views of Human Nature

-Like it or not, even in America, politics is not a game played between individuals; all of whom are fully human; are equal; accept each other as fully equal; accept each other’s human nature as fully equal to their own; and respect each other’s life styles, dignity, decency, and good will. Politics is played by groups. It is part of the group game that each group thinks of itself as the best and as the most near to the ideal human, and thinks of other groups as lesser and as farther away from the ideal human. You might dislike when professional people such as doctors and college professors unconsciously take this attitude toward you but you do it yourself in general. You don’t notice it because you are most often among others that you count as your group. When you interact with people of another category such as a different ethnic group, gender, or profession, you act toward them most often as either somewhat as if you are superior or as if you are an inferior who is not really inferior but has to put up with the role for a while. Even the most die-hard egalitarian “don’t read on me” tough guy American workers, farmers, and ranchers do this.

One political party sees itself as most nearly human while the other party might be human in name but really falls short of what it takes to be fully human, either by oddness of birth or by not cultivating their brains, experience, and moral sense enough.

When seeking a jump in power, one political party picks a group from the other party to demonize as not human and so dangerous that we good people need to take emergency measures now. From the start of his campaign, Donald Trump did this to illegal and some legal immigrants, in particular Hispanics and Muslims (his travel ban was not in the interests of national security but was a symbolic rejection of

all Muslims). Fewer illegal immigrants are drug dealers, sexual slavers, thieves, criminals, and murders than are Americans born here but Trump was able to portray them all that way. Democrats make every business firm equivalent to an oil spill. Jews have been used as a “scapegoat” many times.

By painting one (sub)-group on the other side as evil, this party is able to portray that whole other party as bad, all at one stroke. If the other party can put up with such evil people, defend them, think of them as human, and welcome them, then there is no limit to the stupidity, depravity, and cunning of the other party. They are not better than the worst group among them, and that is really bad.

Usually with less intensity, the same thing happens within parties. In particular, the same thing happens between leaders and followers, core and clients, on several levels. The core group sees itself as fully human and superior while the clients are a little less human and less competent. Of course, none of our clients are nearly as debased as any of their clients or as the other party as a whole; but still, our clients are not as good as we leaders of our party. Clients see themselves as the ones who are really fully human but we “clients” have to put up with the typical haughtiness of leaders until we become the real leaders. Besides, we “clients” gain a lot from the leaders, and, of course, they couldn’t do it without us, so, in a way, we are the real leaders. The relation is like that between: leaders of a work crew and the work crew, a fore-person and the workers in a factory, levels of management in a business firms or government agency, and the people who do things in a church versus the moderately active members and the members who merely show up every week.

Among Republicans, this relation holds between nationally-and-internationally rich and powerful people versus merely nationally-or-locally rich and powerful business people; and between merely-nationally-or-locally rich and powerful business people versus regularly successful local business people and local professional people. The exact relation between Republican groups has been upset by the rise of Trump and his followers, and a chapter on Democrats is not the place to go into the subject.

If you think the point of the numbered sections below is to blame the victim then you deliberately miss the point and likely you make things worse for your own group and the country.

The point is that Democrats need to decide a few things: (A) How much effort do we have to give? (B) How much can the country afford? (C) Where would the effort do the most good? (D) Where could we put the effort and so likely solve a problem nearly once-and-for-all? (E) To which groups do we say “We will give this much to you now and no more?” and to which groups do we say “We can’t help you now but we will try to help later once we get other matters cleared up?” (F) Democrats have to decide which groups to say this to: “You have to change your attitudes and behaviors before we can give you much help. There might be a lot of good people among you but the too-many bad people ruin it for all your group. This is what you have to do.” It would help if Democrats could adopt a bigger better view of human nature and human social nature, one that still holds humans highly and one that helps guide us to improve. Democrats won’t do any of this. As long as they won’t, then they will continue to lose and to spend money without making the country much better.

(1) Unrealistic View of Human Nature.

-Republicans are not supposed to be fully egalitarian, so they get away with accepting inequality without feeling too hypocritical or guilty. Democrats are supposed to be strongly egalitarian. Yet, by nature, human inter-group relations are not egalitarian, not even subgroups within an egalitarian political party. So Democrats face a contradiction “right off the bat” that Republicans avoid, and the contradiction can never go away. How Democrats manage the contradiction says a lot about the Party at particular times. Since the 60s, Democrats have not managed the contradiction well at all.

-If Democrats are supposed to be equal then they all have the same human nature; the human nature that they each learned from living in his-her own distinct social group is effectively the same for practical political purposes; and the combined human nature and learned human nature is automatically enough to make them succeed in modern capitalist plural democracy right away.

What is that nature? Here I say only what is needed. Ideally, people are like the Enlightenment Liberal ideal of a rationally fully autonomous self-determining person who is a good judge of what is best for him-herself, knows how to go about getting those things, knows how to get along with other people so all benefit, and is both compassionate and practical. The ideal Democrat is like the ideal voter, worker, business person, consumer, family person, and thinker (without being an elitist intellectual), all rolled into one. Every Democrat should be like this ideal person. If you have a few individuating quirks, even if the quirks are genuinely odd such as a taste for corn whiskey or pot, for classical music, or non-harmful B&D, that is OK too. In fact, that is even better because it shows you are the proper mix of angel and beast-demon. (The original Enlightenment ideal actually has been changed to a Romantic version of the rational-and-emotional person, and it is that ideal that really prevails, but that much detail is too much detail for here.)

Ideally, all the people in the Democratic core are like this; and people in the Democratic core show in how they present themselves, and in their attitudes toward others, that they think they are like this. Good Democrats even adopt foibles to show they are a little flawed, and so a little human, and so even more like the modern Enlightenment ideal than the merely perfect.

All Democratic clients should be like the ideal too but they cannot. If they were, Republicans could make a good case that they wouldn't be clients. So, what are they like?

They would be like the ideal except for some unfair external situation that deprives them from their full potential as rational Enlightenment beings. They are not less-than-ideal by any fault of their own. The fault always comes from elsewhere. They are beset by hardship and enemies.

If the bad external forces were removed, all Democratic clients would automatically and quickly change to be the Enlightenment ideal. They would not need any special help to change. They would do it on their own because this is what human beings always and naturally seek. If need be, they would change

their group attitudes (culture) so that they could be good Enlightenment people and could participate in good Enlightenment democracy.

Here it helps to get some perspective. Republicans see non-Americans, foreigners, much the same way, as long as they stay in their own country. If we take away tyranny then all foreigners quickly and automatically create American-style democracy with great respect for Christians and Christianity. This is only natural and only human. Within America, well-to-do foreigners, and foreigners who “make it” well and quickly in America, also automatically and quickly adopt American style Republican style democracy and have great respect for Christians and Christianity. Of course, Republicans are wrong. The issues are not whether Democrats and Republicans are wrong but why they are wrong, why they persist in wrong ideas even when they know they are wrong, and what is correct.

Of course, in reality, Democratic clients are not like ideal Enlightenment men. The fact that they are not like this is part of the big contradiction that Democrats have to deal with but cannot admit.

-Assume Democrats cannot officially see their clients or themselves as they really are – I think that is a solid assumption, for which this part of the essay gives evidence. Then what are Democratic clients like, in the eyes of the core, the eyes of other clients, and in their own eyes? The answer depends on which client. Democrats tend to see different clients differently. They see staunch well-educated middle-and-upper middle class feminists, working women, men, Whites, Asians, working class Blacks, professional Blacks, Hispanics (several kinds), educated middle-and-upper middle class environmentalists, science geeks, etc. differently so Democrats can negotiate the proper relation to keep them in the Party. I have to gloss over all this detail here to focus on what is the most prevalent way and, in many regards worst way, to look at clients.

Keep in mind that, at least since the end of World War 2, problems rarely get settled once and for all. Problems keep recurring and dragging on even when laws get passed and it seems as if we are making progress. We are still arguing over the situation of Blacks and women, we are likely to ban abortion again, swastikas are appearing on Jewish temples, more species disappear every day, and fire season in the west is all year. Keep in mind fault always lies elsewhere. Clients would automatically quickly be perfect if the external fault were removed - but it can't be removed.

-One more fact is needed although I cannot justify the fact here. At least since the middle 1970s, many Americans decided that they are entitled, and all Americans who feel left out of what they are entitled to have accepted that anger and resentment are the best response. Even Americans that we would not often see as left-out-with-reason-to-be- angry have adopted this stance such as upper middle class White people, in particular women but including men. Nearly all clients of both Parties feel entitled and left out, so nearly all clients have adopted anger and resentment. The Angry Black and Angry Woman have become clichés. This is a horribly bad way to handle the situation but it is common. Now even people who don't know why they should feel left out still start every day feeling left out, resentful, angry, and bitter. Popular music and cinema since the late 1970s shows how common the stance is now, particularly rap and hip-hop but also “head banger”, “White trash and White supremacist” music,

and even “grunge”. Now it is more common to hear a young woman sing about revenge against an ex-boyfriend as about why she fell in love in the first place or what might be better for her than revenge. This is the attitude that turned Annikin Skywalker into Darth Vader.

-What is a person who feels he-she has deep problems; the problems are caused by others and only by others; the person has no bad attitudes; the person never learned bad attitudes from his-her social group; the problems keep the person from getting what he-she is entitled to; the problems keep the person from having a satisfying life; the person knows deep down in his-her heart that, if only he-she could get a fair shake, for sure he-she would blossom into a deeply satisfying successful person like a cross between the Enlightenment saint and the religious saint of the Religious Right; the person has to turn to politics and parties for help; but that doesn't really help; and the best response is resentment, anger, bitterness, and striking out against the people who might have done this to you or against society as a whole?

Mostly I call that person a victim, often a self-styled victim. Sometimes the person is a mass shooter, goes out to hunt police officers or Spics, or goes out to hunt queers, Blacks, and bitches. Sometimes he-she learns to use PC, the legal system, and claims of discrimination, for self-advantage. If the person is really a victim, he-she is a victim of the culture of victim that blossomed in the United States after the middle 1970s, a victim of his-her own limitations, and a victim of limitations imposed on him-her by his-her own social group. Yes, the greater society does cause injustice. But taking this view of the situation causes more injustice to yourself and the group that was done to you by the greater society.

What develops as the working attitude of people who have to take care of the continuing victims? It is what we see in the Democratic Party. We also see it, in another version, in the Republican Party with their clients but that is another part of this essay.

A big part of the attitude of the core of a political Party is justifying yourself by serving needy people and needy causes. This attitude is good when it really does lead to good relations, good help, and even good change, even when motives are not pure. It is a bad attitude when it is done not primarily to help but primarily to feel good about yourself, to feel justified. Too often, people that want to help do not think out the problems and situations deeply, and instead simply agitate. Agitating can make you feel good but usually it does not help and too often it makes things worse. At the least, it makes things worse by diverting resources away from actions and relations that would help to simply feeling good. Now, the Religious Right, what is left of the Tea Party, and leaders among followers of Donald Trump, have exactly the same attitude of agitating to justify themselves but apply it to different issues.

Even if they are not of the core of the Democratic or Republican Party, leaders and activists among the clients also take the attitude of justifying themselves through activism and agitation. In fact, these are usually the people that we see on the media leading the agitation and “demands”. Upper middle class Democratic Party women rarely are out on the streets but the friends-of-their-daughters-from-school are. Upper middle class White people are rarely on the streets, except during college, but Blacks are. These people rarely think out the issues deeply but rather take their cues from Party and PC ideology

and propaganda. They hurt the people that they wish to help by diverting resources and by misleading them.

Both the attitudes typical of Democratic core and Democratic clients used to be typical of big agencies that did aid work and of the recipients of aid from big agencies. They are like the rich people at the soup kitchens during the Great Depression and the two World Wars. They are like Republicans that work for welfare offices and big charities. Luckily, now, from what I have seen, agencies like Red Cross, missions, Volunteers of America, and nearly all religious-based aid agencies are not like this and have much better sense. Unluckily, the relation between major religious groups and illegal immigrants in the United States does seem lopsided in this bad way.

It is easy to make a self-perpetuating system from the material in this section and this part, and from the material in other parts of this essay, but I would rather not do that in this essay. The logic and argument are fun but they distract from more important matters.

(2) Contradictory High and Low View of Human Nature.

Democrats have an unrealistic view of human nature that is both too high and too low. Democrats think people are capable of too much, of consistent angelic rationality and heroic greatness; yet Democrats treat most people as intellectually and morally and intellectually simple. Ideally, people should be quite rational, capable of big compassion, and able to act effectively. Nobody is like that but people in the Democratic core like to see themselves as close enough.

In theory, clients should become like that ideal, at least when the shackles are removed or at least when smart people in the core explain their oppression to them. But clients don't become like that even when all tyranny is removed, political, economic, and due to discrimination. They often persist in self-hurtful behavior such as violence, sexism, and a bad attitude about schools and education. They often cannot organize well enough to help themselves and to self-govern.

When clients don't become much like the ideal, people in the core start to see them as intellectually and morally simple, even though it is strongly anti-PC to see clients like that. (It is alright for a Democratic to see Republican clients as morally and intellectual simple but not alright to say it in public. Republicans do the same with their clients and with Democratic clients.)

To see a large section of humanity as morally and intellectually simple goes against the basic Democratic assumption of people as like the ideal Enlightenment "rational person mixed with some interesting post-Enlightenment passion". This contradiction is part of what makes seeing clients as intellectually and morally simple so un-PC.

Clients can sense that good Democrats see them like this and clients don't like it. But clients also know they don't live up to the Democratic pseudo-Enlightenment ideal. It is not that they don't live up to the

full ideal, they don't even live up to a lesser workable version of the ideal. And clients know they need support from the Democratic Party. So they put up with being looked down on.

I have seen young women fight against making women into children (infantile-ization) in the general society only to see that people in the Democratic Party, including other women, look at them as simple because young women come to the Party as clients seeking help. Young women get the contradiction, and you can see the conflict on their faces.

One reason Democrats hold this schizoid view is that alternatives are worse for them. If clients cannot see problems deeply and cannot help in their own rescue, if they cannot change, one explanation is that their own group has a mistaken culture and that clients are trapped in a mistake. The attitudes, based in their social group, of women, Blacks, Hispanics, gays, environmentalists, etc. trap them. They can't get out of thinking in the old not-useful ways and so cannot think in new better ways. They fall back on violence, resentment, rebellion, sexism, submitting to sexism, guile, and staying in the closet. They can't change their mentality from the old to the needed new.

In fact, this is so, not fully but enough to cause issues. The attitudes of Democratic clients get in the way of their own quest for their own social justice. Often this is the biggest obstacle. I would rather believe this than secretly believe that clients are morally and intellectual simple and stupid.

But this view is absolutely un-PC and forbidden. I don't here go into all the reasons why this view is not at all acceptable. If you would like to find out, go to a meeting of Lefties and try saying that one reason why Blacks haven't gotten anywhere in 50 years is their own bad attitudes.

Because this alternative is unacceptable, the only fallback is to hold to a view of people that is both too exalted and too low, that is schizoid and contradictory, not realistic, not ultimately useful, and ultimately harmful.

The proper view requires seeing that people learn long-term attitudes as part of social groups, and that some of these attitudes are good while some are bad. Some are good when a group seeks to better its place in modern capitalist democracy. Others are bad no matter how good they might seem to the people in the group and no matter how tied to the group's self-identity at the time such as being highly sensitive to "disrespect". The group has to change its bad attitudes and practices. The group has to foster better attitudes and practices. The group has to do this even if its identity changes. As long as the group does not do this, then it should expect to be second or third rate, expect to be a junior-ized (infantilized) client of the Democratic Party forever, and expect to take on the role of self-made victim forever. As long as Democrats will not look at problems with a correct view of human nature, then they promote the role of self-made victim for their clients, and they prefer that role to having human beings with dignity and decency, and to having groups that promote dignity, decency, and taking a full role in capitalist democracy.

For a while, many women saw that their own attitudes hurt them. It is when, and often only when, women examine their own attitudes and ideas; place their attitudes and ideas in the context of human nature, society, and culture; change their attitudes and ideas; organize on the basis of well-considered ideas; and strive hard on the basis of well-considered ideas; that they make real progress. When they do, they can get through to men the most and help men the most. Sadly, this thinking got taken over by various dogmas and propagandas, and eventually discredited. Eventually most women too fell back on the dogma that it was all the fault of various enemies, usually men, and that they should get help from political Parties to attack enemies. Women have gained as much social justice as any Democratic clients so maybe attacking enemies helped. But the situation of women did not change as much as it should, and things drag on, so maybe resentment is not the best plan. After fifty years, at 75% of what men get for comparable work, women are doing better than the original 65% but that still leaves 25% to go. And soon an abortion will be hard to get. I see some revival of good thinking in women born after about 1990 but the thinking is done informally and done despite dogma and propaganda rather than with the help of good doctrine. Many modern women political candidates seem to think well. Feminism did a lot of good but formal feminism also did some harm.

(3) Equal under the Law, yet Different, and Not Necessarily Successful

The problem in this section besets democracy. Do you let people into your group, and-or help people, who do not share your democratic values, are not likely to share your democratic values, and might harm your values and your group? If you are in a liberal democracy and you don't let them in, you seem to contradict your own values of inclusiveness and of equality under the law. If you do let them in, then you put at risk other groups that need some of the limited help that is available, and you put at risk not only your group but the chance of carrying superior values into the future. Where do you draw the line and why?

The most common solution seems to be (a) to exclude really bad groups but (b) to allow in groups that are not too bad, (b1) to allow in most groups that are merely ignorant of better values and practices, and (b2) to hope the ignorant groups get better. America allows immigrants even from non-democratic nations hoping they learn American values. By and large, this approach has worked in the past and continues to work now. By and large, immigrants have learned democratic values even if they have not become just like the English of 1750 or the original Americans of 1789.

We do exclude some groups either by denying members entry or by putting members that act up into prison when they act up. We denied avowed Communists entry into the US for a long time. We put into prison people who incite to overthrow the Constitution by violent means or who actually try such as old Communists along with new White supremacist rebels such as Timothy McVey.

This solution is not perfect, and ideas of who to exclude or include change. We now would exclude and imprison dangerous radicals such as George Washington, Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, and James Madison. We allow in people who seem violently anti-woman, to me, as from east Africa. Many Americans want to exclude all Muslims due to the wrong idea that most Muslims wish to impose

Muslim Law on America – a minority of Muslims do who see it as the duty of all Muslims everywhere to try to convert the people wherever they live to strict Islam, as do some Christians. Should we allow in people who really don't care about nature and the planet, or who deny the validity of science? Right Wing people used to disdain all Roman Catholics and Rightists tried to stop their immigration to America but now Roman Catholics are the darlings of the anti-abortion (pro-life) movement. Of course, Roman Catholics do also favor unrestricted immigration of Hispanic Roman Catholics while now most Rightists do not.

What about groups that don't merge well and aren't really democratic in the Western sense but that still do take care of themselves and don't cause trouble? One such group is the Amish. Americans and most Western nations have tended to accept them and leave them alone. I used to buy meat, vegetables, and fruit from the Amish.

What about groups that don't merge well, don't really want to overthrow the nation, do want to reap the benefits from what the nation has built, but often do need continuing help such welfare, and do cause trouble sometimes? They take more than they give, and what they don't give – good values – is more important than anything they do give. This is how the French see most immigrants, in particular Muslims from North Africa. This is how many British and Germans now see immigrants even when some immigrants do well in school and financially, such as South Indians in England and Turks in Germany. What happens with these people is a test of how democracy, plurality, and inclusion work. Democracy, plurality, and inclusion don't necessarily fail just because the greater state gives up on these groups or because these groups are restricted from further immigration. It might be necessary to give up on them and-or to restrict them so that the greater whole keeps going properly.

What about groups that have been in a country a long time, don't assimilate well, do require help, and-or do cause trouble? The question of immigration does not come up because they are already here, although more of them in other countries might be restricted from coming to this country. This is how the French see their Muslim residents who came from North Africa after about 1950. This is how some non-Black Americans see Black Americans. It is how some Americans think of Muslims who do not do well such as some from North or West Africa. It is how some "Conservative" Americans see "uppity" women, LGBTQ (gay) people, and Hispanics. Again, what Americans do with these people will measure how well democracy works. Again, not to continue to support them and not to pretend that eventually they will do well is not necessarily the end of democracy. Not including revolutionary Communists and violent White supremacists was not the end of democracy.

-These issues get mixed up with the ideas of equality under the law, rights, and inclusion. In particular, Democrats tend to mix the ideas, so I need to go through the issues in those terms.

In theory, Democrats both respect rule of law and Democrats embrace differences between individual people and between groups. They promote equality, difference, and inclusion. In practice, Democrats confuse equality under the law with absolute sameness of people and groups; confuse differences between people and groups with opportunities to assert privilege through the law; and overlook (deny)

that any differences between groups affect how groups participate in democracy at the same time that they say differences between groups require additional care for some groups and additional burdens for others. They say all groups differ yet no difference causes any problems, and all differences ultimately make all things better. Democrats want to have it both ways, to have their cake and eat it too. They say all this because it lets them recruit clients widely and because not to say this, to say something better, would require them to think through problems and require them to be clear about their values and priorities. It would require them to finish some programs.

(4) Examples.

Even if true, generalities alone don't help much. So I need examples. I might as well use the examples that are most likely to get me in trouble, and get it over with. I allude to these examples and similar examples throughout the essay.

Overall, I support people with problems. I know the problems of women about as much as an old man can who has never had any children. I came from the insecure lower working class and I am still in it. I worked for Civil Rights in the 1960s, and still see the plight of Black Americans, but now I disagree with their basic attitude, stance, tactics, racism, and deliberate blindness. My parents were immigrants and my wife is an immigrant. My wife and I fought two long battles to get her into the United States. She is now a citizen. I don't like that people can simply walk across the border, have a baby, and so get easily what took us years of fighting. We resent paying taxes to support people who pissed away their chances in school, and had babies before they had any hope of supporting their babies. We resent paying taxes so business firms don't. At my wife's work, Blacks discriminated against my wife, and a Black woman broke my wife's arm in a physical attack – so we know all kinds of racism are real. I think the media has a slight Lefty bias (not nearly as much as Righties say) so I use the media to show a view similar enough to Democrats. I hope to put on my website comments on some events such as when Trump separated un-documented (illegal) immigrant parents from children. The comments also help clarify generalities.

(4 A) Welfare, Social Security Disability, and Other Support Programs

I return to this case so often as to be annoying. Sorry. Most recipients would rather have a good job than get welfare. But enough people get support so that support programs balloon to many times the projected size, and cost far more than they should. Enough people would rather have support than a job so that they cause serious strain on budgets and economy. People have children before they are ready to support the children. They get the state to act as substitute parents or grandparents. While these people might wish for a job, they can't get a good job, often can't train for a good job, and so learn to live on the system. They also cause too much strain.

The Democratic response shows their refusal to face human nature. There are no cheaters, or, if there are, there are so few that we don't have to worry about it. All the people on welfare are victims. They are victims of the Republican-White business system. They can't find a job because business people make sure there is a big class of people without jobs, or with only poor jobs, so that all working people

feel insecure, and so that business people can control working people. With enough help, all people on welfare etc. will find jobs and get off the welfare system. They deserve enough help so that they live at least as well as many people who already have jobs.

