

Over the last decade or so and especially over the last 12-14 months it occurred to me that the most fundamental problem within the society's communication cluster is the ever-widening gap between people's and groups' behavior versus the political tags ("conservative", "liberal", etc.) we hang on them. This has been creating many serious confusions.

I think President Trump didn't realize this problem. In a highly charged political theater like America was between 2016-2020 one of his self-inflicted wounds was keeping the "democrats" label referring to the "other" party, its leaders, voters, actions and gatherings. While he was successful inventing "fake news" and engraving it into America's vocabulary, he left the "democrat" tag on a segment of the society that last time behaved as "democrat" during John F. Kennedy's presidency. I to this day believe he still would be the president if he tagged them as "Progressive-Anarchists" which they are (but more later). Pres. Trump should have assisted our society do some thinking using this rational and historically correct term (Progressive-Anarchists) to help people realize what they are looking at.

Let us review the terminologies societies have been using over the last half a century, then let's bounce the so called "democratic" half's core characteristics against the historically correct definitions.

"DEMOCRAT"

The word "democrat" is a derivative of "democracy"; which phrase was invented in Greece around 500 B.C. "Democracy" is mixed phrase coming from "demos" (people) and "kratos" (rule). It means that citizens of a country must take active role in the country's governance. As a system, each year 500 names were chosen from all the citizens of ancient Athens. Those citizens had to actively serve in the government for one year. During that year, they were responsible for making new laws and controlled all parts of the political process. When a new law was proposed, citizens of Athens had the opportunity to vote on it. To vote, citizens had to attend the assembly on the day the vote took place. Even in their free time they were expected to play the prescribed part of the free citizen and to pursue activities called *scholē* (the historical root of the word "school").

In the US, the "democratic" party was born in 1824 by the split-up of "Democratic-Republican" party (founded by Jefferson and Madison) under Andrew Jackson. Jacksonian Democracy kept the democratic platform's original concept, being an authentic democratic movement; it declared itself to be the party of ordinary farmers and workers and opposed the special privileges of economic elites. In accordance with the contemporary structure women, slaves and blacks couldn't participate. All the way back from B.C. time Greece, one of the hallmarks of the democratic concept was the "informed" voting citizen. Jefferson frequently talked about how a vibrant and free press is critical to sustaining the rule of law. Along with free speech, a free press is indispensable for people to be informed and to participate in a democracy. The transparency that journalism brings to events makes government work better, decreases the risk of corruption and ultimately makes our nation safer. Free speech and free press were so important that as Jefferson said *"Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost"* and these rights were enshrined in the US Constitution's First Amendment; *"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."* Mass media was created in N.Y. in 1833 by Benjamin Day starting "The Sun" at the price of one cent. Larry Dimond, an American political scientist defined "democracy" as a sum of free and fair elections, active participation of the people, protection of human rights of all citizens, and follow the rule of law.

In short, "Democracy" that "democrats" should adhere to can be summarized as:

1. Fair and free election by participating members of the society
2. Structure is for and by ordinary people, opposing economic elites
3. Rule of law, including the protection of human rights for all citizens
4. Information dissemination among the voting public is critical, for which free speech and free press belong to the basic foundation of democracy.

(Tragically) Mistaken Terminologies

April 7, 2021

Let's see how the current "democratic" group of people stack up against "Democracy's" age-old core pillars.

- 1- There were a lot of "irregularities" during the 2020 election and there is no need to relitigate it. However, it must be said that in several states (Pennsylvania and Michigan being the most egregious) where fundamental state laws were not only violated but turned upside-down and disregarded. *(03.17.21: It's too late now, but vindication came to one of the Trump campaign election violation claims lobbed after Election Day. The Michigan courts ruled that Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson overstepped her authority when she issued unilateral changes for absentee ballots in the state. It all centered on voter signature verification. If she wanted to do that, she was going to have to get the state legislature's approval. There was a reason why she didn't pursue this route: Michigan's state legislature is majority Republican. So, she took this for a spin, and it worked. The Trump campaign's claim was vindicated, but the damage is done.)*

That the current "democratic" party's HR-1 Bill federalizes state voting, which is anti-Constitutional therefore illegal.