The Republican response is that there are enough good jobs, even for stupid people, so everybody can get a job if he-she wishes. Look at the official job statistics during boom times when the state says with pride that the effective rate of real unemployment is zero.

(4 B) Harvey Weinstein and Various Women in Various Situations.

I much admire and strongly support “Me Too”, and I say good things about it later. What I say should support, not hurt, but many people will take my words as attack. I wrote while Harvey Weinstein was under indictment but had not yet been found guilty of anything.

(1) If Weinstein physically coerced any woman or girl, Weinstein committed a crime. (2) If Weinstein solicited sex from any woman or girl who might not have been able to decide, Weinstein committed a crime, legally or morally. Vulnerable people are (2a) too young, (2b) legally old enough but still not able to decide for various mental reasons, and (2c) drunk on alcohol or a drug. (3a) If Weinstein coerced any woman or girl who depended on work from him for getting along, for herself, her family, or dependents, then he is guilty of a crime and should be held accountable. (3b) He is especially guilty if he knew that the woman needed help, and he used that information to coerce her. (3c) Even if Weinstein did not know the details about any particular woman or girl beforehand, he did know that the women or girls that he badgered for sex were potentially vulnerable, and Weinstein should have found out before urging sex. As a person in power, he has a duty to know the vulnerabilities of people beneath him and not to abuse the vulnerabilities of people beneath him. If the woman needed the work for herself or others, even if she said she agreed to sex with Weinstein, Weinstein should not have pressured her into sex. He is still guilty.

(4) What about a woman who (4a) could make up her own mind, (4b) did not absolutely need the work to live or to support dependents, (4c) wanted to work in show business and in no other field, and (4d) knew the only way to get work in show business from Weinstein was to give him sex? In that case, if she agreed to sex with Weinstein, then Weinstein is not guilty. She consented. Weinstein is disgusting and immoral but he is not guilty of a crime. The woman has to make up her own mind.

(5) If, under the conditions of (4), Weinstein promised work in exchange for sex, got the sex, but did not give the promised work, then he is guilty of fraud but not of a sex crime.

(6) If a woman or girl wishes for work in show business, (6a) knows she might get it through Weinstein only in exchange for sex, but (6b) might also get it through another person who does not wish for sex in exchange, but (6c) has less chance of getting work through another person, (6d) then she has to make up her own mind. (6e) Under these conditions, if she agreed to sex with Weinstein, then she consented and he is not guilty.

Shortly after Weinstein was indicted, apparently his lawyer said what Weinstein did was despicable and immoral but not illegal. All women from whom Weinstein got sex consented. Weinstein did not solicit sex from any woman who could not make up her own mind or who was "in a bind". I disagree about all the complaints against Weinstein falling under this principle, I strongly suspect he did coerce, but I do understand the idea.

(*) A lot of people, including a lot of young women, wish for careers in show business but don't need careers in show business, especially if the price is too high. If they can't find a career in show business, they can go back to school or can learn other skills. Being young and really wanting a career in show business, even if all you have ever done is act or sing, is not the same as having no choice. It is not as bad as growing up in coal country and never learning anything else. If the conditions for getting a job in show business are too tough or too disgusting, then, even if you love show business, you might have to find another way to make a living. A lot of young mathematicians and musicians face a similar choice although usually they don't have to give sex to get a job. If you really want a career in show business, are in a position to freely make up your own mind, but the only way you can get into show business is through people like Weinstein, then you have to make up your own mind.

The Weinstein case is not like the case of Bill Cosby. Cosby clearly was guilty of coercion.

On the one hand, Weinstein's lawyer seems to be arguing that all the women that Weinstein had sex with are as described in the paragraph marked with a star. That is almost certainly wrong.

On the other hand, the typical Democratic stance is that all the women were coerced even if they could make up their own mind, were old enough, did not have dependents that absolutely needed support, were not intoxicated, could have sought a producer other than Weinstein, or could have given up show business. Women are victims. All women are victims all the time. All women are incapable of saying no or making up their own minds. No woman can make up her own mind or act for herself. All women have to be cared for by somebody in power such as a man or a state attorney.

Usually Democrats try to have it both ways by saying women are full adults just like men with all the abilities of men and so should have all the rights and status of men BUT also women are especially vulnerable, need to be taken care of, other women can do some of the caring, yet ultimately it must be men in power who do the caring because women are not fully able to fight men. Democrats try to have it both ways. Republicans do the same thing but in arenas other than show business.

Neither position is acceptable.

Some women, like some people regardless of sex or gender, are vulnerable. We have to make sure bad people don't prey on them. We have to punish bad people who do prey on them. We have to protect vulnerable people because they are vulnerable, not because they are women. Women are vulnerable in

ways that men usually are not (I overlook homosexual coercion of men), and we have to take that into account, but doing so widens ideas of vulnerable people; it does not make all women always needy.

Not all women are vulnerable all the time. At some point, we have to see that women can-and- should make up their own minds and take responsibility for their acts. Not to accept this view of women is to rob women of their humanity, of their status as sentient moral beings.

Some of the women that Weinstein preyed on were able to say “yes” or “no” and effectively said “yes”. Not all the women could effectively make a good decision. It seems that many women said “no” either explicitly or implicitly, and Weinstein went ahead anyway. That is wrong. The authorities have to sort out which women were in which camp.

Democrats tend to see all people with a complaint as victims. They tend to think all those people, all victims, should have special status and be able to assert special privilege under law. That is wrong. The Democratic attitude might be well-motivated but, in fact, it causes damage. It invites people to take the posture of victim, and eventually to internalize that way of life, so as to get help and keep help.

While most Democrats and many women will be angry at me on reading this, some women will see the point. I think the strongest feminists that I have met will be most likely to see the point although they might not press the point in public.

To think women cannot make up their mind, even when faced with Harvey Weinstein and a strong need to be a star, treats women the same way that the silliest Republicans treat women. It results in passing women from one protector to another, necessarily one man to another. That is even worse than Harvey Weinstein.

At the same time that I urged us to treat women as adults, I accepted some situations in which people pay for limited success with sex, I said that people including women can make up their own minds even in those situations, and I urged us to allow them to make up their own minds even there. The use of sex as currency is part of the real world but not a part that we like. We don't have to put up with it if we can change it. Ideally, only in the open sex trade, and only as done by fully adult autonomous consenting people, should sex be part of a deal. Suppose people widely accept that subordinates, male or female or any gender, had to have sex with their superiors, male or female or any gender, to succeed in school, academia, the grocery business, or the police force, or to go to heaven. That is not acceptable. It should not be acceptable in show business or real estate or banking. While we allow people to act as adults in their chosen arenas, we should work hard to make all arenas as free of coercion as we can. I think, and hope, that bigger goal is part of the “Me Too” movement - although I think women should focus on their situations of sexual coercion for now. We will not succeed in making arenas fully free of coercion but it is worth the effort. That is part of being an adult sentient-moral being, a human person, too. I think Democrats hold this ideal but do not act on it consistently. I think Republicans see this ideal but apply it only where their own daughters might be at risk.

(4 C) Trayvon Martin and George Zimmerman

Look up the case on the Net. Wikipedia has useful articles on the shooting and on Trayvon Martin.

George Zimmerman was a resident in an apartment complex in Florida. He was in the watch group for the complex. Sometimes he carried a pistol. I don't know if he habitually carried a pistol. I do not write about Zimmerman's ethnic background or other background other than to say he is not Black by the usual American socio-cultural typing.

Trayvon Martin was a young Black man, seventeen years old, living in Florida. Sometimes he visited kin in the apartment complex. He did not live in the complex. He had not been there often before.

On 26 February 2012, Martin was walking through the complex. Zimmerman saw him, did not know him as a resident or as linked to any residents, was suspicious, and called the police. The police said to do nothing, not to follow Martin, and to wait for them. I don't know how long before the police arrived. Times are given on the Internet. Zimmerman followed Martin. Martin noticed. The men confronted each other. It is not clear who started what. The men fought. Martin had Zimmerman on his back on the ground, hitting Zimmerman. Martin hit Zimmerman's head on the ground at least once, wounding Zimmerman. Zimmerman pulled his pistol and shot Martin. Martin died.

In his trial, Zimmerman pled self-defense. He was acquitted of murdering Martin.

It is not clear if Zimmerman suspected Martin because Martin was a young Black man and for no other important reason. Martin was wearing a "hoody" style sweatshirt or jacket. It is not clear if Zimmerman suspected Martin because Martin wore a hoody, and was young, Black, and male. It is not clear if Zimmerman engaged in what is known as "racial profiling".

The pictures of Trayvon Martin that appeared in the media after the shooting show him as he was about the age of 14. They do not show him at the time of the incident. He was bigger and looked more like a young man than a boy. "Bigger and older" do not mean "criminal" or "more criminal". The 14 year old boy might not have been a threat to Zimmerman but the 17 year old man likely was.

I focus on reaction to the event, how reaction is biased, and how the bias hurts people.

Black people, in particular young men, are often suspected of "being up to no good" or engaged in crime even when they act in normal ways that would not usually bring suspicion on White or Asian people. People associate the clothes that Black people wear with "hoodlums" ("hoody" refers to an attached hood, like on the cloak of "Little Red Hiding Hood", and not to "hoodlum"). Even old Black people feel this way about young Black people. Young Black people deliberately dress like stereotypical "gangstas from da hood", and mimic stereotypical "tough guy" behavior. As often, Hispanic people are looked at the same way but that attitude toward Hispanics has not gotten as much attention as the attitude toward Blacks. Black people resent the stereotype and resist it despite dressing and acting it. Black

people complain, likely correctly, that non-Blacks would look down on them even if Black people dressed like straight White kids from the 1950s (“Leave It to Beaver”); so Black people might as well dress and act in ways that are fun. Sometimes young Black people resist the stereotype vigorously with verbal assault. Sometimes they resist with physical assault but that only confirms the stereotype. For here, assume Martin got angry through resentment against the stereotype and against for what Martin thought Zimmerman did in accord with the stereotype.

If you wish to know how young Blacks feel, visit a country where Americans are followed by the police, security agents, gangsters, beggars, hustlers, pimps, and bar girls (or boys). Following doesn’t have to be intrusive all the time but it does have to be intrusive sometimes. It has to be there always except in safe American enclaves. Learn how Americans learn to act in those situations. Think what you would do. Think what would be the most useful way to act. Pretend you could never leave. This feeling is like how parents feel when they are really tired from their job and the world, yet all that their children can do is give them trouble all day long.

Most Democrats, and most Black people, automatically assume: Zimmerman represents all non-Blacks, especially all Whites, “except good-hearted non-racist Democrats like me and people similar to me”; Zimmerman’s attitude and actions represents the attitude and actions of all non-Blacks, especially Whites, toward all Blacks; Zimmerman was entirely at fault; Zimmerman acted entirely out of profiling; Zimmerman had no good motive; Zimmerman trying to protect the complex was only and entirely a cover for racism and bad racist acts; the stereotypes about young Black people have no basis in fact; Zimmerman cannot tell the difference between stereotype and fact; Zimmerman cannot tell the difference between a Black person with bad intent versus any Black person, so he assumes all Black people always have bad intent; Zimmerman was out to exert the authority of a non-Black over a Black, that is, to show that all non-Blacks dominate all Blacks; by not doing as the police said and by following Martin, Zimmerman showed he had bad intent; thus everything that happened did so as a result of Zimmerman’s bad intent, and for no other reason; all of it is Zimmerman’s fault regardless of what Martin did, even if Martin started the fight; Martin was entirely not at fault (innocent of all bad intent and all bad acts); Martin did nothing to raise suspicion; Martin did not help start the fight; Martin was not harming Zimmerman even when Martin was sitting on top of Zimmerman hitting him, and even when Martin slammed Zimmerman’s head on the ground; Zimmerman was not in danger; Zimmerman was not in danger of his life; Zimmerman had no reason to think he was in any danger; Zimmerman had no right to carry a pistol even if Blacks have a right to carry a pistol; Zimmerman was entirely wrong to shoot Martin; and Zimmerman was entirely wrong to shoot Martin even to defend his life.

Most Democrats, and most Black people, automatically assume that the following factors are by far the most important in Black life and they entirely determine the place of Blacks in American society: The constant suspicion that Whites and Asians have of Blacks; the constant bad attitude that Whites and Asians have toward Blacks; the constant bad acts that Whites and Asians perform against Blacks such as following, harassing, “stop and frisk”; and the badly unequal treatment in the justice system. Nothing else is worse or comes close. Race discrimination is the overriding factor in Black life and should take all of Black attention. Blacks should focus their energy against the bad racial attitudes of others.

Any Black “fighting back”, including violence, is entirely justified, and violence in fighting back is never any fault of Blacks.

I take Martin to represent to Blacks the situation of Blacks and their feelings. Zimmerman represents all the bad non-Black forces in Black life. Zimmerman represents the idea that all non-Blacks ruin it for all Blacks, and only non-Blacks ruin it for Blacks. Martin represents the idea that Blacks would be just fine if others did not discriminate against Blacks. Blacks have total right to resist in any way they can as hard as they can.

Although Martin and Zimmerman represent these ideas, that does not mean these ideas are true. I do not think these ideas are fully true. How they are false does much damage to Blacks, and much of the harm is self-inflicted by Blacks on themselves.

Democrats publicly take the Black view without considering how much is true or false, and what good and harm come of the Black view. Democrats take the Black view without considering weighing it because Democrats wish to keep Blacks as clients. Democrats might agree or disagree but that is not what is important. Even Democrats and Blacks who might see some fault in what Martin did still insist that Zimmerman is by far the most at fault, and so they imply that non-Blacks are by far the most at fault always.

As mentioned, as far as I can recall, most media showed only the picture of Martin aged 14. To me, that display shows a bias along the lines of the Black view and Democratic view.

As far as I can tell, in the Black and Democratic view, the following factors are not nearly as important as racial discrimination against Blacks, and Blacks don't have to worry about them until Blacks can make White and Asian people act better toward Blacks. The following factors arise entirely from bias against Blacks, and would not harm Blacks if there was no racial bias: The bad performance of Black children in school; poor attitude of parents and children about school; the poor preparation that Blacks have for school; teen pregnancy and motherhood; the huge prevalence of single mothers, especially of single mothers with children by multiple men; Black crime; especially Black-on-Black crime; the tendency of young Blacks, especially men, men to feel always disrespected and lose their temper; the prevalence of violence as a response to many situations. “It is all their fault. None is our fault. What we do is always an expression of our culture and good, including the “gangsta” attitude and acts, and the “moll” attitude and acts. Other people have to change, fast. We don't have to change at all. They can change even if we have flaws and even if we don't change. Even if we did change, they would still act badly toward us, badly enough so that our change would not matter.” “Because other people are so bad and we can't make it on our own honest efforts, we have the right to use laws and rules that were supposed to stop racism so as to favor us. We have the right to stress rights over responsibilities. In fact, we have few responsibilities to all those racists. We have the right to use reverse discrimination and PC to move Black people ahead. We have the right to use White guilt to advance Blacks. We have the right to make

White people feel guilty and uncomfortable so as to promote Black causes. Our racist use of anti-racist rules and laws is not racist.”

Republicans assume the opposite of the Black and Democratic view. Zimmerman was entirely correct. Bias played no part in Zimmerman’s attitudes or acts. Martin was entirely wrong and Martin represents all Blacks who are always entirely wrong. Bias played a huge role in Martin’s attitude and acts. Blacks act badly a lot of the time, and we have to be ready. Martin over-reacted. Zimmerman had to protect himself just as all non-Blacks have to protect themselves. Zimmerman represents what happens due to bad reverse discrimination in favor of Blacks and against non-Blacks. Zimmerman is what happens when a decent person acts entirely within his-her rights to defend his-her “hood” and home against people that he-she has a right to suspect, and who are statistically factually proven worthy of suspicion and of fear. When so many people in a group are proven to do bad, a rational person must suspect all of them and must be prepared. Blacks should change. If Blacks changed, then all non-Blacks could and would automatically act better toward them. If they won’t change, then non-Blacks can’t act any differently toward them. They have to change first. The law should be hugely on the side of non-Blacks in these cases. The Republican view can get stronger but I don’t lay that out here.

Many people in cities also assume that the stereotypical Black-Democratic view is not correct. They do not take the Republican view but they do take another view. These people include many Blacks in cities, along with people of all colors who have faced crime (as victim, witness, nearby resident, kin of victim, or friend of victim). To be safe in a dangerous place, you have to suspect some people and you have to keep a guard. Sometimes you need to act. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

It would take a book in itself to sort this out, and I’m sure books have been written.

Neither man acted well. I do not here assign how much blame to whom in this particular case. Neither the pure Black-Democratic view nor the pure White-Republican view can be correct. This is what Zimmerman and Martin represent to me. They show that we can and should do better in what we understand and how we act. They show that both sides have faults and have to address their faults. The faults within a side might be more important than the faults of the other side. They show that neither side wishes to address its faults.

Readers should know that I (Mike) consider Black problems with attitude, education, having children young, single mothers, crime, violence, etc. more important than non-Black attitudes-and-acts toward Blacks even though the attitudes-and-acts of non-Blacks are a significant hardship. The bad attitudes-and-acts of Blacks are more important even than the unfairness of the justice system. I do not deny the problems due to racism but Blacks have to work around them and can work around them. The current attitudes-and-acts of Blacks hurt Blacks more than help them. In particular, the idea that the problems in the Black community can be put aside in favor of blaming Whites, the idea that Blacks can ignore their internal issues, taking “gangstas” as role models, stressing “rights”, the use of PC to favor Blacks, and the use of anti-racist laws as reverse discrimination, all hurt Blacks far more than the attitudes-and-acts of non-Blacks.

It is extremely unlikely that Blacks can get non-Blacks not to act racist as long as Black people persist in bad attitudes and bad acts. Yes, non-Black people would persist in racism even if all Blacks behaved like stereotypical angels. Yes, a lot of work would remain after Blacks “cleaned up their own act first”. Yes, it is hard not to act on anger and resentment when you can see racism against you and against Black children. Yes, the Black “gangsta” stereotype can “get you off”. Yes, using reverse discrimination and using White guilt feels good and does get you some of what you deserve. But none of that is a reason to persist in bad attitudes and acts, attitudes and acts that hurt you and your people much more than help. You should not let Black schools and Black families produce bad Black minds and characters just because non-Blacks are still racist. Just as non-Blacks should not expect Blacks to act like angels before they stop their own racism, Blacks should not expect non-Blacks to act like angels before they stop their racism and before the act to help Black children and the Black community. It might be easier to act non-racist if you first saw, accepted, and dealt with the racism in yourself, as you ask other to see it in themselves. In the long run, Blacks have to do it for themselves and this is the only way they can do it for themselves. If you think my opinion disqualifies me, so be it, but you are wrong. I do not take the Republican view, and I dislike that view. I do not take Zimmerman as a good symbol.

From the 1950s onwards, Whites and other non-Blacks have had to examine their attitudes carefully. Many Whites and other non-Blacks changed for the better. The job is not done but a good start has been made. The change helped many Black children in their quest for better lives. Many Black lives really are better now than they would have been otherwise. I do not see this sort of self-examination widespread among Blacks, and so I do not see much of their needed changes.

Zimmerman was not completely wrong to suspect Martin. Still, Zimmerman should have followed the advice of the police. Not to follow the advice of the police was wrong. That does not mean Zimmerman was entirely at fault for all that happened.

Zimmerman had not been involved in many fights before. It is unlikely that Zimmerman alone started the fight. Probably both men were at fault for allowing a fight to start.

It is unlikely Zimmerman could have run away from Martin fast enough if Martin were determined to pursue him. In my experience, pursuit usually lasts only a few yards, and so it is possible Zimmerman could have run away far enough even if Martin began the fight and even if Zimmerman could not have beaten Martin in a long race. Running away is a good strategy. This idea does not mean either man was entirely at fault or entirely correct. It means there were better options that likely were not taken.

Still, both men were wrong to fight. Suspicion of Martin does not excuse Zimmerman if Zimmerman accosted Martin. Racial profiling, anger, bitterness, and defending your race do not excuse Martin if Martin accosted Zimmerman.

Martin was wrong to pound Zimmerman’s head on the ground. That endangered Zimmerman’s life.

When having your head pounded on the ground, it is reasonable to conclude that your life is in danger. It is reasonable to use a pistol to defend yourself. Zimmerman could have avoided the incident, but, once the incident got to that point, Zimmerman did what he had to do, and did what many Black people would have done if a White or Hispanic man were pounding their heads on the ground and they had a pistol.

If you had a pistol, and you saw a large man of any color pounding the head of your child on the ground, even if your child was large, even if for some reason the man was right and your child was wrong, you would pull the pistol and shoot the man. If you were Black, and you saw a large White man pound the head of your child on the ground, even if for some reason the White man was right and your child was wrong, you would pull your pistol and shoot the man. Make color and gender substitutions until you see-and-fully-appreciate the intersection of human nature, right, and wrong.

Even if Martin was angry at being profiled, and his anger is justified in some idealized view, his reaction was not useful. That kind of anger does little good. It is entirely human to be angry especially when you are being wronged. It is entirely human to shove somebody that you think is belittling you (“dissing”). But that kind of response is not useful. Most Whites, Asians, and Hispanics do not go that way. I do not guess which group is provoked more. It adds to the heavy load already weighing on Blacks to say they must be rational and show restraint when unfairly profiled and followed, but, even with the added burden, it is hard to see how any other response will do much good. Usually anger does a lot of harm, much more harm than good, even when it is somewhat justified.

Automatically entirely blaming the non-Black side and entirely exonerating all Blacks does no good. That view enables anger that is too quick, anger that is too much, and that view enables hyper-sensitivity to being “dissed”. It is bad reverse discrimination.

Automatically entirely blaming Blacks and entirely exonerating all non-Blacks does no good.

Work out for yourself what likely happened in the case. See both sides. Work out why putting blame entirely on one race or the other is not helpful and quite harmful. Think about what you would do if you were Black or non-Black. Think how you wish your political party to respond and why it didn’t respond that way.

Profiling and following are unfair – even if sometimes they do make sense as a defense tactic by a group that feels fear. What should you do if profiled? What should you do if unfairly followed? What would be the best response for your group and for society too? How do you address underlying bad acts and attitudes by both sides that lead to profiling and following?

I have seen Black streets in Black neighborhoods in which the residents took great pride in their houses, schools, and churches. On those streets, Black residents are as suspicious of stereotypical young Black people just as Whites, Asians, and other non-Blacks are suspicious. They react toward outsiders, even Black outsiders, about as do Whites, Asians, and other non-Blacks act towards Black people dressed as

pseudo-“gangstas” and who act superficially like “gangstas”. If you wish to keep up the quality of your area, what is the proper response toward people who threaten it with acts or attitudes? Is this racism or is it rational? How do you draw the line? Are Blacks in good neighborhoods racists against Blacks? I doubt it.

Again: The media make matters worse by showing pictures of Trayvon Martin only when he is 14 years old. To do that makes Martin, and all Blacks, like permanent children and never like adults. It is a form of lying and patronizing. Imagine if the media showed only pictures of George Zimmerman when he was 14 years old.

Why do Democrats consistently see only one side? Wouldn't it help more if Democrats told the whole truth, no matter how painful?

(4 D) Black Crime; Black-on-Black Violence; Police Violence against Blacks

Young Blacks have become more open against racial profiling, against acts that come from profiling such as calling the police on innocent Black people and the police practice of “stop and frisk”, against violence against Blacks by people in other groups, against violence against Blacks by the police including Black officers, and especially against police shooting Black people often with seemingly less provocation than when the police shoot people in other groups. Much of this protest came together under the banner of “Black Lives Matter”.

Look up “Black Lives Matter” on the Internet and look up commentary opposed to any simplistic view of this situation. Look up what Black skeptics say about “Black Lives Matter”. Find both the truth and bias behind “Black Lives Matter”. Look up what some Blacks say about Blacks addressing Black problems first. Look up FBI statistics on the Net. They describe kinds of crime by ethnic group and describe police shootings. I cannot refer to the “hard data” here. So, I write in generalities.

Blacks have a higher rate of most crime, especially violent personal crime, than almost all other ethnic groups, especially crime by young men. Blacks have a higher rate of crime, including violent crime, than other ethnic groups that seem in similar positions in the socio-economic class system such as recent immigrants and many Hispanics. Poverty, discrimination against Blacks, and resentment by Blacks, help explain some of the crime but only a small amount.

It is not entirely clear, but it seems most Blacks with steady jobs, middle class Blacks, upper middle class Blacks, and Blacks who have had security in the socio-economic system, especially if they have had security for a couple of generations, seem to show crime rates similar to other ethnic groups (think of the “Cosby Show”, “Blackish”, and any shows featuring any of the Wayans brothers). Black young men in secure Black groups seem to show crime rates similar to young men in other similar secure ethnic groups. When Blacks can live the usual middle class life, especially over a couple of generations, they live it about as well as most other people. That is what happens to immigrants in America too. Not all Blacks who seem decent and polite are faking. Not all Blacks are waiting for an excuse to drop the “nice

guy” act, get angry, cry “foul”, get violent, and use PC and reverse discrimination against non-Blacks. Most are pretty reasonable. Most are genuinely nice guys most of the time.

Contrary to fears by many non-Blacks, most Black crime is not against people of other ethnic groups but against Blacks. In particular, Black violence is largely Black-on-Black. Black-on-Black crime has a severe bad impact on Black communities.

The typical Democratic response, and the typical Black response, is to blame all the crime on systematic discrimination and exploitation due to the socio-economic class-and-race system, and to blame nothing on Black individuals, Black groups, Black culture, or society. Blacks blame all Whites and non-Blacks both collectively and individually. Individual Blacks, Black groups, culture, society, and families, are never are to blame for any bad act. Black attitudes are never to blame. Crime does not disrupt or hurt Blacks or the Black community. Only bias, discrimination, and exploitation hurt because only they generate crime. To quote “West Side Story”, “I’m depraved on account of I’m deprived”.

Blacks have to be given special consideration for a very long time to make up for the badness that they have endured. It does not matter that they have already been given special consideration, and that it has not worked. Special consideration is the standard Democratic answer.

The typical Republican response is to blame Blacks for everything and never to consider the impacts of discrimination, scorn, marginalization, exploitation, poverty, the positive feedback cycle that develops around crime, bad education, hopelessness about jobs, or social pressure. No Republican would ever commit crime like that no matter how poor he-she was; no matter what the neighborhood was like; no matter who did what to him, her, or the family, for how long. Republicans only commit white collar victimless crime. The standard Republican answer is to throw them all in jail for a long time no matter that prison costs a lot more than welfare and costs more than making good schools.

Neither attitude is at all useful.

The obvious comment here is to sort it out for yourself, and to put blame where it is due. Don’t make excuses, but do see that poverty, discrimination, etc. make their mark. Think about how White families in long term poverty (some “White Trash”) handle the situation. They too have high rates of crime, and a lot of it is White-on-White. Think about what happens to middle class families and upper middle class families, White or any color, when the parents lose their jobs. At the same time, we cannot excuse. We cannot overlook that Blacks have higher rates of crime than we would expect among, for example, Asians, Hispanics, and most Whites in similar socio-economic situations. Try to think out what it is about Black society, culture, attitudes, and pop culture might enable and feed crime, and what about Black crime would feed back on Black pop culture, attitude, etc.

Who kills more Blacks, the police or other Blacks? The answer is “other Blacks”, by far. What the police do to Blacks and the Black community is a drop in the ocean compared to what Blacks do to other Blacks and to the Black community. Look at statistics for Chicago, Philadelphia, Oakland, and Washington DC.

In the late 1960, I lived for over a year in Oakland. In the mid-1970s, I lived briefly in Southside Chicago, in the only White family in sea of mostly hostile Blacks.

So why has all the focus been on the police and not on Black-on-Black violence? My answer is “a huge bad attitude”. Even taking into account all the crap that Blacks endure from some police, focusing on the attitude and acts of the police is like worrying about a clogged drain in the middle of a hurricane. It is an effective but bad way to distract attention from the real problem and to make yourself feel as if you are doing something important when really you aren’t. It is self-deception with bad results. It is like another kind of drug. The Black community does not need another drug.

After decades of marches to “end the violence”, the violence has gotten worse. The violence gets worse during bad economic times and gets a little better during good economic times (with lags for both) but it never goes down nearly as far as it should. Whatever Blacks have been doing since the 1920s to reduce Black-on-Black crime, it doesn’t work. Rather than admit this, and search for real ways that might work, even if the real ways are not PC, Blacks would rather yell at the police and feel good for a while. Rather than look at problems within Black culture, society, attitudes, families, and schools, Black people would rather feel good for a while by yelling at the police.

No doubt Blacks need more community cohesion and community action. Maybe to get that, Blacks have to get angry, angry at people other than Blacks. Americans had to get angry at the English before the Revolution. Simply pointing out injustice and offering well-reasoned political theory is not enough. But Blacks have been seriously angry at least since the 1950s, and it has not done much good. Another wave of anger is not likely to produce what previous waves did not produce.

Yes, “stop and frisk” is demeaning. But old people in Black neighborhoods like it. “Stop and frisk” does a lot of real practical good. Rather than focus on “stop and frisk”, focus on why police and old people think police need “stop and frisk” and on why it helps. If “stop and frisk” really is unconstitutional, then it has to stop. But it doesn’t have to stop only because young Blacks feel demeaned. If your grandma wanted to feel safe walking to the market to buy oatmeal, would you rather have “stop and frisk” or not have it? I’d rather have it.

The Democratic response: All Blacks are victims. No Whites are ever victims (except other Democratic clients in their role as clients). As victims, all Blacks are more victimized than other victims. All Blacks are justified in all they do, including rioting (maybe not looting). No Blacks are ever racist. All non-Blacks are always racist, especially toward Blacks. The police are often wrong. Anger at the police is correct. All Black anger and Black bitterness is justified, to the full extent that it shows. All acts done as a result of Black bitterness and anger are justified to the full extent of the act, including crime, rioting, murdering, fighting back against police officers, and murdering police officers. Every officer who ever shot a Black person was wrong, criminally wrong. Every Black person who ever was shot by a police officer had never done anything wrong and always was a victim. No Black person ever provoked a police officer. No Black person ever threatened another person and so required a police officer to intervene. All Black violence is due entirely to discrimination and repression by non-Blacks. Without discrimination

and repression, there would be no Black violence. There is nothing in Black culture, society, families, attitudes, or schools that supports general violence or Black-on-Black violence. Black anger never causes any problems and never worsens any problems.

The only answer is more support through programs. Although support for programs has changed almost nothing in over sixty years, this time still more support will change things.

All police officers and all police departments are only tools of racism and of the repressive Republican business system, although police officers individually don't know so. All police officers and forces are like those in Los Angeles, Chicago, and the south in the 1950s. All force, even force short of violence, by the police on any Black person is not needed and is condemned. Blacks must be carefully protected in their encounters with the police and the courts. They need extra consideration when the police meet them and they need to be given extra help in the courts. The presumption of innocence must be rigorously enforced when Black people are suspected, arrested, or in court. In these conditions, although shooting of police officers is to be publicly condemned, still it is understandable and partly excusable. Just as some police officers say young Blacks are "asking for it", maybe some police officers are "asking for it".

Comment by Mike: Bias against young Black men in arrests and in the courts is real and has been well documented. The questions: (a) What leads to such bias other than discrimination, such as the fact that Blacks commit more crime, and (b) What to do about it other than give Blacks extra consideration? If nothing else works, extra consideration might be needed but I deeply hope not.

Comment by Mike: In America, violence against police officers is never justified and I condemn all of it. It is ugly and evil. No excuses are allowable.

Of course, the Republican response is the opposite of the Black and Democratic response. You can go through the exercise of flipping the above comments around.

Comment by Mike: I doubt very much that Black crime and violence can be cured by any of the methods in use now. One root lies in racism, oppression, discrimination, and comparative poverty but another root equally large lies in Black culture, society, attitudes, families, and schools. Few people are honest about those causes and are willing to address those causes. As long as those causes remain, then the current situation will go on. As long as those causes remain, it will not be possible to do much about racism, oppression, discrimination, and comparative poverty. Blacks and Democrats will continue to blame others, and Republicans will continue to blame Blacks alone. Every once in a while, things will get better or worse for a while. Now that Blacks have settled into chronic anger and bitterness, that anger will continue, and will be aimed at the police and at non-Blacks. That anger will also increase Black-on-Black crime and Black marginalization.

(4 E) Recent Hispanic People Who Come to the United States from the South

I do not use the term “illegal immigrant” when I can avoid it.

How many people enter the US legally and illegally, and how many stay illegally, depends on economic conditions in the US. When conditions are good, many people come illegally and stay illegally, and many come legally but then stay illegally. When conditions are not good, fewer come and fewer stay. Even in bad conditions, people come and stay illegally. People come through two main routes: (1) across the southern border with Mexico, and (2) through airports. Legal immigrants do come through the southern border. Most people who come through airports and stay illegally at first came legally, as on visas for tourism, study, and work. What ratio come through the southern border legally or illegally and then stay illegally, and what ratio come legally through airports but then stay illegally, varies with conditions. During the early boom years of Bush 2, about 5000 people entered and stayed illegally every day (yes, every day). I am not sure what ratio came in through airports and what ratio came in from the south. During the Great Recession that began in 2007, there was a net loss (out migration) of illegal Hispanics. Even during the Great Recession, people still came through airports and stayed illegally. Since about 2015, about 1000 people per day enter legally or illegally and stay illegally. Most illegal immigration now is through airports where people enter legally but stay illegally. A guess: of about 1000 per day that stayed illegally in 2018, about 750 came through airports while 250 came through the south. Since at least 2009, the southern border has not been the main source of illegal immigration and Hispanics have not been the majority of illegal immigrants.

Some people on terror watch lists do try to enter the US. The vast majority come through airports. Only a small number, I think less than 10 per year, try to come through the southern border. Even those are criminal terrorists and not terrorists for political or religious reasons.

I do not summarize legal immigration. Legal immigration much surpasses illegal immigration. Again, it depends on economic conditions.

Illegal immigration is important both for real reasons, mostly having to do with jobs in the United States, and as a symbol of stress in the US. Which reason is most important depends on the person and Party. I mistrust symbols. In contrast, both Parties stress symbols; but differently. Republicans use Hispanics to capture the fears of White-Asian-and-Black working and middle class people, and to represent the belief that the world abuses the US. Republicans get tough on Hispanics to show they are tough in general and to protect clients. Democrats use immigration to oppose Republicans and to signal to potential clients that the Democratic Party can be their champion. Both Parties use immigration to recruit and to hold clients but from different groups and in different ways.

For me, the relevant reality is whether the US can sustain full ideals of democracy and fairness, in the American fashion (the “American Way”), in the face of heavy immigration, legal and illegal. I think illegal immigration might pose slightly more of a threat but maybe not much more. The threat depends less on the quantity of immigration but more on the decline of understanding and citizenship among Americans

who have been here a long time. Economic and political stresses eroded understanding and citizenship among long term Americans, on both the left and right, since the mid-1970s but especially since Reagan. Inept citizens cannot teach immigrants to be good citizens. Inept Americans cannot teach immigrants to be good Americans. If we felt better about being Americans, if we acted more adeptly as citizens and we felt justifiably proud of our skill as citizens, we would feel less bad about immigration in general. We would tend to deal with it as a practical issue rather than a symbolic issue.

Beginning in the 1970s, drug cartels began mass producing cocaine and shipping it to the United States, mostly through the Caribbean. Beginning in the middle 1990s, the United States effectively shut down the smuggling routes through the Caribbean, so the cartels needed new routes. People in Mexico had long been smuggling marijuana into the US. The Colombian cartels began a new route through Central America (look up the countries there), through Mexico, to the Mexican smugglers, and into the United States. Central American and Mexican smugglers added other drugs such as amphetamines and opiates. They also took control of smuggling people into the United States.

The Central American and Mexican smugglers got quite rich and powerful, became very bad people, and corrupted their nations. They began a wave of violence that is almost unprecedented in the 1900s and 2000s for violence not committed by the military or police. The violence reaches beyond the drug gangs to harm families, neighborhoods, rural areas, villages, towns, and cities. People from Colombia to the Southwest US learned to use violence to get what they wished for, including using kidnapping, robbery, murder, rape, sex slavery, blackmail, extortion, and human trafficking.

At the same time, (a) traditional ways of life, mostly through agriculture, failed; and (b) people had more children and more children survived. People in Central America and Mexico could not make a living as they had done for three thousand years. People always had many children but most died. Now people have seven or eight children who survive. Unlike Europe, America, and Japan when they went through similar periods, Central American people had no way to support the surviving children and they did not at first use birth control. Modest industrialization in Mexico (mostly assembly factories and some simple chemical manufacturing) helped but certainly did not solve the problem.

People from below the border have long come to the United States. To tell this story correctly, I should tell it in the context of that long-term large-scale migration. But I cannot take the space here. Look on the Internet. Find stories about battles over this immigration, battles waged often since at least the 1920s. Read about the “zoot suit” riots in Los Angeles and which ethnic groups fought. Find out when marijuana was first made illegal in the United States and why.

To make a living, escape violence and corruption, and because transportation became more available, people from Central America and Mexico began to come to the US increasingly in the 1970s, and then even more in the 1990s and early 2000s.

From now on, rather than use “people from Central America and Mexico”, I say “Hispanics” or “Latins”. Do NOT use the term “Mexicans” to mean all Hispanics. My usage glosses over the fact that people

from Puerto Rico, South America, the Dominican Republic, other areas in the Caribbean, and Spain, are also rightly called “Hispanic” or “Latin”, but using long exact phrases is cumbersome. I apologize for any unintended insult. (Brazilians speak their version of Portuguese, not Spanish, but people in the US still incorrectly call them “Hispanics”.)

I think that most Hispanics who entered the US through the southern border at first were Mexicans but now most are from countries south of Mexico. I think the numbers of Mexicans who come to the United States and leave from it now are about equal, resulting in no net immigration from Mexico. There is still positive net immigration from countries south of Mexico, most of it illegal.

I think American enforcement officers prevent about 10% of illegal Hispanics from entering the US and staying in the US. I don’t know how many are stopped at-or-near the border and how many are caught later. 90% of illegal Hispanics get through. The reasons for this low rate of catching are the difficulty in enforcing the border, agencies charged with catching are desperately under-staffed and under-funded, and the allure of jobs in the US is so high that so many Hispanics try to get in that only a massive effort could stop the majority.

It seems the obvious answer would be make jobs harder to get and hold. Why is it so easy for Hispanics to get and hold jobs in the United States? The simple true answer is that middle level business people, nearly all Republicans, want cheap labor. Business people want Hispanics. Business people don’t report them to the police. Business people help avert the police. Republicans do all this. See below.

Hispanics have been coming here for a long time so why is there so much fuss now? There has been fuss before. About once a generation fussing turns into a big issue. Since the 1970s, more Hispanics than ever before have come, so that is one reason for more fuss now.

The biggest reason for the fuss now likely is American jobs and wage levels combined with the recent high number of illegal immigrants. Since the late 1970s, Americans have had fewer jobs, especially few good jobs with benefits, and real wages have stagnated. Americans are touchy about wage levels and lack of jobs. For many Hispanics to come in and get jobs, any jobs, while long-time Americans cannot find good jobs, cannot find bad jobs, or cannot find any jobs at all, is quite hard. (Hispanics take jobs that Americans won’t take, such as farm labor, but that is another issue.)

The touchiness of workers about jobs goes directly against the fact that business people, Republicans, want a lot of cheap labor, including Hispanic labor. One part of the Republican Party, business people, wants cheap labor, including Hispanic labor, and they don’t care how they get it. Another part of the Party, the working and middle class, hates cheap labor and has grown to hate Hispanics. The group of Republicans that get cheap labor has been able to keep attention off themselves so the group that hates cheap labor doesn’t see what is going on in their own Republican Party. Ironically, one way the group that gets cheap labor is able to divert attention away from itself is to keep the group that hates cheap labor agitated against cheap labor. Blame the people who get hired and so divert attention away from the people who hire. If American workers and small business people were still Democrats, this battle

would be like battles in the past but now enough American workers and small business people are Republicans, so this battle differs. I do not point out how this time is not like the past so please use your imagination.

How are so many illegal workers able to stay here?

(1) Business people, mostly Republicans, who want cheap labor, protect them.

(2) Americans don't like "calling the cops" on anybody, especially when a person is hardworking, clean, fairly quiet, responsible, religious, sends children to school, and the children appear to get along fairly well, as is the case with most Hispanics. Even American workers who have lost jobs don't like calling the cops on Hispanics. This attitude is changing somewhat.

(3) Churches and religious groups think they can gain new members from among the Hispanics, and so protect them, in particular the Roman Catholic Church does this. People who wish to feel justified and heroic protect them, and many of these people are affiliated with a church.

(4) The Democratic Party has protected them because the Party thinks it can recruit them as clients. The Party protects them so as to curry favor with the Hispanics who are already here, here either legally or fairly securely, and who can vote or can exert power. The Democratic Party protects them to validate its self-image as champion of the underdog. Republicans would like to protect them so as to gain them as clients, but, so far, Hispanics have resisted supporting the Republican Party even if most of their work comes from Republican business people.

(5) Hispanics already in the United States legally, and citizens with Hispanic ancestry, protect the illegal immigrants in many ways, including illegal ways. Some of the Hispanic protectors are uneasy that the recent illegal immigrants break the laws and some protectors don't care as long as the people that they help are fellow Hispanics.

You should stop to ponder whether the support of Republican business people or Democratic politicians is really more effective in protecting Hispanics.

The various forces overlap.

(6) Two quirks in American law help. (6A) Anybody who claims asylum has to be heard. Until recently, the claim could be based on domestic violence, gang violence, political violence, or threat of physical harm such as from extortion. Hispanics could apply for asylum by going to a US consulate or other office, either within the Hispanic country or at the US border. Until recently, Hispanics who came to the US without applying for asylum first, and who likely had entered illegally, could apply for asylum if they were arrested for being here illegally – but usually they could not apply for asylum if they had been arrested for a serious crime such as robbery. (6B) Any child born in the US is a citizen of the US even if his-her parents are here illegally. Any citizen (the child) of the US has the right to request that his-her

near kin come to the US. So, while the parents of a Hispanic child born in the US might be subject to deportation, to deport them is not worth the effort. The child, who is a US citizen, can simply apply for them to return. Rather than waste time and money on both sides, simply let the illegal parents and other near kin stay. Children born in the US who can serve to keep near kin in the US are called “anchor babies”. Children who came here when they were still young and can be used as levers to keep parents in the United States also sometimes are called “anchor babies” or “anchor children”.

The use of anchor babies is common among people from outside the United States. Students from China, Korea, Japan, India, Thailand, Europe, and the Middle East have children in the United States so the child is a US citizen, so parents can stay, or, more often, return at a later time. The practice is not a Hispanic plot. If you wish to stop Hispanics from using anchor babies, then you have to change general immigration law. To not allow a child born in the US to be a US citizen might require a Constitutional amendment.

(6C) In recent years, until the Trump administration, the idea that it was not worth the effort to deport the near kin of an American was applied not only to the near kin of anchor babies but to the near kin of children who been born outside the US but who had lived in the United States since they were young, whose primary culture was American, and whose primary language was American English. The Obama administration called these people “Dreamers”. (6D) It takes a long time to go through the legal process to decide whether a claim for asylum is valid. Rather than waste time and money on both sides going through the claim and deciding, if a claimant proved to be a good citizen, it was easier and cheaper to let him-her and near kin stay in the United States.

(7) In the regular immigration process, a Hispanic person can apply to come to the United States or can apply to stay here if already here legally such as while studying. Not only many Hispanics go through this regular legal process but so do Asians, South Asians, and Europeans. I do not dwell on other paths such as through military service.

Having one member of a family bring in other kin, who might then bring in other kin, and so on, is called “chain migration”. There are other uses of the term but they are not relevant here.

I do not know the latest statistics about migration, legal and illegal, since the Great Recovery began to cool in 2017 and since Trump’s trade war. I think the pattern is much the same as from after 2013, with about 1000 per day of illegal immigrants, most through airports and not through the south.

If you wish to stop most illegal immigration, which comes through airports, first you have to go after the fairly-well-off usually-middle-and-upper-middle-class people, with jobs, who add to the economy and pay taxes, and who often are tall and pale rather than short and brown. Legal changes have to address both groups. You cannot use the law simply to act against brown Hispanics from the south because they are a symbol of what you don’t like about the modern world and your place in it.

How many Hispanics come into the United States illegally primarily to seek work and how many come because their lives are at risk due to domestic violence, general violence, gang violence, or the violence of political repression? How many come for economic reasons and how many come because they really need asylum? It is hard to say because political repression, violence, and economic hardship come together. I would guess more than 90% come primarily for economic reasons while less than 10% face deep lasting violence and-or repression, aimed primarily at them, from which the only escape is asylum. Some Hispanics have learned to ask for asylum automatically if detained even if they know they don't qualify or they are not even sure what asylum is. Asking for asylum is now another tool in the fight to get to stay in the US. I don't know how many Hispanics use that tactic.

For context: If a person from Central America wished to flee violence, that person could ask for asylum in South America or Mexico and does not have to come to the US. Likewise, a Mexican could flee to Central America, South America, the Caribbean, or Europe. The level of threat, and lack of jobs, likely is as great in major American cities as it is in Central America and Mexico. I am serious, I am not joking or being rhetorical. Where do residents of Houston, Chicago, Detroit, Oakland, and Philadelphia go? Do we have to give them some kind of asylum? Why should incoming Hispanics get jobs when the people in Chicago don't get decent jobs? How do incoming Hispanics get jobs when they don't get jobs? Why are incoming Hispanics protected from the police when, according to Black residents of those cities, Black residents of American cities are not protected?