- 2- There is a study published at <https://theprint.in/pageturner/excerpt/high-family-income-not-sat-scores-ticket-to-harvard-yale-princeton/547180/>, concluding:

- Most students at selective colleges and universities are from affluent families; very few are from low-income backgrounds. More than 70 percent of those who attend the hundred or so most competitive colleges in the United States come from the top quarter of the income scale; only 3 percent come from the bottom quarter.
- The wealth gap in college enrollment is most acute at the top. At Ivy League colleges, Stanford, Duke, and other prestigious places, there are more students from the wealthiest 1 percent of families than from the entire bottom half of the country. At Yale and Princeton, only about one student in fifty comes from a poor family (bottom 20 percent).
- If you come from a rich family (top 1 percent), your chances of attending an Ivy League school are 77 times greater than if you come from a poor family (bottom 20 percent). Most young people from the bottom half of the income scale attend a two-year college or none at all.
- Only 1.8 percent of Harvard students (and only 1.3 percent at Princeton) rise from the bottom to the top of the income scale.
- One might expect things to be different at the major public universities. But they, too, enroll so many already-affluent students that they contribute little to upward mobility
- Taken together, the 1,800 colleges and universities Chetty studied—private and public, selective and non-selective—enabled fewer than 2 percent of their students to rise from the bottom fifth of the income scale to the top fifth.

The "economic elites" (Google, Twitter, Facebook, Apple, 95% of all TV broadcasting channels, and around 80% of all printed media) have been ruling the United States of America.

- 3- Although this segment could take book volumes (as far as how "democrats" violated practically every rule of law they could touch), a few examples:
 - The idea how -starting with Barack Hussein Obama- the country handled illegal immigrants; how "illegal" doesn't have a meaning for a "democrat"
 - The very name of "**Black** Lives Matter" (I guess to support the "protection of human rights for **all** citizens" thesis)
 - The way how "democratic" mayors let their city burn during the summer of 2020, refusing President Trump's offer to send guards in.
 - The way how the "democrats" handled Justice Kavanaugh's hearing, the "Russia!!!" and the "Ukraine!!" hoax. For what Adam Schiff had done during that three years (all are proven by data), Adam Schiff should be in jail. He is not.
 - The string of "democratic" leaders (Comey, Clapper, McCabe and others) lied under oath; none of them are in jail.
- 4- While the US media outlets were (more or less) there in the 1960s and 70s; they searched for and reported "news"; Richard Nixon's downfall was created by the American media. By 1990, the same had become the bullhorn of left wing ideology. This function had changed again around early 2008 from "selectively reporting" to "fabricating" news; by today, it has become a solid "lie about anything that will serve our purpose" practical sewage canal. They are supported by social media to a point (in the name of "Information dissemination among the voting public is critical" I guess) that two of the most major sewage canals (Twitter and Facebook) prevented the transmission (even the link of it) of a N.Y. Post article that described how Hunter Biden left his laptop (loaded with emails consisting he and his dad's corruptions) in a repair shop. Everybody's account, who wanted to transmit the data was

censured. Jack Dorsey, Twitter's chief (gangster) later "apologized" for it, but they knew what they were doing all along; prevent the information transmission, assist Biden, then "apologize" when it's all done.

All taken into account, there is no political establishment in the US that can today be classified as "democrat", therefore there are few "democratic voters" (who either remember the time when there was a Democratic party or understand what the term means). Voters who voted for a "Non-Democrat" are hard to define as a "democrat."

"LIBERAL"

John Locke (1632-1704), regarded the father of liberalism, wrote in his thesis: ***"The basis of liberalism is the person's natural rights to life, freedom, and personal gain without the interference of the reigning government"***

In essence, John Locke laid down the basics of "Liberalism": *"The individual person's liberalism equal to the freedom from government's oppression."* He determined it based on the individual's "life", "freedom", "freedom of personal gain"; all without the interference of the reigning government. In a sense the US Constitution is the detailed version (i.e. as it defines religious freedom, freedom of press, freedom of speech, etc.) of Locke's thesis. Specific points of Locke's liberalism were:

- 1- We are all born free
- 2- We have the right to our livelihood (each individual a self-owner, rightfully appropriating natural resources to sustain life)
- 3- Limited government
- 4- Parliamentary supremacy (legislatures supremacy) over every other arm of government or anyone claiming to be a governor. The reason the legislature is supreme that it represents better than any other political body for "consent of society."
- 5- Personal gain through money (wealth accumulation without "spoiling"; Locke's thesis was the maximization of one's land; you cannot harvest all acorns and let it rot)
- 6- Naturalized immigrants have to pledge express allegiance. The State is free to enclose outliers and renegades politically, without limit.
- 7- No one is above the law: **the only right people give up in order to enter into civil society and its benefits is the right to punish other people for violating rights. No other rights are given up, only the right to be a vigilante.**

In the first wave of liberalism in the US (early twentieth century) the objectives were the constitutional rights of *economic individualism, personal freedom, and freedom of speech*; all under a duly elected parliament and government supervision. In this context, the "parliament" could be the most crucial point; parliament consists of elected representatives chosen by the people.

In summary John Locke's basic tenets of liberalism were:

- 1- Limited government
- 2- Individual freedom (of all forms, including religious, press, speech, gaining wealth)
- 3- Parliamentary supremacy
- 4- Immigration control
- 5- No one is above the law

Let's see how the so far "non-democrats" fulfill the "Liberal" definition:

- 1- As president, Donald J. Trump was a liberal. He accomplished something no president accomplished since Ronald Reagan; for every one new regulation, the Trump government eliminated 10-15 (various estimates set different numbers). Obama's government exponentially grew the size of the government and governmental power and the Biden government is set to do the same.

Sponsored by the (so far) non-democratic, non-liberal side of the society, "antifa", "black lives matter", cancel culture are the anti-thesis of "individual freedom." The society has sunk so low in this regard that people are afraid of placing even an opinion on social media that is somewhat against this (non-democratic, non-liberal) segment of the society, because they lose their business or jobs. The liberal ideology dictated "Individual Freedom" is non-existent in the American society today. It has become a

version of fascism. As of this writing, Twitter locked former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich's account for a post of *"If there is a covid surge in Texas the fault will not be Governor Abbott's common [sic] sense reforms. The greatest threat of a covid surge comes from Biden's untested illegal immigrants pouring across the border. We have no way of knowing how many of them are bringing covid with them."* This is how far "Free Speech" has sunk in the United States of America. This mode of operandi was established by Barack Hussein Obama, whose IRS, EPA, Land Management and other agencies wholesale harassed and many times destroyed conservative donors, intellectuals and people in various positions.

- 2- Since entering the 117th Congress (with the smallest majority in a century) House "democrats" have been ramming through major Bills without the relevant Committees ever seen them (which is the House rule). Nancy Pelosi has been ordering floor vote, then it goes to the 50-50 Senate for mostly rubber stamp, and "we have a new law!" It is anything but "parliamentary supremacy."
- 3- Again, Donald Trump fulfilled the "Liberal" definition; he wanted to let legal immigrants in only, and only on merit basis (*"Naturalized immigrants have to pledge express allegiance"*). The Biden government on day 1 in its administration opened the US border for (illegal in 95% of the time) immigrants causing catastrophic situations that extended to a "No one can enter into the US at any port without negative Covid test, except if you enter through our southern border, illegally; in that case we don't require test."
- 4- In the Obama administration practically everybody who belonged to their circle was above the law; this "circle" included Hillary Clinton. Unfortunately it has to be stated: the Republican Congress (under Donald Trump) didn't do nearly enough (through their power) to clean up the Obama mess. The Biden administration is set to continue what Obama was doing.

The above five points clearly demonstrate that there is no political establishment in the US that can today be classified as "liberal" and no liberal process in the US today.

"SOCIALIST" and "COMMUNIST"

Karl Marx used several tenets to define "Socialism." On the economy side, he defined socialism as a post-commodity system, where the individual inputs labor or product in one form and receives goods in another. He popularized the "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" communist slogan. On a system level, the entire Marxist thesis stood on two basic principles; "Working class must conquer its own freedom" and "In order to produce socialist transformation, the working class must overthrow the reigning system and create a new one." As far as ownership structure is concerned, in socialism the state owns most assets and capital; the state decides if any part of the asset is leased to the individual for a defined period of time. The state also has the power to decide what assets of the country are owned and/or operated by the individual.