These comments do not mean we should never give asylum to any Hispanics but we do need to keep the issues of asylum and economic hardship in context, and we need to separate asylum.

Almost on the day that I began to write about this topic, Jeff Sessions, then Attorney General, said: (1) Threats of violence, gang violence, extortion, some political discrimination and violence, and domestic abuse, would no longer be accepted as conditions by which to apply for asylum. I am not clear about discrimination based on religion, ethnicity, and gender. (2) Only people who applied in the normal fully legal way for asylum, to an American office before entering the US, would be considered for asylum. (3) Any person in the United States illegally could not apply for asylum. If a person had entered illegally, even if that person had a fairly good case for asylum, that person could not apply retroactively. (4) The Trump administration is blocking attempts by non-Americans in military service to get citizenship. The Trump administration is blocking non-American residents, legal and illegal, from military service, likely because they can use military service as a route to citizenship. The Trump administration uses the excuse of national security but that claim is simply an evasion. I consider these actions to be attacks on the military and to be shameful.

As I said in another essay, by far the easiest and most effective way to control immigration would be to arrest and punish-with-long-jail-sentences any people that employ illegal aliens. This action would hit Republican business people hardest. To a small extent, this method was used in the 1980s. It has since been dropped. Please do not forget that this method has NOT been seriously proposed by either Party since. Ask yourself why.

How many immigrants can the United States sustain and still retain its character? The answer depends on where the immigrants come from, their culture, and their society in their place of origin. It depends on the long-term health of the American economy. It depends on how much land, water, and nature remain. It depends on how many Americans remain who can teach right values and the American way of life. It depends on the health of American politics. I think already we have too few Americans who can teach our way of politics and life, not because American character was drowned by Hispanics but because too many Americans of all colors, religions, genders, ages, occupations, and regions aborted real American values (not the fake values espoused by either Party). Already American politics is too far gone for reasons that have nothing to do with Hispanics. America might handle 1000 illegal immigrants per day - maybe. Likely America cannot handle 5000 per day.

In my experience, most immigrants, legal and illegal, have great respect for the ideal of democracy, for the American economy, and the American way of life built on modest prosperity. Because many have experienced bad government and bad economies, they have more respect than Americans do. Despite respecting the ideal, they do not yet understand how to turn the ideal into a workable system. They tend to falter on points such as nepotism. How to turn the ideal into a workable real is more important than the simple ideal. That is what we should be teaching immigrants but we are not. To teach it, we have to know and practice it. We have to work on that problem more than we have to work on issues of immigration. If we could teach immigrants the practical ideal then likely we would be able to deal with immigration much better and would not use it as a mere symbol and a mere tool in partisanship.

Regardless of how many illegal immigrants per day the American economy can handle, the immigrants are illegal. They are breaking the law. They erode the rule of law. They contradict a deep value, the rule of law. In asking for asylum, or in using asylum as a tool, presumably they are saying that the rule of law does not where they fled and they seek to live where the rule of law does hold – yet their presence here illegally gives the lie to that claim. Does tolerating one such immigrant per year totally undermine rule of law? Not if we can tolerate all of Trump's antics. Does tolerating 5000 such immigrants per day totally erode rule of law? When Americans think of 5000 illegal immigrants per day, they think not of undermining the rule of law but of eroding their pocketbooks, so maybe the attitude of legal Americans already has done more to erode the rule of law than 5000 illegal immigrants per day.

Despite living here illegally and so partly undermining rule of law, in fact illegal Hispanics are more law abiding than Americans born here. They are arrested less often, especially for harsh crimes. Contrary to lies by Trump, major Hispanic gangs all started in the US, mostly in prisons, even if gangs later reached out into Mexico and Central America. The crime rate among illegal Hispanics is less than among legal Blacks and, I would guess, legal poor Whites. In part, illegal immigrants obey the law because they fear getting caught, but the law-abiding tendency of Hispanic immigrants seems to run deeper than that. Having lived where the law does not hold, they appreciate when it does hold. Keep this tendency to follow the law in mind when assessing the impact of illegal Hispanics on rule of Law and when assessing claims of President Trump about crimes, criminals, gangs, and terrorists.

The typical Democratic response: (a) ALL the Hispanics are de facto refugees and deserve asylum. (b) The bad economic conditions south of the border amount to persecution, and we should see even those Hispanics that come to America to seek work as refugees. (c) Everyone Hispanic who came here without first seeking asylum at a consulate, but then later claims asylum, must be treated as if he-she did first seek asylum in the regular. For those people, being in the US illegally is not a crime. Everyone who seeks asylum should be granted asylum immediately on the face of his-her claim. (d) Even those that come here primarily to seek work do not really come primarily to seek work but a dream. Coming to seek work is a long American story. It is a right. We should make it a privilege under law. Why should we in this generation deprive Hispanic people of the right to come here to seek work when previous generations let in legions from Europe, China, and Japan. (I omit consideration of slavery.) (e) The only reason that Hispanics must come here to seek safety is because the American greed for cocaine and other drugs created ALL violence and evil in their countries. They are victims. We are responsible for ALL bad that befalls them just as Whites in the United States are responsible for all the bad that befalls all Blacks (who are always innocent) and men in the US are responsible for all bad that befalls women. Because we destroyed their lives, we must fix their lives. (f) We should give them special status under the law. We should never arrest them for immigration violations. Effectively we should eliminate the distinction between legal immigrant versus illegal immigrant for them but not for others. We should not worry whether they pay taxes, have a driver's license, or have auto insurance. We should allow them to vote. We should give them state benefits such as welfare, health care, and schooling even if they do not pay taxes. We should allow them to chain migrate. All their babies are anchor babies. (g) The United States easily can assimilate all Hispanics that come here. 5000 per day is not too many. Mexico and Central have a combined population of several hundred million. If all of them came here, we could absorb them all easily. (h) All Hispanics who are here right now should get amnesty and citizenship. (i) If we do all this for Hispanics, no other group will wish for similar treatment. All other groups will accept being treated as before under the laws as before. All other groups will accept special treatment for Hispanics without jealousy.

Predictably, the Republican response is pretty much the opposite on all points. I don't go through the exercise. The Republican attitude amounts not to treating Hispanics like other people who have to live under the rule of law but like treating them as sub-humans that we use laws to control.

As usual, neither side is acceptable.

Whining about the other side is not enough. You figure out a good plan. You figure out how to make it work with laws. Keep in mind this is a chronic problem that has recurred half-a-dozen times since 1920. Keep in mind how people enter the US, mostly through airports, but don't forget the southern border. About 1985, Reagan and the Democrats thought they had it solved and had ended illegal immigration once-and-for-all but they were wrong. How many immigrants from all sources, legal and illegal, and how many Hispanics, can America absorb? Figure out how to keep the number below the limit using only the law. How many can we absorb economically and how many can we teach good citizenship? How do we make ourselves better citizens and better Americans so we can adeptly teach immigrants to be good citizens and Americans? Don't forget to arrest all people who hire illegal workers. Don't allow

the trick of “work permits” to run around the law and subvert it. You might consider legalizing some drugs and taxing them so as to undermine gangsters, create a strong US industry, and make more state revenue. What would happen if we fully legalized marijuana and white powdered cocaine?

(4 F) Biased Reporting.

On 14 July 2018, I saw a case of biased reporting on the news. I do not say which news. I am sure the network did not know it was biased and would have corrected the bias if it saw its own bias. I am sure the network thought it was promoting better race relations and helping people come to grips with their inner prejudice. The network reported the following three stories together:

(1) Two Black men came into a coffee shop, sat down, but declined to order. They two Black men said they were waiting for a friend. Workers in a coffee shop called the police after only 10 minutes. The police came quickly and arrested the men for illegal trespass. The friend showed up shortly after the police. This is a fairly straightforward case of profiling and fear. It is not unusual to call the police on people who sit in shops and don't order, or who use the toilet but don't order, but usually the staff waits for more than 10 minutes. Staff members usually call the police faster with Blacks than with Whites or East Asians. I don't know about Hispanics or people who look Middle Eastern or South Asian.

The two Black men handled the situation very well. They were upset but did not get angry and they did not start a scene. Rather than “sue the pants off” the restaurant and the police, they settled for a small token amount (I think 1 dollar) and the provision that the restaurant chain carry out a comprehensive program of education on race issues. No better resolution could be reached. I am not sure but I think TV news did not often report this resolution along with the story.

(2) A White woman called the police on a Black girl for selling bottled water. It is not clear if the girl was using the property of the White woman to sell the water. The woman who called the police said the issue was that the girl did not have a permit but more likely the woman did not want any child selling anything near the property of the woman. The fact that the girl was Black might have made the woman more annoyed. I think that is how neighbors took it and that is what the news implied.

(3) At a neighborhood pool, the “guards” are volunteer residents; they serve on a rotation. Almost all residents in the neighborhood, people at the pool, and guards, are White or Asian. A Black family came to use the pool. The Black family lived in the area and had a right to use the pool. The guard asked to see their ID as residents. The guard, a White man, had not seen them before and did not know them as residents. To ask for ID from people that the guards do not recognize is common because it keeps out non-residents. Apparently Black non-residents try to “sneak into” the pool often enough so that it is an issue. The mother of the resident Black family was sure the only reason the man asked to see their ID is because they are Black. The White guard said that was not the only reason or even the primary reason.

The network did NOT report the following stories although the stories were on the Internet at the same time:

(a) A 91 year old Mexican man was visiting his children and grandchildren in the United States, as he had done many times. After he visited, he always returned to Mexico. As he was walking on the street near a park, as he also had done before, he passed a Black woman. She picked up a brick (or piece of rubble), struck the man on the head a couple times, and began screaming “Go back”, “You don’t live here”, and racial slurs. The old Hispanic man fell down. Black men rushed over. The Black woman and Black men kicked him repeatedly. The old man survived but had a broken jaw and broken ribs.

(b) In a restaurant, four Black women were seated at a table. Their server, a non-Black woman, brushed the knee of one of the Black women with her leg. All four Black women jumped up, grabbed and struck the server, knocked her down, pushed over the table with food on it, struck the server more while she was down, robbed the server of several hundred dollars, and fled the restaurant. A warrant was put out for their arrest. I don’t know if they were arrested or convicted.

To me, stories (a) and (b) are more telling than (1), (2), and (3). If we reversed the races in stories (a) and (b), what would be the reaction? Imagine a mob of Hispanics beating up an old Black man. Imagine a gang of four White women beating up and robbing a Black waitress, and trashing the restaurant. Who uses violence and who does not? Why weren’t (a) and (b) on the TV news?

Which stories do you think the Democratic Party would stress and which overlook? Why? Is that tactic by the Party helpful or hurtful? How about Republicans?

The point is not that one race is good and another race is bad, or one race is better and other races are worse. The points are: There is too much racial tension all around. All races show racism and all races suffer from racism by other races. All races have bad attitudes. All races do harm. Races pick on those people they feel they can get away with picking on. Violence is bad and wrong (except in self defense or to defend people unable to defend themselves). We all can do better. Patience and caution are good. Your group might suffer from faults of attitude and culture that make things worse. Anger, bitterness, and violence are not useful responses even to long-term disrespect. Even professional networks have bias. Now the bias is often pro-Black and anti-White. Bias on the networks cannot counter bias in real life. Only full truthful reporting can counter bias. When you see racial bias by any group, even one that has been the victim of racial bias such as Blacks, call it as you see it. If Blacks have attitudes or do things that hurt or don’t help, say so, even if you are Black. If Whites have attitudes or do things that hurt or don’t help, say so, even if you are White. The truth is always our friend.

(4 G) Should Women Golfers Compete on the Men’s Tour, and Vice Versa?

This case is not heavy, which might be a relief after the above cases. Readers who have heard of Renee Richards and tennis can apply the same ideas here to tennis. Apply the ideas to basketball.

Men usually don’t understand why women are so unhappy when men point out differences between the sexes (genders) even when differences seem obvious, innocuous, or charming. (1) Almost always:

(a) when a man or non-feminist woman points out a difference; (b) even if the difference has no real implications for competency in politics, citizenship, business, school, math, science, etc.; (c) men use the difference as an excuse to marginalize women, paint them as inferior, reduce their rights, and give men privileges over women. (2) Differences are always used to disadvantage women, never to advantage them, and never neutrally, even when the differences could not possibly be relevant. Women like high heeled shoes; that practice shows they are stupid and prone to self-destructive fads, so they should not vote or hold office. On average, the brains of women are about 5% to 10% smaller than of men. That fact shows the same, shows women are not educable and so we should not spend money on school for them, and shows women should not have positions of authority in business - despite any objective test scores and any objective assessments of education or judgment, and despite a clear record of success.

Many differences are learned, have no basis in biology, and show nothing about different abilities, yet men amplify the difference and use it to discriminate, as with shoes, differences such as that now women tend to wear skirts while men wear pants, or women use cosmetics often while men rarely do.

Facts that might show the superiority of women in some ways are ignored. Women might have a higher brain-to-body ratio than men. The bridge between the two halves of the brain is comparatively larger in women, and maybe faster, than the bridge in men, so maybe women process faster and better. Women seem to handle stress better. What would you make of the fact that women all over, in various cultures, on average, actually do say many more words per day than men (about three times as many)?

Rather than fight over all these differences that really don't mean anything at all, women feel it is better to deny any-and-all differences. Women are not more intuitive. Women are not more nurturing and supportive. Women are not physically weaker in any way. Women are not prettier. Women are not better speakers. Women do not talk more. Women do not process faster and better. Women's brains are not smaller and women do not have a larger bridge between brain halves. If pretty men ever were culturally valued, men would wear makeup.

In practice, of course, women put down women, likely more than men do, but I leave that issue aside.

We can't ignore differences. Some differences are interesting and-or fun. To ignore differences is not scientific. Yet we cannot persist in using differences to put down women. Especially we cannot magnify differences that couldn't possibly matter in important areas such as citizenship so men can put down women. If lipstick makes no difference in voting, then why care so much? Because men make it matter so much, and make it matter in the wrong ways, even when it shouldn't.

What to do? What is the correct balance? Democrats say we must pretend there are no differences, at all, regardless of science and what our own experience tells us. That does not work. It sets up backlash and greater irrationality.

Men and women play golf remarkably equally except for one big difference. Men hit the ball longer in general and especially hit the drive off the tee longer (the opening shot on each hole). Except for the

drive, the greater distance on other shots does not make much difference. Men professionals average about 285 to 290 yards per drive. A strong hitter might average 305 yards. With women professionals, the average drive is about 250 yards and a strong hitter might average 275 yards. Women do hit the ball 300 yards at times, some of them consistently. After the drive, men and women hardly differ. Women are almost exactly equal to men. Watching the “short game” (near the green) and the putting (on the green) of women golfers is fun. I think women in general are slightly better than men after the drive but I am a recent fan and so might be biased. When women are allowed to hit their tee shots from closer to the hole by about 35 to 40 yards, they can compete with men fairly easily.

Men professional golfers make much more per tournament and on the golf tour as a whole than women professionals, greater than the difference between men and women for equal work or comparable work of about 25% to 30% now. The gap in golf is not due to any systematic gender bias that I have seen but is due to the fact that the public prefers to see men play and the preference leads to higher advertising prices on TV and to higher “purses”. I don’t explain why the public prefers to see men. This is roughly the differences that we find in women’s professional basketball versus men’s basketball, and in men’s American football versus men’s soccer in the United States. In Europe, soccer and “American football” would be the other way around. A comparable difference prevails in tennis but the difference in tennis has gotten less recently because women’s tennis seems to be more popular than men’s tennis now.

Should women play on the men’s tour **without** any advantage such as starting from 40 yards closer? It has been tried. Anika Sorenstam did well in the middle 2000s for a few tournaments, and I am glad she tried. But difference in distance off the tee is a high barrier. It became clear that she could not compete to win over the long run.

Is there anything that can be done to allow men and women to compete in the same arena without giving women what would seem like an unfair advantage? Likely no. What does that say about how we should see men, women, and differences? Does that imply anything for other arenas such as politics, business, math, and science?

Should women play on the men’s tour **with** a positive “handicap” to make up for difference off the tee? Should women be allowed to tee up the ball 40 yards ahead of men? That allowance is given all the time on courses in casual play but that allowance does not seem right for an official event in which men and women would compete. Should everybody get to hit the tee shot from a different place depending on body weight somewhat like there are weight classes in boxing and MMA? Should we use how much a person can bench press as the index? Should we use height or body fat percentage? Should we use a complex formula that will please nobody and offend everyone? None of that seems right.

If women are allowed to play on the men’s tour, why can’t men play on the women’s tour? That seems only fair. I am quite sure women would never allow it. Men would dominate. Even if men had to start further back than women, likely still men would dominate. And, if men had to start further back enough so men did not dominate, then some man would sue, saying that such discrimination is unfair, and likely

he would win. If women were allowed to play on the men's tour but with a 40 yard advantage on the initial tee shot, again some man would sue and likely win.

Likely, we have to put up with two different tours and with men making more than women.

What does that mean?

It does not mean that women are less intelligent or less adept at politics, business, education, the arts, or anything. This difference in golf is not extendable to any other realm. It helps to see situations as in golf to appreciate which differences really matter (few) and which do not (nearly all). The difference in golf does not mean women in general should make less than men for the same work or for comparable work. It does not mean that women can't be good leaders, including political leaders. If a woman can engineer a space satellite as well as a man, she should make as much money. If a woman can negotiate a deal better than a man, she should make more money. If a woman is worth more to a business firm as a microbiologist than a man is worth to a university as an engineer, she should, and now does, make more money. If a woman can play music better than a man, she might make as much money as Beyonce Knowles, Taylor Swift, or Katy Perry, and she deserves it. If a woman can be representative, senator, or governor, then likely she can be President.

The fact that a man project head in a business firm makes 30% more than a woman head for equivalent work is not the same, and does not come from the same reasons, as the fact that men golfers make more than women. The facts are related but not the same. One is a matter of bias (the difference in salary in the business firm) and the other a matter of market and audience. It would take too long here to explain. This is why Democrats, and readers of this essay, need to know more than a little economics if they wish to see accurately and act correctly.

Learn to use your head. Learn to appreciate similarities and differences. Learn what matters for free citizens in a democracy and what does not. You can do that. The vast majority of golf fans can see the difference between men and women without using that to support general gender bias.

The stereotypical Democratic response: There is no difference between men and women, regardless of what we see with our own eyes and what statistics say. Women hit the ball as far as men do. All claims of differences result from bias and from bias only. The following facts are entirely and only due to sexist bias: audiences for golf are mostly men, men prefer to see men play, men will pay more to see men play golf, TV will pay more for men's golf, and sponsors of ads on TV will pay more for ads on men's golf than on women's golf. Men need to be educated. If necessary, men must be forced by law to be educated. Business firms need to be educated. Business firms must be forced by law. Sports shows and channels need to be forced to air as much women's golf as men's golf. If needed, the amount of men's golf has to be reduced until the air time is equal. The law must compel business firms to pay as much for ads on women's golf as ads on men's golf. The law must compel tournaments to pay as much for women's prizes as for men's prizes. Women must receive as much for first, second, third, and so on, as men. If women may wear shorts while they play, men may wear shorts – this point shows we are not biased

against men. If women may wear skirts, men may wear skirts. Women must be allowed to play in men's tournaments. Even though we just said there is no difference between men and women, when women play in men's tournaments, women must tee up the ball 50 yards ahead of men. Even though we just said there is no difference between men and women, men should not be allowed to play on the women's tour. If men insist on playing on the women's tour, they must tee up the ball 60 yards behind women on all holes, even short holes where a driver is not used off the tee. Eventually maybe there will be only one tour, mixed for men and women. Wouldn't that be wonderful?

The Democratic response is an example of what happens when you try to force equal outcome rather than equal opportunity. Sometimes equal opportunity really truly honestly fairly does lead to unequal outcome. Sometimes the attitudes differences between groups (culture) leads to unequal outcome even with equal-enough opportunity.

The fear that people get while reading the Democratic response is typical of the fear that people have of rampant PC. People fear the use of apparent equity really to force one group to have an advantage over others. Even rules deliberately aimed at equity are applied for advantage. Democrats don't appreciate how much their programs come across this way and how much people fear their attitude and programs. Again, read "Animal Farm".

The stereotypical Republican response: Men are fun to watch in sports and women are boring, and that is all there is to it. People watch women not for the skill but for the entertainment, such as to see what they are wearing - like women flashing panties in tennis is really for other women. Women should be grateful they can play for money at all, that there is a women's tour at all. Clearly the women's tour is derivative on the men's tour, so women owe all they have to men. If women undermine the men's tour, they will kill their own. Differences in prizes, air times, and ad revenue accurately reflect the intrinsic value of women's golf. That is what the free market does - it automatically sorts out the human and moral realm so that we don't have to think. Differences are not due to superficial market evaluations but to intrinsic value. Market value always directly reflects intrinsic value. Men are more valuable while women are less. Women will never compete on the men's tour so why bother with a token show every decade? The fact that women need a handicap of 40 yards shows how silly the idea is, and shows how little people would watch. All revenues would go down. The idea of letting men on the women's tour is ridiculous. Only a gay man of the "bad kind" would want to do that. Women should go ahead and have a good time among themselves and should quit annoying men with all this crap. Women might want to keep this situation in mind when they stick their noses into business, politics, and higher education.

These days few Republicans would say this aloud but still they would think it, including women. Other people can hear it in the background. Republicans don't appreciate how stupid they sound, even if only from the background, and don't know how much people see that Republicans use these arguments to perpetuate disadvantage and perpetuate structured society.

Democrats and Republicans, each in their own ways, try to have their cake and eat it too.

There are real differences between men and women, Whites and Blacks, gays and straights, young and old, and Christians and Buddhists; and sometimes real differences matter. They almost never matter for quality citizenship in a democracy. Almost no differences matter in business, politics, education, and character. Group differences in violence and crime do matter. Some differences we have to live with because the cure of trying to make everything fully equal is worse than the fact of some real differences. You can see real differences without adopting the stereotypical old Republican view – which many Republicans now do not hold. Women don't want men in general to be pretty in the same way that women are. Professional golf is a case of real difference. The result in golf is not ideal, and sometimes not good, but this world is not perfect. We can't generalize from golf to politics, jobs, education, math, science, business, and character. We should never use the fact that we have to live with some real differences as an excuse not to fight bias or an excuse not even to see bias.

If you can learn to see differences and similarities, learn which matter when, and which don't matter for politics, business, education, character, etc., then you can avoid silly responses over gender, and avoid similar ridiculous responses in other arenas. If you can learn to see when differences lead to problems but sometimes we can't do much about unfairness, then you also see when we can do something about unfairness. If you can't learn to see, you will be fooled and trapped. Apply these ideas not just to golf but to all sports and to business, politics, and education. Apply these ideas not just to men and women, but to all genders, and to all races and religions.

(4 H) Avoiding Reality: Labor Unions

I go into the economics and history behind what I say here in other parts of this essay and in other work. I do not go into the background in this sub-section.

Since 1950, American workers have divided into at least five categories: (1) Workers with really good jobs that are secure, pay a lot, and have full high benefits. (2) Workers with good jobs that pay well, are secure, and have benefits. (3) Workers with jobs that are fairly secure but pay only modestly and have only modest benefits or no benefits. Now most workers fall into this category. (4) People with bad jobs that are insecure, pay poorly, have no benefits, and might not be full time. More workers are going into this category. This is the category parents want their children to rise above. (5) Unemployed or really badly employed. Category (1) "set the pace" for others. From the 1950s to mid-70s, Americans thought all American workers would eventually be in category (1). This was when American workers were solidly in the Democratic Party and were the backbone of the Party.

From World War 2 until about 1975, many American firms made extraordinary profits. People thought that would last forever. After about 1975, the rest of the world caught up, and profits fell. America did not handle the change well. Categories (1) and (2), at least, were based on the high profits. Giving workers that much would not have been possible without the artificially high profits of the time. When the high profits went away, business firms could afford only few workers in categories (1) and (2).

Rather than deal with the changing economy, rather than accept that business firms are not all “cash cows”, workers tried to dig in their heels. Workers rejected reality. Through a blend of mismanagement by firm officers and unrealistic worker demands, many business firms died, and many workers lost jobs. Many jobs were degraded. Many jobs lost benefits. The job with benefits would disappear for a while then reappear under another name without benefits. Real salaries stagnated. President Reagan began a successful crusade to break all unions. The entire union movement in effect got broken. That is where we are now.

In the long run, denying reality hurts more than reality. It is better to accept reality and face up to what needs to be done, collectively if possible, than to all drown one-by-one, each clinging to his-her sliver of drift wood as if it would miraculously expand back into the full-size Titanic again.

Rather than band together, each union went it alone, each union sank, took its members with it, and effectively took all workers down too. Everybody ended up worse off. Workers with good jobs turned their backs on all other workers both in their unions and in other unions. Unions that had many good jobs turned their backs on all other unions, especially on those that had few, or fewer, good jobs. Every worker that had a good job was more concerned with protecting his-her superiority and his-her feeling of having “made it” than protecting the labor system and the other workers that had helped them make it. Every union that felt it had made it did the same to other unions that it felt might drag them down. Every worker and every union that had “made it” deluded itself into thinking it had made it on its own and could continue to make it on its own.

The best strategy would have been for labor from many industries and many business firms to meet, decide what realistic demands would be in what industries and what firms, scale expectations to reality, and all get by together. It would have been better for laborers to cooperate and to help each other out until America found its best place in the world economy. That would have resulted in a much better adjustment for American labor and America in the world economy. Instead, a good adjustment has been delayed by decades, and still hasn’t happened properly. Of course, business adjusted quicker and is doing fairly well – but labor can’t be a part of that now.

Some unions did re-negotiate contracts but by then it was “too little too late”, the damage had been done, and even the unions that did re-negotiate did not do well. Autoworkers are a case in point. They gave up a bunch but too little too late. If they had not been rescued first by foreign automakers and then by Obama, they would all be lined up waiting outside the factory fences in Mexico.

Not telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, causes real harm, much more than the hardships of current reality. If you are an official, there is no excuse for not finding the whole truth and telling the whole truth. If you are a plain citizen (union member, American worker) there is no excuse for not finding the whole truth and telling the whole truth. You owe it to your children because they will pay the price even more than you.

At the time, at least some officials and members of the Democratic Party knew what was going on and could have suggested better action. At least some union officials, leaders, and members knew what was going on and could have suggested better action. If they did so suggest, their ideas did not make it into any policy in the Party or in unions. Party and union officials said nothing because to do so would have gotten them tossed out. It is easy to say that they chose to keep their jobs rather than tell the truth, and I suggest you do say it, but if you stop there then you miss where the blame really should fall.

The blame should fall on all ordinary members of the Democratic Party and all ordinary union members. If somebody is trying to tell you a hard truth now to spare you from an even harder reality later, you owe it to yourself, family, co-workers, and country to listen. If you would rather keep your good job and your good union, while other unions and other workers go down, then you deserve what you got. You owe it to yourself to figure out what is going on and act on the basis of reality. You owe it to your family and other workers to cooperate on the best actions for workers and America as a whole. That is not likely. The Republicans won't save you.

The Democratic Party should tell the truth about the world economy, domestic economy, world ecology, race, gender, religion, and working conditions. It cannot continue to avoid telling the full truth so as not to offend any clients, and hope all comes out well in the end. That hasn't worked. The result of trying to do that is the Party lost most of labor, the middle class, and upper middle class. If Republicans were not so stupid in their own ways, Democrats would be a memory. Tell people what the new normal likely is. Tell people that we can't afford to send everybody to college, and, even if we did, still many people are not smart enough, and many college grads won't get jobs. Tell people we can afford national health care only if we don't give everybody comprehensive coverage. Tell Blacks to stop their own violence and make their own good schools. Tell people how to really control rising costs. I don't see much hope that Democrats will really delve into issues and really tell the truth.

(4 I) The Bad Performance of Many Schools with Students Who Are Black, Hispanic, and Poor White.

You work this one out for yourself. Here is a hint: In the modern world, money still makes a difference but not nearly as much as it did forty years ago. Schools can offer students an adequate education with not much money. The problem is the attitude of the students, families, communities, and groups. What do you think is the typical Democratic view and typical Republican view of this situation?

(5) Back to Unsupported Generalizations, with Repetition, without Examples.

-Sometimes Democrats think equality under law implies absolute sameness as in political correctness (PC, see below). They pretend to ignore important differences that matter such as different attitudes about violence, education, respect for law, decency, and respecting neighbors. They ignore attitudes that get in the way of Democratic power, that is, they ignore bad attitudes by their clients.

Democrats make a show of accepting different cultures, groups, sexualities (gender), and individual differences, but it is not clear exactly what we are supposed to do once we respect the varieties enough

to make sure everybody is treated equally under the law. Democrats are not clear how we respect this particular client group well enough yet still make sure other people don't get hurt much. They ignore that Democratic groups don't all respect each other and that various groups use the idea of "respect me too" to get "respect me first and most".

Democrats want us not to confuse the idea that somebody-is-not-like us with the idea that another-person-is-not-fully-human-and-not-equal-under-the-law; but that is not what comes across in grand proclamations of sameness-within-diversity and full equal rights for all. What comes across is, by using the law, you can get what you wish even if it violates the idea that law is for the good of all and we are all equal under the law.

-Democrats have an unrealistic view of human nature and of the culture (attitudes) of subgroups such as Whites, Blacks, working people, upper middle class people, Republicans, and immigrants. In theory, at bottom, everyone is a near-angel and quite rational, will see the right thing to do, will do it when he-she can, will respond to state aid only modestly and for the greater good, never cheats in getting state benefits, develops bad feelings only in response to ill treatment and only directly in proportion to the ill treatment, and will give up bad attitudes and bad acts when given half a chance with social justice. All of this is true regardless of the original culture-and-attitudes of anybody. Of course, this idea of humans and groups is wrong, impractical, and has bad results.

In practice, core and near-core Democrats take a condescending stance toward their clients in which core and near-core Democrats are the wise priest-like (though also charming and rascally) people who bring social justice while the clients can never learn to be quite as rational as Democrats need but can learn to be rational enough to get along and not to rock the boat of Democratic programs. Even this view is not accurate, and leads to wrong, impractical, and bad results. Republicans condescend too but the feel is different.

Sometimes the Democratic attitude is sweetly hopeful but more often is condescending and annoying. It's the attitude you get from an environmentalist, Black person, or feminist, who thinks you would be OK as a second-rate or third-rate semi-human being if you only had your consciousness raised but likely you never will and you have to be treated as if you never will. You can be molded into someone who is merely bumbling and who fits in enough to carry on, but that is about it, and that is enough as long as you stay on our side.

Democrats can see that their clients think the economy and politics are a zero sum game, clients think they are always the losers, and so they have to get more to make up for what they have been cheated out of. But Democrats think they can make the economy and politics into an obvious positive sum game beyond what it already is and can make their clients think they are winners too in the new game.

Democrats think they can make everything fair, almost absolutely fair, and fair enough so that clients and everyone will accept that it is fair and will join enthusiastically. Too often you just can't make the world fair this way. Sometimes you can make everybody a bit better off but almost never can you make

everybody equally well off and so make the whole thing almost absolutely fair. Democrats think you can. Democrats act surprised when things get better but not equally better for everybody, and then people get angry. Actually, Democrats don't really think this way but pretend to think this way because it appeals to clients with a problem.

Democrats think everybody can see when he-she-or-us are getting a good deal, likely an unfairly good deal, as with rich and powerful people. Democrats think, when people see they have a good deal, they will be filled with human kindness and voluntarily give up their wealth for the greater good. Democrats think Republicans and Republican clients, or even Democratic clients such as the upper middle class, will voluntarily give up their wealth for the greater good and feel happy about it.

Democrats feel poor clients will feel grateful when Democrats get Republicans to give up wealth, and Democratic clients will not try to get more than their fair share when the state forces Republicans to give up advantage. Democrats think their clients will never freeload or act selfishly.

According to Democrats, all oppressed groups, at the deep level that counts, are entirely free of bad attitude, bad motives, bad character, and bad acts. No person in any oppressed group is ever biased in any way that makes a difference or that matters. No person in any oppressed group ever acts badly or has a bad character. All people in all oppressed groups have really good hearts that are only waiting to emerge. People in oppressed groups routinely reach out of their pain and oppression to help even their oppressors by teaching their oppressors the real meaning of being human, having a heart, and helping a fellow. They teach their oppressors all the true American arts such as music, dance, and drama. They teach true spirituality such as from Native Americans. The attitude of Democrats reminds me of the idea that every hooker really has a heart of gold.

All bad attitudes and behaviors by poor people, Blacks, Black men, Hispanics, Muslims, "White Trash", crack heads, meth tweakers, women, immigrants, etc. are entirely-and-only due to oppression by the state, the economy, and nasty prejudiced groups such as Whites and men. All bad attitude and bad behavior is entirely-and-only due to prejudice and oppression by the groups that control the economy and the state, chiefly upper middle class and upper class White men, women, and their allies. People with power and wealth make the state and the economy unfair. Other people, the oppressed people, develop bad attitudes and behaviors as a response to the unfairness in the state and economy created by the ruling class, and only in that way.

All bad attitudes and bad behaviors by oppressed people will vanish once people get a chance through education or a program. Then everybody will be a perfect Enlightenment citizen and act with sufficient rationality for a modern democracy. If people get welfare, people will not cheat but will use welfare only to help families. If we support disabled people, nobody will pretend to be disabled just to get support and so not work. If people get a diploma from a school, then we can rely on them being educated up to the intellectual and moral ideals of the diploma and they will act up to the moral and intellectual ideals. Diplomas automatically solve all problems. The only reason for bad relations is prejudice. In areas where most Black people have a job, then Black-on-Black crime will be no greater than White-on-White

crime or Asian-on-Asian crime. If we just tell all Black people that Black-on-Black crime is bad, then they will stop right away. If people see the unity of humanity, they will stop prejudice and the ensuing bad acts, so, for example, gangs will not fight and not kill innocent people in drive-by shootings. Anybody can buy a house in any neighborhood. People will stop making noise, littering, and parking all over the lawn. If everybody had a diploma, everybody would seek an honest job and would not turn to crime. If we legalize soft drugs and victimless crimes such as prostitution, we will have no problems from those drugs or that activity. If we give all convicts a half-way decent job, there will be no recidivism.

Once we explain clearly to people that they should be good, kind, and helpful, of course, everybody will be good, kind, and helpful. We don't need to compel anybody to do anything if only we can explain well enough. Once everybody understands, everybody will be a good Democrat.

The best place to explain is in the public schools. We can't count on churches or other private groups. We must use the state to indoctrinate children and so make good citizens.

-Of course, in contrast to Democratic clients who are all on the verge of becoming angels, all business people cheat in every way they can, and so all business people cannot have the same human nature as Democrats and the clients of Democrats. They are demons. No Republicans want fairness but instead all Republicans want power and wealth. Republicans are at heart immoral hypocritical opportunists. Some of them are merely deluded, simple people yearning for simple morality and easy-to-understand order, but they are just as much a problem because they go along with bad people. So, Republicans can't have the same basic human nature as do Democrats and the clients of Democrats. Republicans, business people, rich people, powerful people, and all clients, are not susceptible to gentle persuasion and to Democratic reason. Republicans and their clients cannot be saved no matter how much good we do for them or how much friendship we offer. They must be carefully controlled, and we must use the state to do it. Republicans have exactly the same attitude toward Democrats and their clients, including necessary use of the state.

(6) More Bad Democratic Attitude.

-This Democratic patronizing attitude is not compatible with the idea that all people will be good once they see the truth, and all people easily can see the truth if shown. But Democrats are able to live with both sides of the contradiction.

Democrats see "people as people" in the same way we see a sad wet little kitten as a potential grown cat, a powerful hunter, the pride of its neighborhood, someday, maybe, if we help it enough now; but secretly we hope it never grows up fully because then it won't need us and then it won't have the same deceptively unrealistic lovable kitten nature. We want the clients to stay clients even after they see our truth. We want our fantasies.

Of course, some children (clients) are easily hurt and even children (clients) do harm. Even the kitten kills innocent birds in the neighborhood, and it kills even more when it is grown. So Democrats have to

protect all people, not only against the ravages of society and bad Republicans but against themselves as well. Democrats have to protect Democratic clients against themselves. Democrats explain why they have to do this when they can, but, if other people, their clients, are too stupid to get it, Democrats have to get Republicans force them to do what is in their own good. Democrats take this attitude even with people who are smarter than the Democrats are and who have had more experience than they have had. This attitude adds to “political correctness” (PC). It adds to the modern “hipster” pose. Without it, living in irony would not be possible.

Republicans have a version of this attitude but the Democratic version is more cloying and annoying. At least when Republicans look down on you, they do so openly (or did so openly before the days of PC), and they give you the reasons fairly openly, such as that you are an indecent subhuman who does not know God and so you can't live in decent society. I don't go more into differences between Republicans and Democrats, and why Democrats are more annoying.

In some cases, this contradictory attitude leads to good ideas such as helping drug addicts and helping women who have been abused sexually or by violence. It led to better-quality education in the 1950s and 1960s. It might someday lead to equal pay for comparable (equal) work for women. In other cases, it is simply stupid, as in supporting welfare matriarchs (now not much) and public housing. It leads to overlooking Black-on-Black crime and excusing attacks on the police. It is hard to figure out the correct view of human nature and to correctly make programs following the view only of Democrats or only of Republicans.

Democrats have this view of human nature not because they really believe it but because it gives them an excuse to promote programs, get clients, get favors from clients, get morally indignant against people who don't share their view (such as Republicans and me), and oppose all programs of Republicans because those programs are not based on the same view. The same is true of Republicans in their way.

Democrats are like children who have figured out how to use “but that's not fair” so as to get what they want but haven't figured out yet that the family can't give them all they want and that they personally would be better off if they grew up. They know, but refuse to accept, that it is not all about fairness even if fairness is a huge value and an important lesson. So, they use fairness only as a tool and do not use fairness as it should be used. They are like the teenage daughter before she goes to college for a couple of years. They are not selfish in the way that a five year old is selfish but their selfishness hurts all the same. They are correct enough to be worrisome, and to win points in arguments, but not enough to make long-term sense; and it is hard to explain why to them. Sometimes owning a 5G phone just like everybody else really does not make your life that much better. Sometimes you are better off with a good character and with some real education. Sometimes you don't deserve to be boss.

The Democratic attitude is mixed up with the idea that some people are more hip, cool, smart, with it, trendy, chic, well-dressed, sexy, sensitive to modern art, especially music, sensitive to new ideas, in the know, and a hot rebel. This attitude is mixed up with the ideas that (a1) underprivileged ethnic groups such as Blacks and Hispanics, (a2) and marginalized groups such as Gays, (b) automatically are more hip-

cool-gangsta etc; (c) but sympathetic accepting Whites and Asians can learn from them and so become hip-cool-pseudo-gangsta etc. “I’m in with the in crowd”; everyone not a Democrat or client is Mr. Jones or the bad guy in “Positively Fourth Street” (both from Bob Dylan). If you are hip-cool-gangsta-etc, you must have Democratic leanings; you should lean toward a modern “ism” such as feminism or Black-ism. If you are a Democrat, are in an “ism”, or in a movement such as “Black lives matter”, then you are more hip-cool-gangsta all around. Surprisingly, this attitude has not waned in the face of reality since it first began in its modern style in the 1940s; it only changes form a little. Marginalized groups suffer from the attitude as much as White Democrats, likely because the attitude makes them out to be automatically hip-cool-gangsta etc. and superior to plain White Folks in the ways that really matter, even when they are not. The attitude is false, on all counts. Sometimes the attitude is funny, as when each generation thinks it invented the attitude; but, after decades of display, sometimes nasty, the attitude is more annoying than funny, and it causes real damage, including some crime. Maybe the worst damage is how it shuts minds. Republicans have their own annoying style.

If you are Black, Hispanic, a modern liberated woman, an LGBTQ (gay) person, went to college, or have seen much of the world, then it makes no sense that you might not be a Democrat, or, heaven forbid, might be a Republican.

Both core Democrats and their clients know that core Democrats and their clients don’t have a correct view of human nature, of rational yet heart-filled core Democrats, and of their hip-cool-gangsta clients. Both core Democrats and their clients know that they are not nearly as rational as they wish, are not nearly as good as the image of clients as “fallen angels”, and that clients will not change to become ideal Enlightenment people after only a few days of state support through Democratic programs. There is no point going into what core Democrats are really like or what clients are really like before and after help. Yet both core Democrats and their clients continue to pretend. Pretending is a huge hypocrisy, and the pretending-hypocrisy weighs on the hearts and minds of Democrats and clients.

Core Democrats look down on clients and look down on themselves for being so foolish as to continue to help when it does so little good – but can never admit it to themselves or to their clients. Clients feel looked down on, hate people who look down on them, hate themselves for saying they will change when they know they will not change, hate themselves for needing help and taking help, turn hatred out on other people, and turn hatred on the people who try to help them. This response is human and normal but it is still a problem. The response to this attitude is not to “unpack” it, see it plainly, see groups for what they really are, and come up with better relations and better attitudes, but instead the response is to “double down”, cover up harder, and throw more money. This complex is found where one materially better-off group tries to help another group, even in war and famine where help is clearly needed and help does much good. In America, this attitude adds to the overall creepiness of politics and the haze of creepiness that pervades Democrats and clients. It adds to racial, religious, and gender tension and violence. I dislike the whole complex of attitudes, especially the hypocrisy and deliberate blindness.

-If Democrats wished to show they have a firm grasp of the economy, human nature, and human nature in groups, they would join Republicans to get rid of programs and ideas that don't work, and would work hard to develop programs that do work, that don't balloon up and don't tempt otherwise hard-working decent people to become dependants of the state. If Democrats wished to show they have a firm grasp on reality, sometimes they would stand up to clients. Some individual Democrats have tried all this, and sometimes reform groups in the Party try. The joint welfare reforms of the Democrats with Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan, the welfare reforms under Bill Clinton, and some of the many suggestions of Hillary Clinton, have been good steps in this direction. But there has been no overall change of view or change of heart. Always realistic reform movements within the Party are only minority movements. Common sense never seems to get from the minority reformers to the large mass of Democratic clients.

When Democrats propose deep and broad national health coverage, propose free college for all, take the side of people who abuse the police, offer amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants without a clear understanding of the implications and without a realistic plan to control immigration in the future, and don't explain how helping nature benefits jobs and families in the long run, people know that Democrats have not thought through any implications either in terms of what we can afford or in terms of human nature. When Democrats call for gun reform that will have no real effect on crime, and do not call for gun reform that would have a real effect on crime, people in general have to doubt Democratic sense. Doubt about such ideas undermines all Democratic ideas about welfare reform, drug use, civil rights, human rights, gender roles, family, and everything that Democrats might see better than Republicans and might have better ideas about, ideas more in tune with the times.

People in general don't believe Democrats can change to be more realistic about the economy and human nature. People believe Democrats depend too much on clients, and so have to give to clients, for Democrats to be able to step back and craft what is best for the nation. People never see Democrats stand up to clients with the truth and so never believe that Democrats can stand up to clients when the welfare of the nation as a whole is more important.

-In the future, Hispanics and women will become more important in the Democratic Party, in particular as they hold office, but also as large voting blocs. Hispanics and women are as rational as any group. They are as rational as long term core members of the Party, other clients of the Party, or Republicans. They are potentially as competent as anybody. How the Party acts toward them as both members and clients, and how they carry out their roles in the Party, will go a long way in making the attitude of America in general toward the Democratic Party and making or breaking the success of the Party. If they show deep understanding of the economy and human nature, can stand up to clients, have realistic ideas, and offer realistic programs, then the Democratic Party will succeed. If they merely carry on as usual from the past, nobody will believe there is a realistic head on a Democratic shoulder, and the Party will fail.

Reminder:

-The Democratic Party core is made of comfortable middle class people with secure good jobs, some upper middle class people, and some wealthy people. The Party includes clients such as poor people, unemployed people, people with bad jobs (low pay and no benefits), Blacks, Hispanics, women, once-upon-a-time Jews, and old people. The Party includes some White people and Asians but many of them left in the 1970s. The Democratic Party used to include working people and middle class people who had reasonably good reasonably secure jobs but quite a few left in the 1970s. The Party used to be the party of labor generally and organized labor but many of those people left in the 1970s.

Working class and middle class people who have half-way good jobs but who fear falling into poverty and who feel insecure mostly moved to the Republican Party in the 1970s but now might vote with either Party. They feel forgotten by both Parties. Especially Whites this category feel forgotten. People of all ethnicities in this category change votes and Party affiliation more according to local candidate than national policy, unless a charismatic leader emerges or they believe the claims of a self-appointed savior. Until wage stagnation and the wealth gap became clear, costs of living rose, and they could see that their children were not getting ahead, they tended to vote Republican. Now that they do not think Republicans will help, they do not automatically support either Party. I do not know which way their allegiance usually goes now. I do not clutter up this essay with guesses over each issue. If I were forced, I would say the older people of this group still tend to vote Republican but younger people are moving more Democratic. Please use your own experience to make the division for yourself about this group as you read other points.

The Party gets and keeps power by giving favors to clients in exchange for votes, favors such as welfare, Social Security, SS Disability, unemployment, legal protection, protection for the environment, support for education, support for research, trying to turn bad jobs into good jobs, some tax breaks, and help with the police.

The State is Our Best Friend and Only Real Friend.

-According to the Party, the state can deal with problems better than any alternative means such as the free market, private initiative, or private charity. The state cannot fully solve all problems but it always deals with problems better than alternatives. Look first to the state to solve problems.

Democrats rarely consider that state intervention, even well-intended state intervention, might cause more harm than does the original problem. The state might help with the original problem but it might also cause collateral damage that is as bad or worse. The state is like a doctor giving a prescription for a big bottle of pain pills to cure backache only to find the patient is now addicted. For example, we need to help people with something like welfare but welfare often balloons and it tempts people who would otherwise work to not work. The new harm often leads to people becoming dependant on the state. Sometimes you have to put up with the original problem or have to find smaller solutions. Democrats have no habit of anticipating when a program will do harm and so they are caught by surprise and are unable to deal with new harm. They have no framework in which to make good guesses about overall

harm and benefit, direct and collateral, and so to make plans that convince others how to proceed. They see only a current issue and a quick fix through giving resources (money).