Communism takes the socialist thesis one step further; in communism the state abolishes all private ownership. The difference between socialism and communism in the "Labor or product in one form and receives goods in another" and "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" thesis is that while in socialism national currency (issued by the government) plays role, in communism the function of money is eliminated because the participants of communism will have the moral standing of producing the maximum based on their abilities and consume only the necessary assets (in other words, a person will take another pair of shoes off the shelf in a store when the existing one is no longer functioning)

In both structures the state equals the communist party, the party leader is the de facto leader of the country and the "rule of law" (also written by the central administration of the state) is enforced by the state. The rule of law in the oppressive socialist system is enforced.

While this structure obviously didn't work anywhere in the world one crucial characteristic must be mentioned: no state has ever gotten close to "communism" but the people who participated in building and controlling socialism in their respective countries were standing on a "leaning forward" footing. They had theoretical problems with the contemporary capitalist system and were convinced that socialism will serve the people's interest better.

In summary, the main parameters of the socialist system are:

(Tragically) Mistaken Terminologies

April 7, 2021

- 1- The system is seeking to establish a “better life” for the economically seriously disadvantaged in the society
- 2- State owns most assets
- 3- “Party” equals “state”, therefore the “congress” and its function are mere formalities
- 4- By its very structure, the state dictates and micro-manages all economical and other activities in the country
- 5- Rule of law is enforced

Let us investigate how the so far “non-democrats” and “non-liberals” fulfill the “Socialist” definition:

- 1- In the US most economical layers of the society has a privileged life. There must be 4%-8% of the society that feels disadvantaged but at the end of 2019 there were 1.4 million more jobs than unemployed people.
- 2- The state (local or federal) does not own most assets in the US
- 3- In the US neither party equals the “state” even if both chambers of Congress and the White House is under one party’s rule. The individual state administrations and the Supreme Court (although this body proved itself relatively spineless during the 2020 election) will prevent the “party” becoming the “state”
- 4- The US Constitution and various state laws prevent the federal government to micro-manage all issues and dictate economic parameters
- 5- How much “rules are enforced” in the United States was well demonstrated between March-November of 2020, where all “democratic” states were burned to the ground with the assistance of the states’ governors and local mayors. It is also demonstrated in our immigration mess; in the idea how the District Attorney of L.A. letting criminals out, etc.
- 6- As an added point, the “socialist’s leaning forward”, “wanting positive changes” posture must be examined further. While “socialism” is an impossible theory it doesn’t mean that people who wanted to establish it weren’t honest in their objectives. By this definition, there is one “socialist” in the entire American structure; Sen. Bernie Sanders. While his ideas are delusional, he has been very solid and very constant in his views for four decades, for which I respect him (as a matter of fact there were only two politicians in the entire US political galaxy saying the same for decades and following up on them; Bernie Sanders and Donald Trump). The rest of the “politicians” in D.C. have proven to be either political opportunists or downright gangsters.

These six points clearly demonstrate that there is no political establishment in the US that can today be classified as “socialist” and no socialist process in the US today.

“PROGRESSIVE”

As per Wikipedia, “Progressivism is a political philosophy in support of social reform. In the 21st century, a movement that identifies as progressive is “a social or political movement that aims to represent the interests of ordinary people through political change and the support of government actions. ... Progressives take the view that progress is being stifled by vast economic inequality between the rich and the poor; minimally regulated laissez-faire capitalism with monopolistic corporations; and the intense and often violent conflict between those perceived to be privileged and unprivileged, arguing that measures were needed to address these problems. The meanings of progressivism have varied over time and from different perspectives.... Contemporary progressives promote public policies that they believe will lead to positive social change...”

Without spending too much time on further examining “progressivism”, it is safe to say that “Contemporary Progressivism” is Socialism’s consigliere; an enforcer. There cannot be “vast economic inequality” in a country having 1.4 million more jobs than unemployed people. That’s the fundamental problem with the concept. What is left is a mindless power grabbing in the name of progressivism. As it was stated earlier, original “Progressivism” was against “monopolistic corporations” such as Google, Facebook, Apple and Twitter are. Which are the bastions of (non-existent) progressivism today.