As a result, Democrats are too open to pleading by interest groups and their programs are too open to unforeseen harm and to abuse.

For example, “equal opportunity, not equal outcome” is Rightist propaganda but it is also true. Yet Democrats do not see that it is true, see why it is true, and see why the distinction is so important to working class people with decent jobs, middle class people, and upper middle class people. More importantly, Democrats seem to wish not to learn.

In the Democratic view, only the state can muster enough power to oppose other powers such as business firms, churches, strong religious passion, public opinion, and prejudice, powers that threaten general liberty, general well being, and the well being of the clients of the Democratic Party. Power must be met with power, and only the state has enough power. To guarantee basic freedoms and rights, the Party needs to control the state.

Only the state can gather enough resources to fully compensate people and groups who have been maltreated (fully redress grievances) and give those people the support they need to get back on their feet and to keep themselves in the face of opposition. The state can take resources from the people in general, and from oppressors, to give to victims, and only the state can do this. In taking resources and using them like this, the state always increases the general welfare. Taxes are the main means to take and redistribute resources.

Democrats do seem to want to cure all problems by throwing state money at the problem and victims rather than by getting at what causes a problem and rather than considering how people will respond to a big dollop of state money. Democrats do seem not to consider that state help might not be best and not to consider that money might not solve all problems. Democrats do not see themselves this way but this is how they come across.

When underdogs, victims, or groups with a self-perceived need, seek resources that they cannot obtain through their own business, own work, and own community, they seek resources from the state, that is, they seek money from the state. To get money from the state, they go first to the Democratic Party. It is not always wrong that people should use the Party and the state to get resources. Victims of most big natural disasters should expect help from the state. But the habit of seeking money from the state leads to clients with dubious claims and to too many clients seeking help from Democrats. The Party can no longer assess which clients deserve help, which to help, and how much to help. The Party cannot tell to whom to say “no” to or say “not that much”. It can no longer assess how much the state can help and how to apportion state aid.

-Again, generalities are fun but I have to be specific. When to use the state and when not to use the state would require several books. Here I focus on the federal level. After a hundred years of bickering

back and forth, I think we do a pretty good job already of deciding what to use the state for and which level of state to use for what. All I do is list without much explanation. The lists are only a few examples to get across the idea.

Beforehand, I give some advice. When we use the state, we should give enough funds so that the task given to the state can be done adequately. We have to put enforcement teeth into laws. If we pass a law but do not enforce it, as by under-funding it, then we should remove the law. If we want the SEC (Securities and Exchange Commission) to enforce laws against bad trading, or want the FDA to inspect food, then we have to give them enough money to do the job. Republicans since Reagan are notorious for under-funding agencies and projects. All that does is frustrate people and reinforce disrespect for law and governing. Any bill should come with a stipulation for the mandatory minimum funding needed to carry out the law adequately. Anything below that level and the law ends. It is not under-funded, it disappears. If the executive does not allocate stipulated funds and does not actually enforce a law, then the executive is subject to sanction and impeachment. If a law cannot be adequately funded from the start, it should never become law. This way, legislators know the implications of under-funding, and Presidents know what has to be done. This way, legislators actually have to budget. Of course, this way of doing things will not be adopted.

Do NOT Use the State to:

-The state should make sure all children who are able and have a good attitude get a basic education. The state cannot guarantee that all schools offer the same high quality education or that all children get the same funding for education. The state cannot guarantee that all children learn what they should because some children are not smart enough and-or they have a bad attitude, or parents, community, and social group have a bad attitude. The state cannot make all social groups, communities, parents, and children have a good attitude.

Parents and communities need to be the first people to make sure their schools are doing the job. If their schools are not doing the job well enough, parents and communities should not wait around for the state to come rescue them. Parents and communities have to accept that doing the job properly means that some children won't make it all the way through.

-The state cannot guarantee that everybody behave like a gentleman and gentlewoman. People are not like that, and we can't change human nature. We can make institutions so that most people, not all people, behave well enough.

-The state cannot provide free abundant health care for all. It can provide limited health care to all.

-The state cannot provide a free college education to everybody regardless of ability.

-The state cannot provide corporate welfare.

-The state cannot protect American business from overseas competition.

-The state cannot guarantee that most business succeeds, that most business people succeed in the long run. The state cannot guarantee that small business does as well as big business.

-The state cannot guarantee the American Dream. The state cannot guarantee that everyone will live well enough. The state cannot guarantee that all people will make enough to support a family and to send their children to college.

-The state cannot guarantee that wages won't stagnate as a result of the global economy.

-The state cannot support parents and children where the parents had children when the parents were too young. Do not support parents and their children when the parents have too many children. Do not support parents and children when the parents made no provision to have a job good enough to support their children.

-The state cannot support all people who claim a disability, especially a psychological disability.

-The state cannot enforce your morality such as to ban all abortion or to ban use of recreational drugs.

-The state cannot ban nearly all guns and gun parts, at least not in the United States now.

-The state cannot make people think of other minority groups as human like you. The state can enforce some kinds of fairness such as in job hiring but cannot enforce attitudes.

-The state cannot support private charities of any kind such as Planned Parenthood or United Way, even if those charities do good work, do work that the state might otherwise have to do such as abortions, and do the good work responsibly. If the state wishes the work to be done, it should allocate funds to do the work through state agents.

-The state cannot allow religious groups to opt out of taxes because those taxes are used to support actions that the religious groups disagree with such as abortion, birth control, and the military.

-The state cannot protect all species in the environment from extinction. The state cannot preserve nature as it was before humans. Don't try to preserve the environment just as it was. Figure what we can do to keep biodiversity and to keep as many species as we can in conditions as close to possible, and let some things go. We can and must maintain a system of healthy enclaves for nature such as national parks and forests. In some places, our national forests are in sad condition.

People who love nature should vigorously work through private agencies such as WWF and even Ducks Unlimited without expecting the state to help support those agencies.

-The state cannot provide a path to citizenship for all illegal immigrants.

-The state cannot protect ethnic and religious groups from the consequences of their own bad ideas and attitudes. If Black people wish to be angry, and do not cultivate love for education, then they have to pay the price. If some Muslims wish to remain apart and also do not cultivate education, they have to pay the price. If White Supremacists insist on endangering others, they should expect to spend most of their lives in prison.

-The state cannot guarantee a minimum wage if that minimum wage causes inflation.

-The state cannot guarantee a lifetime minimum income.

-The state cannot protect American workers from overseas competition.

-The American state cannot set up democracies all over the world. That is a great wish. Eventually the vast majority of the world must have successful government. But America alone cannot do this. We cannot expect people to adopt American style democracy immediate and well just because we kill their dictator for them.

-The American state cannot protect every group in the world that suffers from tyranny or discrimination.

-The state cannot adjust salaries so that salaries reflect what the work returns in the free market. The state cannot make business firms pay wages that equal the value of the contribution made by labor. This is what unions are for.

-The state can provide women with legal recourse in case women are discriminated against but the state cannot guarantee total equality or guarantee that everybody will have a good attitude.

-The state can provide to groups and individuals that are discriminated against, including women (see above), legal recourse to some extent. But the state cannot guarantee total equality or guarantee that everybody will have a good attitude.

-The state cannot make sure that all people of ability get someplace.

-The state cannot guarantee equality of outcome. The state cannot guarantee equality of opportunity although it can help.

-The state cannot make sure that all groups based on gender, ethnicity, place of origin, religion, age, etc. do the same in overall outcome. It can promote fairness but cannot guarantee fairness.

-The state cannot make sure that all particular attitudes that prevail in groups do not get in the way of doing well. If your group has a bad attitude, you have to live with it.

-The state cannot guarantee that all people of ability, with a good attitude, do well enough even if not all equally. To work toward “well enough” is better than to work toward equal outcome for equal ability but not even “well enough” can be guaranteed.

-The state cannot guarantee that differences in income and wealth decrease or even do not increase. The state cannot guarantee that differences are always based on merit and are not self-perpetuating. The state can take action when differences are so big as to cause overall problems and-or to cause more problems than benefit.

You May Use the State to:

-Make sure all children who are able and have a good attitude have a chance for a solid basic education.

-Provide health care coverage to everybody, but not comprehensive. Some conditions have to be not covered, or have limited coverage, depending on age and how well a person cares for him-herself.

-Support parents who prepared themselves for parenthood through education to allow them to get a job to support their children, did not have too many children, but met with a disaster such as illness or a car accident.

-Regulate some guns and gun parts.

-Provide limited universal retirement payments, including to home makers and other people who did not necessarily work much in paying jobs during their lifetimes. This can be done only if we can control inflation and costs.

-Recognize non-traditional couples such as male-male and female-female couples (male and female are here defined biologically and not culturally).

-Defend voters' rights.

-Guarantee a minimum level of safety and peace in all neighborhoods. You cannot guarantee safety and peace in neighborhoods where the people have a bad attitude and resort easily to crime and violence. To protect safety and peace requires being willing to spend the money.

-Protect the right to privacy and all that the right to privacy entails such as the right to an abortion under the right conditions.

-Protect worker safety.

-Protect public health,

-Regulate markets, in particular financial markets.

-The state may allow legal recourse to consenting adults who wish to do what they wish as long as they do not harm others, do not harm nature, and do not strain the public medical care system.

More on Private Initiative.

Somehow during the 1970s, people got the idea that private initiative was a Republican plot to make sure the state never helps anybody in public but still helps Republicans behind the scenes. The idea of private initiative is a way for Republicans not to give to groups that need help and a way to make sure any funds are always less than enough. It is a Republican way to make sure victims cannot climb out of poverty and discrimination enough to compete with Republican clients. Even if somewhat true, on the whole this view of private initiative is wrong, hurtful, and sometimes evil.

People need to learn to act regardless of the state and to stop waiting for the state. If your ethnic-religious-gender group as a whole won't help, then find enough people in your group who do help, do it with them, don't worry about the rest of the people in your group, and don't worry about the state.

In the late 1950s through early 1970s, Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, Black Muslims (before some of them killed Malcolm), and the social wing of the Black Panthers, did not wait for the state to do it all for them. Mothers against Drunk Driving did not wait. The marijuana lobby did not wait. If these groups had waited for the state, they would have vanished. They saw needs, and did what they could, then and there, with what they had. Often they did a better job than the state could have done, did it with fewer resources, and what resources they had were enough. Gay people did not wait for the state. Feminists did not wait. The vast majority of help for the planet and saving animals gets done by private initiative. All the groups try to get what they could from the state, especially legal protection and legal recognition, but they do not think that would solve all their problems and they do not wait for the state before they start. Just because they worked, and still work, on their own apart from the state does not mean they were in a Republican plot to make the state hurt the poor, downtrodden, and victims.

The view that you have to wait for the state is slave mentality. It is not the mentality of a free person. It is an excuse not to do anything, not to take responsibility, not to be a person, and not be a free person. It is the denial of your own personhood and freedom. It is an excuse to blame the power structure even when the power structure could care less and even when the power structure might wish you well. It is an excuse to blame anybody-and-everybody but yourself.

Yes, Republicans use the ideology of private initiative as an excuse not to help and to keep people down. But that does not mean the core of the idea is false and that you can't act on your own in a way that puts Republicans to shame. A lot of Republicans will admire you for it.

Taking responsibility for yourself and not waiting for the state is not the same as denying the economy has flaws and problems, denying that socio-economic class exists and self-perpetuates, there is poverty and hunger, and denying economic problems fall harder on some groups such as single mothers. Taking responsibility for yourself does not automatically validate false Republican ideas that all is hunky dory and the only source of problems is laziness and bad character. It does not excuse the evil in the world. Get over all these false ideas and excuses.

After a tornado or a hurricane, American neighbors don't wait for the state to come in and save them. They pitch in and help personally. Red Cross, Volunteers of America, and religious groups, often give far more aid than the state. That is the spirit that you want.

Look up Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church in Philadelphia. Look up Dr. Pollard, one of the leaders of that church. If you can, find a copy of the segment about the church on CBS TV on 21 July 2018. See what they have done and how. Imitate them. Do more.

I would like to see local communities take charge of their schools and make sure all their schools provide a good education. To do that, they have to accept some facts about human nature and human social nature, as, for example, not every kid is a genius, many kids won't make the next grade because already they can't do the work for this grade now, bad community attitude gets in the way, and a good attitude does not consist of screaming at your kids to do their school work. If your community as a whole won't save the school, band together with parents and make sure your children get a good education through a home schooling club. Unless you have to work three jobs just to put food on the table and pay the rent, you can do this.

Waiting for the state to make a voucher system that applies to you so you can send your kid to the good school for Whites and Asians on the other side of town is a wrong bad attitude. It validates the idea that poor people and non-Whites-non-Asians can't self-govern enough even to make a good school. Yes, if you have to wait for a state voucher, you have to do it. But, in the meantime, and the meantime can be decades, what do you do?

The attitude of the Democratic Party and most clients is to demean private initiative as never enough and as a Republican plot. You must do things through the Party and the state. You never can do enough on your own. You can only do enough through the Party and the state even if working through the Party and the state never does seem to do enough. Reject that Democratic stance. Reject slave mentality. The Democratic Party should reject that stance and reclaim private initiative for its own. It should lead the way in teaching people how to do things on their own regardless of the big state, the local state, the local community, or their supposedly deprived social group. The Democratic Party won't do so because the Party needs to keep all its clients dependent and dependent on it.

Equality of Wealth, and Who Pays.

-Contrary to deliberate Rightist propaganda, Democrats do not seek total equality of wealth. For a long time, many people, not just Democrats, have known that a situation of few very rich along with many poor is bad for a nation. Big differences in wealth lead to big differences in legal justice, social justice, and lifetime chances. Big differences in wealth are passed down to future generations and grow. Big differences in wealth cause problems.

Often, even in a modern diverse capitalist economy with a variety of jobs and incomes, many problems can be reduced, and welfare of the nation as a whole can increase, by taking some wealth away from the rich and giving to the poor – state forced redistribution. For a long time, people also have known that some wealth disparities are good and that totally equal wealth is not as good as some disparity or is outright bad. People know that big redistribution is bad. People do not want to take all the wealth of wealthy people; they do not want to “fleece the rich” or “soak the rich”. They want the rich to “pay their fare share” by paying a bit more in proportion as wealth goes up.

The problem is that Democrats cannot make a good case for how much less the poor should pay and how much more the rich should pay. The Democrats cannot come up with a workable believable plan for taxes and other government “taking and giving” that everyone can see is reasonably fair and that does not threaten to get out of control. So, all Democratic plans sound like “fleece the rich” even if that was never the intent and that would not be the result. All the programs sound as if they will hurt the overall welfare of the country. In that case, not even the middle class, who hope to be rich someday, can support the programs.

Individual Freedom.

-Democrats say they support personal autonomy and self-determination, as with freedom of religion, freedom to choose an abortion, and freedom of choice in the market. In fact, they are equivocal and they often support strong state intervention, especially in markets. For example, the Democratic Party favors strong regulation of many markets so as to protect poor people and consumers and the Party favors centralized medical care. But Democrats do not explain why they support freedom in some cases and state intervention in others. They do not say when we can rely on individual autonomy and choice and when we cannot, and why. Even when Democrats are correct, we need to know why, and the why should be part of a bigger view. As an exercise in political logic, they could start by explaining why we needed forced retirement savings in the form of Social Security, why Social Security has been a big success, and why similar programs might not work, especially private-only programs.

In theory, Democrats support de-criminalizing and legal leniency for some activities such as sex, and they support small sentences on some crimes, especially “victimless” crime such as prostitution and drug use. This view makes sense in terms of promoting personal autonomy and responsibility but that is not what Democrats argue. They simply pick some arenas in which to work for de-criminalization and leniency because those arenas are popular among clients. They overlook contradiction. Support of freedom in situations such as drug use and sex might undermine arguments that people are unable to choose and so are being exploited in other arenas such as in financial markets. If you can choose a drug

you ought to be able to choose a mortgage. Liberals do not think through (or state publicly) their view on individual autonomy and what their view implies. Why can people figure out sex but not mortgages? Sex and relationships are more complicated than mortgages. It is not clear why Democrats support minimal laws about activities other than that the laws about such crimes have often been used to attack the client groups of the Democratic Party, such as Blacks and women, so that minimizing legal control of the acts protects client groups of the Democratic Party. When Liberals seek to minimize laws about sex and drugs, it does not seem as if they are promoting individual freedom but instead are protecting their power and are attacking the families of working and middle class people. Protecting Blacks and women is a good motive but would be better if placed in a fuller context that includes believable ideas about individual freedom and responsibility.

Democrats traditionally tolerate non-traditional lifestyles including “Bohemianism”, non-traditional gender, non-traditional sex acts, and drug use. Yet this supposed tolerance of non-traditional lifestyles often is more of a philosophical wish than it is action to defend individual freedom. Democrats do not strongly pursue laws to allow individual free choice. Most clients of the Democratic Party, including ethnic groups such as Blacks, and many groups that the Democratic would like to win as clients such as working and middle class people with good jobs, condemn non-traditional sex and gender lifestyles, condemn abortion, condemn all pornography, and do not want freer use of drugs. If Democrats push too hard for lifestyle freedom they might lose some of their present clients and they can never win the working class and middle class back as clients. Verbally supporting lifestyle freedom but doing little to protect it seems like wanting to have it both ways.

Despite the ideal of individual autonomy and choice, Democrats favor regulation of markets to protect consumers and nature. These regulations would help consumers, and consumers need the help, but the regulations would also hamper business in some ways and would restrict consumers in some ways. The Republican Party has successfully painted all regulation as an attack on business and on consumer choice and benefit. The Democratic Party has not been adept at sorting out which rules might do more overall good than harm and so gaining support for skillful regulation.

While saying Democrats favor freedom of religion, in fact, Democrats look down on religion in general, on most particular religions, and especially on Christianity. In public, Democrats praise non-Christian religions and worshippers such as some religious ideas of some Native Americans, Buddhists, and some Muslims. In private, Democrats think any religion is merely a social and personal crutch, and sincere belief shows weakness of mind and character. Democrats are NOT waging a group war on Christianity. Individual Democrats merely ridicule it as a way of raising their own status among their peers. They do enable anti-religious zealots to go after all links between religion and the state as when anti-religious zealots wish to remove Christmas decorations from public areas. It is not clear if Democrats enable anti-religious zealots to attack religion as a way to annoy the Religious Right and the Christians who move to the Republican Party in the 1970s.

The Family.

-Please see material from Part 2 on the family.

For reasons that I can't go into here, nearly all Americans, Democrat and Republican, have returned to a religion of family. They might call it a return to Christianity, Islam, or Hinduism but it is more a return to religion of the family than to the core beliefs of the major religions. The family they have in mind is the idealized nuclear family from TV.

Even people who cannot live in this kind of a family still support this ideal. It is hard to win elections if your policies might somehow possibly in imagination weaken the idealized family. This situation is a problem for Democrats because some of their policies, such as gender freedom and freedom to choose abortion, support non-traditional families, non-families, and non-traditional gender choices. Working and middle class people take any policy that supports any non-traditional families and non-traditional gender as an attack on the idealized nuclear family and on all working and middle class families - even when support for non-traditional families and non-traditional gender does not harm working and middle class families and can help them. Working and middle class people take publicly supported freedom to choose abortion as an attack on the family, and so on the working and middle classes, even when they privately seek abortion sometimes. Working and middle class people take non-traditional families and non-traditional families as rivals. Whatever helps rivals of the working and middle class is thus an attack on the working and middle class. So Republicans are able to portray Democrats as against the family just at a time when the family is central in religion.

Some Democratic policies do support non-idealized non-traditional families and the policies might help those families compete with traditional families but that does not mean Democrats aim to attack the working class or middle class. Most Democratic policies also can help working and middle class families even when they help non-traditional families such as "Obama care". Some Democratic policies do support all families such as consumer protection and support for education. Democrats do a poor job explaining because their own ideas and goals are unclear to them.

It might not be possible to convince working and middle class families that non-traditional families are not their serious rivals, and not possible to convince working and middle families not to attack policies that support non-traditional families and non-traditional genders. Modern TV shows such as "Reba", "Modern Family", and "This is Us", help people to think more clearly. "Millenials" seem to be clearer about this situation. I don't know how to support a broad spectrum of family types without causing some types to be jealous of others and to seek political support against potential rivals. Both political parties will continue to exploit this situation. Democrats have to show how policies that appear to undermine the nuclear family, to undermine the working class, and middle class, do not undermine the family and those people. Democrats have to stress policies that support any family as supporting all families.

-Some particular Democrats genuinely feel for illegal immigrants, but mostly the Democratic Party (and various churches) supports immigration and supports helping illegal immigrants so the Party can recruit immigrants as a client group. With Hispanics, Democrats have been largely successful because not all

Hispanics climb the wealth-and-class ladder quickly but they do climb it quickly enough to have hope and to use the American political process. Democrats have not been as successful with immigrants that climb the ladder quickly such as well educated Muslims, Asian, and Hindus. Some clients, such as Blacks, view immigrants as a direct threat and wish the Democratic Party not to support recent immigrants, to hurt immigrants, and to protect current clients from immigrants. Some policies that benefit immigrants also benefits Blacks, such as more health care, help with employment and education, and lessening of laws about personal behavior (sex) and drugs, so these issues remains contested. Current Democratic clients want those policies to help them but not to help immigrants, and that is hard to do.

Real Acceptance and Real Help.

-Democrats have not thought through what real acceptance and real help mean. Democrats did not invent the idea of political correctness – the modern version goes back at least to John Calvin, and Republicans-Conservatives are giants of pseudo-moralistic judging. But Democrats did promote the modern version. PC Democrats are as moralistic, judging, and narrow-minded as any people. They are as conformist as any people I have met, and they enforce conformity. A group of Democrats all looking exactly alike and parroting the same views is normal. Democrats are equal to White Right Christians in conformity. Democratic upper middle class women, of all colors, are among the most moralistic and intolerant people that I have met. American Blacks are among the most condemning and intolerant people I have met. Democrats have never been able to explain why they tolerate some things, publicly tolerate but secretly condemn others such as sexual experimentation by their own children and sexist racist “hater” music by Blacks, yet openly condemn some other things such as guns and pornography. Because there is no believable obvious consistency, people assume Democrats use tolerance or moral indignation whenever one is more likely to help their agenda.

If a client group accepts the help of Democrats, a reasonable person would expect that client group to buy into some of the ideals, including tolerance and acceptance. Again, beyond the surface, that is not true. Blacks, Hispanics, groups of poor people, activist women, environmentalists, and most Democratic groups, have their own world view and group morality, and they want other people to live by those. They don't really think about how the various group views and moralities might get along or about the greater deeper principles they are supposed to share. They tolerate other groups within the umbrella of a big movement such as Civil Right and Environmentalism, or within the Democratic Party, so they can achieve their own goals. But they do not really respect other groups and would change other people if they could. How often do Blacks support environmentalists or women?

More on Costs.

-When thinking about giving help, we have to figure out how much help costs. We have to consider costs even when the appeal is highly moral. As I was writing this paragraph in April 2018, America had to think if we wished to go to war with Russia over an attack with gas by Syrian dictator Al Assad on his own people. How extensive should be our response, should we warn the Russians (we did not), should we avoid hitting Russians, and should we be ready to follow with more raids? In the international arena,

Democrats have about as much sense as Republicans over appeal versus cost but for domestic causes Democrats seem to have no sense. They simply don't consider how much it costs to help, whether we can afford it, and whether we should use resources in other ways. If they do make these calculations, they certainly don't tell them to their clients or make them public. When a Party does not carry out these calculations in public, then it can only seem that they don't care about the cost to the country as a whole because they would rather curry their clients. It can only seem that the Party puts the interests of the Party and the client above the interests of the Party as a whole.

Even if we do have enough resources to fund a particular cause, if helping is likely to cost considerably more than it gains, we should not help. If you are likely to get hit by a car running into the street to save a mouse, you should stay put. Likely you would run to save a child. You can figure out some in-between cases yourself. How about your dog? How about a strange cat? This sounds cold but it is not. When we figure cost and benefit, we can see the money cost somewhat and we can claim the moral benefit even it is not likely to happen. Yet it is hard to figure the practical gain to the country and hard to figure out the moral cost. It is easy to see the money cost if we gave everybody satellite TV access and a big TV (or a giant gas-guzzling SUV and free gas for life), voters would vote for our Party if we did, and we could excuse such stupidity by saying it is for national defense. But we should stop to figure out the practical gains and losses to the country and we should see the damage to the American character. The gain does not justify the cost. To me, the moral cost is greater than the practical cost. Any Party with any scheme needs to do this figuring and do it in public. Democrats will not. When they will not, it can only seem they don't care because they put themselves and their clients above the national interest. Even if that is not true, it seems that way.

When a Party will not make these calculations domestically, then all its calculations internationally are necessarily called into question and invalidated, even if its calculations are rational and correct. When you lose your reputation, you lose your reputation. When you lose your reputation, naturally the other Party seems valid by comparison even if the other Party is made up of bleating demonic goats.

Rights and Responsibilities (Duties) 1.

Citizens and residents of a democracy have both rights and responsibilities (duties). Neither rights nor duties are more important than the other. Neither can work without the other.

It seems people in America now stress rights far more than responsibilities. They don't stress rights as in a democracy. They stress the "right" to get something, an advantage, a gain, treat, or power. They use "rights" as a mere tool. They use "rights" as a symbol of which side they are on and of their power in the battle of sides and culture. They overlook responsibilities that come with each right and overlook duties in general. They don't care about the place of their particular right in the whole system of rights, duties, and citizenship. The idea of responsibilities and duties has been lost because it is a strategic detriment, an anti-tool, an annoying impediment. This abuse is true even of real rights such as to vote, privacy, not to be harassed, and to respect as a person; and to duties that go with them. They treat a state payment such as from welfare as if it were a right equal to the right to vote. The modern idea of

rights is one of the biggest examples of how “political correctness” has correct ideas in theory but is hurtfully abused in practice. It shows why people hate PC. The modern idea of rights is one of the biggest abused tools in reverse discrimination and in manipulation by self-styled disadvantaged groups. The modern idea of rights erodes the true ideas of civil rights, ethnic equality, gender equality, privacy, dignity, etc. I am not only a grumpy old man here. Something did change in the 1970s and after. Think of ads for lawyers on TV hinting you can live easy for life at your neighbor’s expense because you pricked your finger on his-her roses.

Republicans say Democrats are entirely and only to blame. Democrats and their clients stress “rights”, and they always-and-only stress rights as mere “give me”, without caring about real rights, real duties, and citizenship. “My rights are big while yours are small, my rights always win over yours, and you pay to enforce my rights. Any dispute between us is not about facts or about real competing rights; it is always-and-only about you not granting me my full rights, my due respect, and some reward in power or material goods to express my rights or to make up for any abuse. Any fault you see in my group is never a fault in my group but always is a bias that you carry so you can take my rights, take what I want. When I say the rights of my group have been damaged I mean I have not gotten what I want. I use the rights of my group to get what I need. Any problem my group has is due always-and-only to another group taking our rights, it is never our fault. I have no responsibilities when I assert my full rights as an individual or through my group.” Some Democratic clients do seem to lie compulsively, tell silly lies that nobody could believe but expect the lie to be accepted, and seem unable to tell truth from lie; this business about rights is one of those. People who claim an “entitlement” such as welfare or SSD, claim to have been disrespected in a restaurant, or abused by police, often look more to gain or a satisfaction than to make sure the system of rights and duties is carried out fully and fairly for all.

In contrast: “All Republicans always deeply appreciate duty and the need for citizens to carry out their duties. All Republicans assert rights only when a right also serves general good. We always see rights in the context of a system of rights, responsibilities, and citizenship.” In fact, most people that stay in the military for a long time do feel a sense of true duty, and tend to be Republicans or to get Republicanized while in the military. Working and middle class Republicans seem more likely to work for the whole community than do people in other groups. There is some truth to what Republicans accuse Democrat clients of and what they brag about themselves, more so since the “nanny” state.

There is enough misunderstanding of rights and duties, enough shirking of duties, and enough abuse of rights, to accuse people in both Parties, and the abuse shapes both Parties. People are selfish regardless of Party, selfishly neglect their duties, and are selfish in their abuse of rights. Often enough, Republicans put property rights, social order, and urban “development” above the right of poor people to live in their own old neighborhoods, and they use the big bad state to overwhelm the rights of individuals to do it. Using tobacco is not a right equal to the right to a fair trial. Sorting out this issue quickly turns into a big treatise. That is not the goal here. Instead, I ask you to do the work.

Start with a simple idea. All rights have responsibilities, responsibilities usually entail some rights, and responsibilities often allow some privileges. If you own a house, you have to keep up the sidewalk, and

sometimes portions of the street, in front of your house. You have a duty to take care of your garbage and not to make the neighborhood dirty or loud. To take care of your own house gives you the right to the same from neighbors and the community in general. If you own a gun, you have duties to know how to use it correctly, not to use it badly, to protect it so that cannot be abused such as by children or by a temporarily angry person, and to make sure that only similarly responsible people own guns. Think about each right and each entitlement, such as the right to vote, housing, be served in a restaurant, respect from the police, welfare, Social Security, etc. If people don't live up to the duties, can they keep the right? I think not.

Focus on the duties that go along with particular rights. If a child has a right to an education, do his-her parents have a duty to make sure their particular school is a good school, without foisting off that duty on the state or on "other" people? If people in an area want a quality education for their children, and a quality education can succeed only if the community has the right attitude, who has the biggest duty to make sure the community provides the right background attitude? If well-educated children are essential to a democracy, the economy, and to preventing bad character, then do people have a duty to help schools even out of their area? If a person has the right to welfare, what duties does he-she have, including the strict legal requirements but beyond those as well? Allow that a person has the right to own a business firm. Does the owner have the duty to serve all people? Which people can the owner exclude? Do women really have a right to equal pay for equal work or comparable work? I think they do. Then what responsibilities do women have in claiming the right, and what responsibilities do they have when they get the wages? If women and LGBTQ people (gays) claim they are mistreated as second class citizens, and claim the right to full recognition and acceptance, then what responsibilities do they have when they get that right? Do (illegal) immigrant "Dreamers" really have a right to stay in America? If they do, what responsibilities go along with the right? If staying here is a privilege rather than a right, but a privilege that many Americans would grant, then what responsibilities go along with the privilege? What duties do gun owners have other than keeping most guns locked up in a box most of the time? I think being a professional in America, such as a professor, teacher, doctor, lawyer, dentist, police officer, soldier, or accountant, gives status, and the status entails some responsibilities that other people don't have. What are the responsibilities, and do these people really carry them out? If we have a right to use nature, what duties do we have toward nature? When people claim a right but overlook duties, what do they really wish for?

Now think about Republicans and Democrats. Which rights and duties do they stress and which do they overlook? Which rights do they claim without accepting the responsibilities? I write a little more about how Republicans make mistakes about rights and duties in the part below about Republicans.

The primary duty always is to be an informed citizen capable of assessing candidates and issues, and to make a good choice. If you have the right to vote, you must be ready to vote adeptly. In a world closer to the ideal than this world, if people did not fulfill their duty to be informed, I would take away their privileges (rights) as citizens. In this world, few of us live up to our duty to be informed but we cannot take away all privileges and rights merely because we are not fully perfect. How many people know all the "stuff" from sections on the economy at the start of this essay, why don't they know it, and should

they still have the right to vote if they don't know it? You don't have to agree with me about those issues, but you should know the material. Think how far away a person can fall from being a good adept citizen and still enjoy the privileges of being a citizen such as the "right" to vote. Think about how we would assess.

Make Sense, Again, and in Anticipation.

I mentioned "make sense" above, and use "make sense" in the history parts of this essay on Liberals.

Democrats think they make sense but they don't, or at least not to most people who are not already in the Party or a client. Even to clients, Democrats don't make general sense; Democrats make sense as a group with power that is most likely to bring the client benefits, protection, or help to avoid a loss. That is not enough.

To make sense in governing of a nation, a party has to see the big picture of national welfare. It has to balance morality and practicality in service to the greater national welfare. It does have to hear moral appeals but it has to know when a response to a moral appeal simply costs too much in terms of money, what is foregone, and effects on national character. It has to prioritize moral appeals and costs. It has to know which group comes first, second, third, or last, and how much any group gets. It has to know when the sum total of responses costs too much even if the response to each moral appeal seems fair and seems not to cost too much. It has to say "no" and "wait" to clients. It has to say "you ask too much in the current world". Because most appeals are moral, and morality and attitude are tied, a party has to assess the attitudes of its client groups and take that into account. It has to set clients straight when they have a bad attitude or has to refuse them when they will not change their bad attitude.

Democrats appear to do none of this. Even when they do it, the general consensus is that they do not. Democrats don't make sense. Republicans claim they do all of this. Of course, they are no better than Democrats, but they have a reputation for being so. The public believes Republicans do make sense. To see the unfair but real weirdness, think how Republicans do not control fringe gun rights advocates and about the attitude of fringe gun rights advocates. Think how Republicans fail with White Supremacists. Yet Republicans always seem to make sense while Democrats do not. On top of what I say below, you think out why Democrats have a bad reputation (undeserved) while Republicans have a good reputation (also undeserved).

If a political party screws up prioritizing and "gives away the house (farm)" on a few big issues, then the party will lose its reputation for making sense, maybe forever. Even when the party does make sense on other issues, big and small, and makes more sense than rivals, still it will not be seen as making sense. Once a party loses its reputation, the bad reputation sullies everything, and the party can rarely get back a good reputation. People might turn to this party for help, or because the other party is in really bad shape as with Republicans and Trump, but people do not really go back to this party for sense and they will leave the party again when the other party is more sensible.

Not only Westerners but many people tend to think in terms of Reason versus Emotion, although that idea is said through various metaphors (“hot heart, head, blood, guts versus cold heart, head, blood, guts”, “long guts versus short guts”, or “long fuse versus short fuse”). In myth, women are emotional, nurturing when not corrupt, and devious. Men are rational, straight, and strict. Once a woman loses her reputation, she is lost forever and must use guile, as with Lucy and Ricky Ricardo. When one woman loses her reputation, most of the other women in the neighborhood now look like angels by comparison even if they do a lot of secret kissing and “heavy petting”. Democrats are now the irrational emotional corrupted party that is vulnerable to emotional pleas and has to use guile while Republicans are the reasonable morally upright party that wins with logic and candor. Maybe only a woman who was a girl in the 1940s or 1950s can know how deeply annoying this frame is. This kind of discrediting is part of what happened to Democrats but only part.

Unfortunately, Democrats perpetuate the discrediting by continuing to make big mistakes.

We need a national health care system, more than what we got with “Obama Care”. Especially with rising costs, to run a national health care system correctly, we have to know when to say “no” and “enough”. We have to know when to say “learn to live with it”, “here is a long-term prescription for morphine”, or “we can help you die if you wish”. That is what the French and Canadians do, and it works. Democrats won’t do this. They won’t face reality. They hint they can give everything to everybody. People know Democrats can’t give everything to everybody and Democrats some people have to be denied care and so die. Republicans, Sarah Palin was outstanding, were able to convince people that Democrats would set up secret “death panels” even when Democrats never suggested anything like that. The Republican answer is no national health care at all, in which case poor people themselves have to decide they can no longer bankrupt the future of all the grandchildren to make granny live another week. Just as many people die under Republican practice now as ever would under die Democratic plans in the future, and the practice now seems far crueler, but Democrats get all the blame while Republicans get all the praise. If you don’t face up to issues fully and deal with them fully in the open, then you get what the Democrats got, and you deserve it.

One foundation of making sense is the rule of law. A Party cannot play fast and loose in applying the rule of law. That is how we get “banana republics” and Vladimir Putin. There are modest exceptions. Mercy and humanity play a part in law. But still we cannot get too loose. Sometimes we have to be cruel to keep the system that serves us all well. The TV show “Law and Order” examined this dilemma well in many episodes. The rule of law applied to President Nixon and it will apply to President Trump and his cronies when their time comes. If we wish to apply it to them, we have to apply it elsewhere as well. Democrats have a reputation for applying rule of law selectively and for not appreciating the rule of law in general. Rule of law applied selectively is not rule of law. Democrats don’t make sense over the rule of Law. That is why, in the 1970s and 1980s, the Republicans billed themselves as they party of Law and Order, and where the TV show got its name.

Illegal immigration ebbs and flows with prosperity in the United States, so, while the US was not doing well economically from about 2007 to 2014, sometimes more illegal Hispanics went back to their own

countries (especially Mexico) than came to the US. Still, the situation with illegal immigration is bad. We have to make sure illegal immigration stops, and we have to deport a fair number of people who are here illegally now. We have to put in jail people who hire illegal immigrants, including the officers of business firms who might not personally have done the hiring. If we do not do all this, we abandon rule of law too much. We do not have to be cruel for fun. We can show correct mercy to children who came here young and who were born here. We can allow their parents to stay to but no other kin. We have to stop "chain migration". But Democrats refuse to see this need. They do not refuse because they really don't see but because they wish to get and keep all Hispanics as clients. They imply everyone can stay for any reason now and in the future. Again, they try to give everything to everyone. They throw rule of law out the window for mere political gain. When Democrats support "sanctuary cities" and the selective enforcement of law, they do NOT come across as merciful and humane. They come across as conniving and selfish. Some proposals by individual Democrats make sense but those are not the ideas of the Party as a whole. It seems Democrats simply want to allow all illegal immigrants to stay here, thus to encourage more to come, and to allow all who come in the future to stay. This does not make sense. If this is not what Democrats propose, then they need to make clear, and believable, what they do propose, why it would work, and why it is best.

Individual Democrats have offered some reasonable ideas on gun control such as background checks and harsh penalties for using a gun in a crime. But that is not what people think of when they think of gun control from Democrats. People think Democrats wish to take all guns from everybody right now. Some of the perception is due to Republican evil propaganda but not all. Republican propaganda fills a vacuum left by Democrats. Most Democrats cannot offer anything remotely reasonable to American ears. Democrats cannot come up with good proposals because they refuse to see that gun control is not one problem, about one social group, with one solution for all, but that gun control is several problems, over several social groups, each of which requires a different solution. Democrats won't see the whole problem because at bottom they don't care about guns and gun crime. They care about getting past this particular horrendous incident and about not looking bad to the people that deplore all the incidents and blame guns. They care about feeling righteous by attacking a straw enemy just as many people that fight abortion really care more about feeling righteous and won't think out realities. Democrats don't want to alienate any clients such as Blacks-in-general who see Blacks use guns in Black on Black crime. This is weaseling and it does not make sense. Republicans come across as reasonable simply by doing nothing, defending what is now, and saying they defend the Constitution – all the while really also only grooming clients. (Gun problems include: school shootings, other mass shootings, terrorist shootings, shootings based on social groups such as religion and gender, general crime such as armed robbery, personal murders such as of one spouse murdering another, gang crime, drug crime, human trafficking crime, inner city crime mostly of Black on Black, inner city crime of short term temper mostly of Black on Black, and crime about guns and gun trafficking, at least).

When Democrats fail in this way on this many major issues, then they fail by default on all issues. They stop seeming to make sense even when they do make sense.

This point will anger people: The Democratic Party is the Party for modern women. Women are still trapped in the “good girl versus bad girl” complex, as partly noted above. Enough Americans still see women as irrational, emotional, and not making sense. Enough Americans still see activist women, modern women, working women, and feminists as bad girls, that is, as somewhat immoral as well as not making sense or as over-bearing, pushy, and selfish and so as not making enough sense. So, when the Democratic Party sides with those women, it sides with bad girls, and reinforces its image as a fallen irrational sappy Party. This view of modern women as bad girls will change as women of both parties get political and economic power. All the “feisty” girls and women, and all the women not in need of a man to save them, in the media, are a good sign of the change. I am not sure if most modern women will then become the good girls and, if the change in how Americans in general view women will save the Democratic Party. I am doubtful.

The Democratic Party is a little like the “crazy hyper-feminist hyper-PC ex-girlfriend” that you really don’t want to hang around with regularly but you like to see every once in a while, not to have sex, but because she is fun and being around her does lead to some good ideas and good times for a while. Democrats sometimes seem to wish to live up to that image. Mostly, though, they are like the smart ex-girlfriend that was good at helping you with your literature homework when you were in school or with your legal case work now that you are out in the real world.

Apart from whether any policies of either Party make sense, people tend to judge all the policies and the whole Party on their view of the character of people in the Party. Valid or not, people link good moral character with making sense and link bad moral character with not making sense – despite decades of stories about anti-heroes, rebels, bad boys, bad girls, social inversions, and moral inversions. People see Democrats as somewhat immoral (really more morally careless) and so not to be trusted to make sense while they see Republicans as doggedly moral and so to be trusted to make sense. People know most so-called Democratic amorality is posing and silly playing. But they have seen enough harm come from it that they are wary. When the time comes, the wild girl (young woman) in college is the un-cool old-fashioned mom. People know that, in real life, Republicans drink too much, pop pills, and chase their neighbor’s spouse but people still think Republicans have the correct long term values in mind, and so Republicans still make more sense overall even apart from moral values.

Repeat: To govern well, to make sense, a party needs a believable coherent practical and moral world view, a sense of a better America, a better world, and the role of America in the better world. Neither Democrats nor Republicans have this believable world view but Republicans fool people that “business” alone can do the trick while Democrats fool nobody about any ideology. Nobody fully accepts any world view offered by Democrats even if particular people have sympathy for some particular projects such as saving hungry children and sympathy for partial views such as social justice. When a party does not have a sufficient world view, it cannot make sense, no matter how good some of its particular projects and ideas. People feel this lack in Democrats, and their feeling reinforces all the other ways in which Democrats do not make sense.

When a party stops making sense in the eyes of the public, then people in the party feel they don't have to make sense, and they actually do stop making sense. Party officials stop expecting clients to make sense or to be able to tell sense from nonsense. Officials start feeding clients whatever works to keep allegiance. Clients know they don't have to make sense to get what they wish for, that emotion often works better than sense, and so stop offering sense. Everyone falls back on appeals to emotion and on superficial morality. It is a self-fulfilling prophecy and a vicious circle.

This all happens with Republicans too for some issues in the culture wars but that dollop of craziness does not undermine the general view of the whole Party as making enough sense. People don't expect Republicans to make sense about gay rights, Christianity, Muslims, or even outsourcing, but still think the Party as a whole does make sense. If the new Republican Party makes enough big stupid mistakes such as the huge tax break for rich people of 2017, ignoring the pain of the working and middle classes, rejecting all help with health care, building a wall on the Mexican border, or renegeing on the Iran nuclear deal, then maybe eventually enough people also will see Republicans as despoiled, emotional, a bit too immoral, irrational, and not making sense. Oddly, that is how the Trump Republicans see the old guard such as Mitch McConnell and Paul Ryan; I think the Trump Republicans are more that way than the old guard. Even then, such a change will not necessarily lift Democrats back to rational moral practical visionary making sense.

I do not offer suggestions as to how Democrats can make up for lost ground except that they had better begin making thorough sense even if it costs them support from some clients.

Christianity.

-The Democratic attitude toward Christianity is complicated and unfortunate. I cover some of this topic in the history parts of this essay so here I say only what is needed.

The Democratic attitude comes from an older Liberal attitude. Liberals were cautious about any claims that could not be verified by science-like methods: by public demonstration, by clear logic from other publicly validated scientific laws, or believable historic reporting. Any claims against obvious common sense were to be doubted unless verified by science-like evidence or trustworthy authorities. Liberals did not doubt everything unusual. Science came up with unusual facts and ideas such as that lightning is only huge electric sparks (Ben Franklin) or Jupiter and Saturn have moons (Galileo). When an unusual fact or idea was not backed by science-like evidence, Liberals said: there was no reason to believe it if it contradicted other established scientific laws and facts; there was no reason to believe if it contradicted common sense and was not supported by science; there was no reason to believe if it was not needed for other serious ideas such as morality; and, if it contradicted good morality, that was reason to doubt.

Most religious claims such as miracles are not needed to support good morality. Some claims, such as there are bad witches, lead to bad acts based on bad morality, and so we should not believe them. Liberals rejected the need for many of the claims in Judaism and Christianity such as that God stopped the sun from going around the Earth so Joshua had more daylight in which to win a battle, or that Jesus

raised Lazarus from the dead. Some Liberals said the claims were false while some (most) Liberals just said the claims were irrelevant and so we need not decide them or believe them. Humans tend to think anything we need not accept or decide is in effect false and to be rejected, so the de facto position got to be “false” on all the supernatural claims of Christianity, leaving pretty much only the morality.

Other people took all Liberals to say that all religions are false and bad even when most Liberals did not mean that. Other people did this as an over-reaction to protect their own beliefs, an over-reaction that is as harmful as un-critical condemnation of religion. I say more about morality and the supernatural in other places, so I do not say more here.

The Liberal stance does not mean Liberals rejected the morality of Judaism or Christianity. Most Liberals were strong proponents of that morality, and were even content to say that morality and God had some kind of close relation.

At the time Liberals were developing their view, the only real religion of importance to them in Europe and the Americas was Christianity. So the default position got to be that Christianity has too many false claims, it is not literally true, and people could be good by accepting the morality of Christianity without accepting any of its claims about the supernatural or accepting any claims about the supernatural from any source. That got to be a kind of chic stance among Liberals. It lingers in academic Liberals today. It is not strictly true but it is true enough for here. Especially after a religious revival starting about 1820, the default position among far too many Christians got to be: “Liberals are amoral or immoral, hate Christianity and Christians, use spurious so-called logic to attack Christianity and Christians, never see any of the virtues in Christianity or Christians, Christianity is true no matter what Liberals say, Christians have to believe no matter what, and Christians have to defend Christianity in any way we can including strong emotion and use of the state”. Not all Churches took this stance. Some big Churches, including the Roman Catholic Church, took reasoned Liberalism (not silly knee-jerk attack of all Christianity and all religion) as a worthy challenge, worked to develop sensible defenses of religion and Christianity, and worked to merge reason with belief and morality. Sadly, most Churches including big Churches such as the Roman Catholic Church still try to use the state to promote their morality.

Then, beginning in the late 1800s, came some unfortunate turns.

First, beginning with academics, the idea that Christianity is false, silly, not needed, and a delusion of the masses became entrenched. Not only were Christians wrong but they were fools. It was chic to disdain Christianity and Christians. Academics used Christians as foils to make themselves feel better, much as genders and races use others to make themselves feel better. As the 1900s went on, more people went to college and so more young people were indoctrinated with a tacit disdain for Christianity, Christians, and formal religion. In response, Christians saw the Liberals as immoral fools deceiving the masses and corrupting all of Western civilization. Christians used a caricature of Liberalism to make themselves feel better, excuse themselves, explain why everything went wrong, and as an all-purpose straw dog.

Second, strong world events, such as World Wars 1 and 2, the Great Depression, pollution, the demise of nature, plagues, hunger, socio-economic classes, racism, and religious wars, undercut belief in old traditional religion, including especially Christianity. Christianity had no answers or few answers. “The Devil Did It” was not acceptable when we could see human hands on triggers, axes, conveyor belts, and bags of poison. The events hit Westerners hard because we had made so much progress in other ways but could not seem to get out of savagery and could not seem to help people see the light.

Third, Westerners encountered religions other than Judaism and Christianity. In particular, they met Eastern religions such as Buddhism, Hinduism, and Taoism. In contrast to Christianity, these religions became chic. I do not go into why and how academics and self-styled “free thinking” people could scorn Christianity yet be fascinated by other religions. The easy half-right answer, good enough for here, is that people need religion, the West scorned Christianity, but Westerners still needed some religion, so they turned to ideologies that they could twist to suit their fantasies.

Fourth, Westerners developed views that could serve as alternatives to religion or that undercut parts of religion by explaining them away as merely something else. Communism became increasingly a force after about 1900. After World War 2, trendy Westerners followed Existentialism – I can’t here explain it. Beginning after World War 1, deep psychology, usually a Freudian version but there have been many, explained away religion by saying, for example, that God is nothing but a stern father writ large and the Virgin Mary is nothing but the pre-adolescent view of a kind mother writ large. Anthropologists explain how religious patterns follow social-cultural patterns and the two can reinforce each other, so religion does not have any independent truth even if it serves as a template for society. Religion in the Middle Ages both followed and set the template for European Feudal Society. Biologists explained how people do not see the world exactly as it is, and how our modest distortions can lead to belief in ghosts, spirits, gods, angels, and witches.

Fifth, both chic Western intellectuals and anti-rational belief-only Christians developed an anti-science bias. These people not only ignored science except to gain from it (everybody loves iPods and cell phones), they said science was wrong and evil. They said it was evil in different ways but they still it was evil. Normally these two camps (chic intellectuals and purposely irrational religious believers) hate each other more than they hate anything else but in this one cause they came together. They reinforced each other. The chic intellectuals gave the anti-rational believers tools to use against science and against rational thought. Republicans were allied with the anti-rational old believers by default but not all Republicans liked this turn. They do not like biting the hand that feeds them, and they do not like militant anti-rational anti-science craziness. They are happy to separate realms and some Republicans even try to keep the best of both realms while minimizing contradictions. Lacking a deep foundation, Democrats did not know what to make of this mess, and sometimes went along with the chic intellectual anti-rational bias. But they also sensed that the anti-rational basis anti-science propaganda supported the far Religious Right of the Republicans and so Democrats did not go too far. This is another case where the middle of Democrats and Republicans overlaps and both middles oppose the extreme but neither Party will open their eyes to reality and say what needs to be said.

Large Christian Churches, such as the Roman Catholic, never participated much in the anti-rational anti-science wave, despite what academics think. They respect the need for rationality and science even though they also stress the need for belief. There were semi-crazy groups in all the Churches that did rail against rationality and science but they never carried the whole Church, and they do not seem as strong now in the big Churches.

It is not necessary to hate rationality and science to hate what we have done to the planet and to hate the abuses that stem from capitalism and militarism. In fact, hating rationality and science only gets in the way of understanding fully and being able to find good responses. The answer is not to stop science and technology but to use them better. To use them better you have to know them.

Sixth, the above points tended to happen more with people who had Democratic backgrounds. Until about the 1990s, people who went to college tended toward Democratic-style politics. So, scorning Christianity and Christians got associated with Democrats. On the flip side, holding to Christianity got associated with Republicans. I do not go into why having traditional religion is linked with well-to-do people and with the secure working and middle classes. Not only did Republicans come to think of themselves as Christians but, especially after the middle 1970s, they came to think of themselves as anti-Liberal (anti-Democrat) Christians in the sense above without falling entirely for the anti-rational anti-science belief-only stances of the Religious Right. Some Democrats did make fun of Christians while adopting non-traditional beliefs; and some Republicans did deliberately reinforce their belief in old style anti-rational belief-only literally-Bible Christianity. But, in fact, most Democrats retain much of Christian belief, especially as they marry and raise children, and most Democrats do not scorn Christians or Christianity. Republican intellectuals, such as Bill Bradley (Firing Line) and political theorists such as the Neo-Cons that were strong under George W. Bush, hardly seem to be traditional Jews or Christians, or even properly religious.

One shameful lapse backward by Republicans is the denial of global climate change, in which otherwise rational Republicans ally with the irrationality of the Religious Right. They shameless use anti-science anti-rationality to attack sound arguments. They shamelessly use bad data to create their own fantasy arguments. They do not do this because they disbelieve in science but because they wish an excuse to get whatever profits they can now before the bottom falls out. That is a lot of hypocrisy. This is why attacking science hurts nature in the long run.

Because Democrats recruit from among underdogs, outsiders, and minorities, Democrats made a point to say non-Christian religions such as Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism are good and should be respected, even while Democrats still made fun of Christianity. Democrats extol the Black Church in America even while making fun of churches with mostly Whites. Democrats know so little about Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism that their assessments of those religions make little sense but people got the public appeal to tolerance anyway. When praise of non-Christian non-Jewish religions comes from a real desire to be inclusive and broad-minded, it is very good. When it comes of ignorance and desire to recruit clients, it is not necessarily bad but it is not the good it claims. When it is combined with scorn of Christianity, it is bad, and the good intentions behind it cannot make up for the bad. I do not guess how Democrats and

academics justify the hypocrisy of scorning Christianity but extolling non-Christian religions, and of scorning churches with White members but extolling all the Black church(es). Republicans see this hypocrisy clearly, and it makes them “double down” on their defense of Christianity even while they try not to offend non-Christians. Blacks also see the hypocrisy and know it means that Democrats praise their church(es) and Democrats ally with Blacks as a political ploy, not out of a deep bond or deep respect for Jesus and his Church. Non-Christians also see the hypocrisy and know it means the same.

Sensing an opportunity, Republicans force Democrats to say publicly that they think traditional religions, especially Christianity, cannot be literally true and that people who believe it to be literally true cannot be fully rational. Pushing Democrats into that corner is not fair but Democrats will always be susceptible until they think out their own views, can explain their own views, and can deal with the hypocrisy that comes of playing the client game.

I enjoy my roots in traditional Christianity, and I follow the teachings of Jesus, but I am not a Christian according to standard views that rely on the Trinity. I have read about religions and I lived for eight years in a good Buddhist country with some terrific monks. I believe that morality and the supernatural are intimately related, so that one strongly implies the other, but they are logically separable. So, I “get it from all sides”: Christians get mad at me, anti-Christians get mad at me, and people in other religions get mad at me. That is why I feel confident in what I said above. Academics treat me like an imbecile, a dupe, a bit dangerous, prone to rely on emotions not logic, a religious zealot in intellectual disguise, and not to be trusted around children and dogs. Christians and Republicans treat me like their false stereotype of a Liberal who hates God and Jesus no matter how much I defend both, as a dupe of clever Democratic-Liberal ideologies, an imbecile, and not to be trusted around children and dogs.

There has never been, there is not now, and likely there never will be, a war on Christianity. The scorn that some Lefties have for traditional-religion-in-general-and-Christianity-in-particular does not amount to a war on Christianity. Mostly it amounts to a war on their own intellects and souls. The purging of religious items from public areas, especially from state-owned areas, is sad but reasonable, and it does not amount to a war on Christianity. We really can’t run America on the basis of any one religion even if there can be no doubt that Christianity played a big role in the growth of America. PC stupidity such as mandatory “Happy Holidays” instead of “Merry Christmas” is silly and regretful but also is not a war on Christianity. Try to tailor greetings not to offend, but, if you have a good heart, and you accidentally say “Merry Christmas” to a non-Christian, I am sure he-she will forgive. Jews put up with it for hundreds of years. If a Muslim greeted me with “May Allah guide you”, I would be happy. The current trend of the courts to allow religious art and the symbols of religion for historical value is the right way to go. Non-Christians, especially atheists, need to develop thicker skins. Christians, especially the Republicans who defend Jesus for political reasons rather than from true sympathy for his teachings, need to grow thicker skins, bigger brains, and bigger hearts. Everyone needs to grow up and lighten up.

Democrats, as individuals, really do need to figure out their own beliefs and to confront their hypocrisy about religion, values, and politics.

Should Democrats and self-styled Liberals stop disdaining Christianity out of modern chic, look hard at their own morality, consider relations between morality and the supernatural, give Christianity and all religions their due, and start living according to decency and maybe according to the teachings of Jesus? Sure. Should Republicans stop thinking their convenient institutional Christianity or born again version of Christianity is real Christianity, stop thinking Jesus loves them more, stop using their false Christianity to feel superior, stop using their false Christianity as an excuse to abuse others, learn about all religions and give them their due, consider real morality, live according to decency, and live according to the teachings of Jesus? Sure. I have no idea how to bring this about. If Jesus, Confucius, the Buddha, Mohammad, etc. could not do it, then I can't.

Bad Political Correctness (PC) versus Good Morality.

-This section only introduces the topic. I love the ideas behind PC but hate the practice, as I love old Liberal and Conservative ideals but hate the practice of Democrats and Republicans. People don't see PC as the correct application of rules to make life fairer and better but the bad misuse of rules to make people feel worse and so to control people. PC is another aspect of the same bad conscience that leads to reverse discrimination. Just as reverse discrimination hurts race relations, so PC hurts the underlying ideas of fairness that it is supposed to promote.

PC is superficially correct moral ideas that are used not primarily because they are moral and correct but as a tool to show power and to control other people. It is modern "holier than thou". Some form of PC has been around a long time. I trace the roots of modern PC to John Calvin.

Republicans have a version of PC, as bad as the Democratic version. While in a group of Republicans, say the following and see what happens: "Ronald Reagan began the modern phase of irresponsible selfish bad deficit spending that has bankrupted America. He began the immoral harmful idea that the free market alone could cure everything, and so people did not have to take personal responsibility. He began the idea that the state is all-immoral even while he greatly expanded the state. He began the modern version of corporate welfare."

The problem is not morality as such. All morality guides and restricts acts. So do all ideologies and ideas including those that say not to be governed by ideologies or "herd morality". The issue is whether the guidance is good guidance to good ends.

Why then do Democrats get blamed for PC while Republicans get a free pass on their moralistic huff? Partly because everybody expects Republicans to be hypocritical up-tight conniving selfish moralists but expects Democrats not to be that way. People expect better but don't get it. People expect the Right Wing to be moral scolds but not Democrats. Yet that is what they get.

Democratic style PC is the natural outgrowth of Democratic confusion over equality under the law with absolute sameness, and vice versa. It is the natural outgrowth of confusion about what diversity-and-inclusion really means and how it relates to equality under law. It is the natural outgrowth of the fact

that some Democratic groups really don't get along. It is the natural outgrowth of groups using ideas such as equality under the law and inclusion-and-diversity as tools for their benefit without real regard for the underlying principles or the fate of others. It is the natural outgrowth of the fact that Democrats have a silly ideal of human nature in theory and are hypocritical in practice about human nature. Unless Democrats can come to grips with equality under the law, same and different, diversity and inclusion, the fact that groups differ, and the fact that some groups don't get along, then Democrats are doomed to pernicious PC.

As with the Democratic attitude about Christianity and other religions, Democratic PC is a contradiction that entails hypocrisy. Democrats are supposed to accept full human nature including faults, and they are supposed to be able to work with that. Democrats are supposed to believe that full human nature with all its faults is enough for us to work together, and that the faults can be corrected enough gently enough so we can work together. Democrats are supposed to be accepting and including. They should be able to take a joke. Democrats are supposed to be a bit "laid back". They laugh at the "church lady" and they think they are never like that. They should accept the view of various ethnic, gender, and religious groups, and that view includes jokes this group makes about those groups. Some Jews still call women Christians "shiksa", which comes from something like "apart and icky" although now it is not used much in that derogatory way but as "temptation". When Walowitz makes fun of the term on the TV show Big Bang Theory, it comes off as funny, not offensive. Penny is a "shiksa goddess". Democrats should be able to tell the difference between friendly humorous "put downs" versus nasty insults based on bad ideas. Democrats should be able to put up with human foibles. Democrats should see beyond foibles to the deep issues and real problems, to the issues that shape foibles.

But PC Democrats are none of that. They lay in wait for someone to make an error, an error that most people would not call serious, so the PC Democrat can jump all over the poor sap. They are like spiders that hunt by lurking and jumping. They are scolds. They care more about bludgeoning a victim and taking control than about teaching good ideas, personal relations, and social relations. They seem not to get their own PC ideology of fairness and decency at any level deeper than mere ideology, and, apart from the shell of the ideology, seem not to have other humane ideas.

When PC people get corrected and get told that their PC hurts more than helps, that they are in it more for the good feelings of moral superiority and indignation, naturally they feel bad and get angry. Usually correcting them that way does little good. Yet they refuse to see that other people feel the same way, and it does as little good, when they scold other people using PC as a tool. If you can't see yourself like this, then you don't have the right to much moral indignation or to scold.

PC supports a double standard that is more prominent among Democrats. Equality under the law and respect for diversity are supposed to go together but, in fact, it seems that Democratic groups use the law, equality under the law, and the idea of diversity to get and keep privileges. They each care for their own status and don't give a damn about the well-being of other groups or the general idea of equality-and-diversity.

In the Democratic version of equality-and-diversity, the group traditionally not in power has privileges that the old group that traditionally had power now cannot have. The group traditionally out of power can do things to the old-power group cannot do. Blacks can call each other “Black”, “nigger”, “brother”, and “sister” but Whites should never use those terms for Blacks or among Blacks, not even in friendship, not even in joking friendship, and not even when no Black is present. We must use “African American” (not accurate) and other similar terms such as “Chinese American”. Yet Blacks and Asians need not say “European American” or “Greek American”. Many Blacks use “Whites”, “White people”, “White folk”, “White man”, and “White woman” as abusively as Whites say “nigger” and Blacks still refer to Whites as “honkey” and “redneck”. In music, Blacks can call women by horrible names, threaten sexual abuse, and threaten violence, regardless of artistic merit, while no non-Black could. Men can never say “girl”. Yet when women get angry at men, they openly derisively call them “boys”; and women commonly refer to themselves as “girls”. Hispanics extol “La Raza” but Democrats officially get angry when White people enjoy European culture and Whites extol the achievements of Europe. My experience with claims of discrimination is that they are used for personal gain and to hurt others rather than to make sure there is no discrimination and to assert equality for all.

We have to allow some leeway to disadvantaged groups, and we have to give them some compensation, but we have allowed too much too long. We are too susceptible to “White guilt” and to “middle class guilt”. Other groups sense susceptibility and they use PC to exploit it. Thus PC enables victimization rather than fights victimization. They PC does not make things better but worse.

PC enables reverse discrimination and it enables non-Whites and women to coerce their employers, schools, churches, restaurants, and everyday people. PC enables using an accusation of discrimination to get what you wish, not because discrimination was really what was going on or it was the most important factor. This use of PC severely hurts the good cause for which PC was intended. It lets us overlook or excuse the dismal performance of Black and Hispanic children in the public schools and Black violence. PC enables such evil as Blacks shooting non-Black police officers, and shooting some Black police officers just because they are police officers. PC enables bad selective blindness. When Republicans had code words that enabled discrimination, those words enabled bad acts and blindness. It is not clear which practice is worse. What matters is that neither should be allowed, but modern Democratic PC not only allows, it enables.

PC lets people feel they have earned a great victory when they catch somebody, lets people feel good about themselves, when really they have done little or have done harm. It is like when anti-abortion activists change the law to allow them to stand 20 feet from an abortion clinic, rather than 50 feet away, so they can get in the faces of women who come seeking help. PC now is more about personal gain through feeling good than about making any real changes.

I saw on TV reference to a poll in which most college students preferred inclusion-and-diversity over free speech. The quality or accuracy of the poll is not relevant here. Simply to ask this question means it is better to have on campus some number of stereotyped underdogs, regardless of academic ability, and not to allow people to say anything about it, especially not to say anything un-PC. Better to shut up

and drink the Kool Aid. Yet this view is typical of the harmful stupidity into which PC leads us. Inclusion and diversity depend on free speech, they would never have happened without free speech, and they could not continue without free speech – even free speech that questions PC inclusion and diversity or even free speech that wrongly painfully questions any inclusion and diversity. Inclusion and diversity without free speech are not real inclusion and diversity. Real inclusion and diversity could not endure without free speech. If inclusion and diversity combined with genuine ability is the right thing to do, then true free speech will lead to them. Not to see this, and instead to prefer some external pretend show to real decency, is a tragedy. Democrats have to ask how they support this view. No Republican delusion exceeds this stance in stupidity or harm.

PC perpetuates the stereotype of (formerly) harmed groups as never able to take care of themselves, never able to grow up, never adult, never smart enough, always behind other groups. Everybody knows PC is not natural, that PC language is not natural language. If we have to always be and speak un-natural around some group then that group is not alright. They are always behind and unable. If they are always behind and unable, there is never any end to it. If they are always behind and unable, then the only way they will ever get any semblance of equality, fake equality not real equality, is to press often-unfair claims of discrimination. If they are always behind and unable, why should they get jobs first, get the good jobs first, get any good jobs instead of somebody else, or be the boss? People don't mind taking care of people who really need care but the central premise of PC is that the disadvantaged don't really need special care – yet we have to give it to them forever and ever.

The worst effect of PC is that PC blocks seeing deep forces because it lets people get great satisfaction from superficialities. When a Black catches a White saying “Black” instead of “African American”, the Black person doesn't have to think why Black kids do so badly in school, why there is so much Black on Black violence, why Blacks cultivate a bad attitude that never has done them any good, or why there is persistent unemployment and why so many jobs are bad. When a woman catches a man saying “girl” she doesn't have to think about the deep evolved human nature of men and women, the glass ceiling, or why women still only get about 70% of what men get for comparable work. When a White person catches a Black person playing at PC to feel good, get ahead, or put down White person, when you see Al Sharpton on TV, or hear about another Affirmative Action case, the White person doesn't have to think about any of this.

People have learned to follow PC in public not because they really agree with the practice but because they get in trouble if they don't. That is how the stocks and pillory worked in 1650.

In this situation, people can't agree or disagree with the good ideas that once were behind PC. People don't get a fair chance to see the ideas behind the cloud of PC. Because PC practice works out badly so often, and overshadows good results even when good results happen, if people take PC to represent the actual basic ideas, then people have to disagree with the basic ideas, even when the basic ideas are good. That is the opposite of what PC aims at.

The ideas behind PC are too important to allow PC to undermine them. We must focus on the ideas and deep issues.

The “Me Too” movement helps women that have been abused, sometimes but not always beaten or raped, but coerced and used all the same. I was shocked as a youth to learn how many of the women I knew had had not only uncomfortable experiences but experiences that bordered on rape or were rape. It is good for women to share the experiences and good for the men who do bad things to be exposed. It is good to insist that men refer to women by terms that do not infantilize women (make them small and stupid) and that do not make it easy to use women. It is good for women to use all means available to make men see them as humans and treat them accordingly. We will get a few public accusations that make too much of a sexual advance and so hurt a few lives unfairly. You have to decide if that is a small enough price to pay.

The desire of women to be treated with respect and not be abused far pre-dates 1970 and far pre-dates the “Me Too” movement. I see little practical difference between the desire of women in 1820 that all men act like gentlemen versus the desire of women now that all men act like gentlemen. Insisting on superficially decent language and polite behavior in public did not change society and human nature in 1820 and likely that will not do the job now. If people think it will do the job, then, again, PC actually hurts more than helps. If economic and political power alone can do the job, then I am sad for all of us. Women and men need to think why men and women act as they do, both from human nature and from the particular social-economic-political-cultural-religious-and-historic conditions at particular times and places. They need to base strategy for good change on that. If they do, PC will follow of its own accord, or will follow with some modest intelligent pushing. If not, no PC will make much of a difference over the long run, and it will hurt. The same is true of all other groups with all grievances.

PC now is more of a liability than an asset. By focusing on superficialities it gets in the way of seeing the really important forces underneath. The women of the “Me Too” movement did not complain because men called them “baby” but because men molested the women. Forcing men not to say “baby” would not by itself make any difference in men molesting women and it would blind us to seeing what would make a difference. What would?

Catching White people saying “Black” or “nigger” might make Blacks feel good but won’t change much. Forbidding all people to use the word “nigger”, even among Blacks in camaraderie, might make Whites feel good but won’t change much. Catching Black people saying “honkey” or “red neck”, or using “Whites” as a curse word, might make White people feel good but won’t change much. Driving around blasting bad hip-hop or country music might make you feel good but it only makes things worse. Tearing down all Southern Civil War monuments, or defending all monuments, might make you feel good but it does little to end racism and it does a lot to sustain racial antagonism. Worse, it means you don’t have to think why you should tear down or keep monuments, should tear down some but keep others, and what better to do to achieve equality under the law and racial respect.

Yes, small things such as language do make a difference but not often the pivotal difference. Find what really matters and work on that. You have to look not only at economics etc. and the attitudes of the “oppressors” but also at the attitudes of your own group.

When I say “PC is more a liability than an asset, it enables bad acts, hides important deep forces, lets us feel we have won a victory when we have not, and we should get rid of it to focus on the deep forces beneath”, I mean it. I mean rely on decency and knowledge instead of ideology. When Republicans say “Washington Liberal PC nonsense” they mean: “Get rid of annoying restrictions; stop looking for deep causes; go ahead and treat badly anybody that you don’t like or who gets in your way; and we will take as much power as we can get with little regard for anyone else”. Republicans mean “Use our ideology of decency to cover up indecency”. Learn to tell the difference. Learn to be decent.

In today’s climate, I do not know how to promote the good ideas behind PC without falling into the bad traps of PC. I do not know how to get Democrats to see they need a better middle way than they have now. I do not know how to get Democrats to follow good vision based on decency rather than promote blindness based on ideology. I do not know how to make people respond to each other on the basis of simple decency so we need neither ideologies nor PC hyper-moralizing.