Based on this brief analysis it can be concluded there is no political establishment in the US that can today be classified as “progressive” and no progressive process in the US today.

“NOW WHAT?”

It is not in the scope of this paper (education, foreign policies, economic policies, the birth of social media, etc.) how has the US arrived to this low point but it could be safely argued that the best description of more than half of the US society is “Progressive-Anarchist.”

Progressive in a sense that people who have no business being near politics are (as “leaders”) trying to enforce unacceptable and anti-US thesis type of rules, laws and regulations on the population. As I said before, I have respect for Bernie Sanders, but from day one I’ve been convinced: Sen. Sanders has been campaigning in the wrong country. His place would be Nicaragua, Russia, maybe he could have a shot in Belgium. But the US Thesis and Bernie Sanders are as complimentary to each other as oil and water. The other side (to whom these “leaders” preaching to) is the population that agrees with the thesis the “leaders” pedal. At this juncture it doesn’t matter if the population (approx. one half of the total number of voters, and the number is growing) agrees with them, doesn’t care, doesn’t understand, or completely clueless of what these “leaders” are pushing on them; either way, these “leaders” have an adoring crowd, buying what the “leaders” are selling. Although the criminally blind, one sided, anti-American hypocrite media is blamed for “being the main source of all wrongs in the country”, it is not so; remember, vultures would die without carcass. It requires 50% of the American voting population’s complete ignorance, bordering utter dumbness for a media to sell what they have.

Anarchist in a sense that it has been working on destroying a functioning, good system that -again- created a situation where there were far more jobs open than people taking them. That is the hallmark of a “good system.” The level of “anarchism” is well portrayed during 2020; with “democratic” leaders’ assistance, businesses were burned to the ground across America. In states where “strict covid lockdown” was in order, antifa and black lives matter gangs received permit to march; all for one reason and one reason only: to make sure people are confused and scared enough to part with Donald J. Trump at the ballot boxes. Then came the “highly irregular” election.

Let’s then agree in the Progressive-Anarchist definition as the correct and most accurate identification of one of the two major US political parties, its leaders, its intentions, objectives and most of all; it’s voters.

“WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?”

Normally it wouldn’t be. Because everybody would know and understand it. But no one does. We either train the society to read and think, or we let them feed (more likely: graze) themselves from Facebook and Twitter as a “major, bone fide and factual news source.” Unfortunately (if this trend continues; soon “tragically”) the entire population between Vancouver and Vienna has been pushed toward the latter. In that setting we cannot allow ourselves to name Al Capone a “tax avoiding, otherwise successful businessman”; there is a reason why we call terrorist a “terrorist”, call M13, Antifa and Black Lives Matter a “gang” and Al Capone “killer.” Because this is what they were and are. Just because Barack Hussein Obama wasn’t willing to call his own kind “Muslim terrorists” --they still were murderous Muslim terrorists. The US media had every benign phrases and terminologies under the sun to refer to their own blatant lies; until Donald J. Trump came around and christened it “fake news.” This is why in the current social “structure” (if you want to call this anarchist mess a “structure”) so vitally important to name these people for what they actually are: “progressive-anarchists.”

I’ve been running scientific research programs for the better part of the last twenty years; scientific research is probably “the” most liberal activity (fully utilizing “Liberalism’s” “free speech, free thinking, free press” components) in the world participated by true liberals. In science what matters (or: should matter) is “data.” A number of scientists work toward a common goal, having different ideas; they test them on a step-by-step basis. At each step the ideas are discussed, plan is made how to test them further, establish result, then on to the next step. In research it almost never discussed who was right and wrong at each step; researchers’ nationality, political views, race, religion and personal life are not playing any role. The stated objective is important.

Right after the 1956 Hungarian revolution, the communist party’s head (and Hungary’s de facto leader) issued an “If you are not against us, --you are with us” slogan. It meant “we leave everyone be so long as the person

(Tragically) Mistaken Terminologies

April 7, 2021

doesn't try to undermine the system." Again, it is not the evaluation of the system in Hungary between 1956-89, it is to highlight the differences in various areas:

- That the Progressive-Anarchist Party of the US has nothing to do with "left", even though 100% of the media tags them as "they moved so far to the left." No, they didn't. They became mindless anarchists. I don't recall a single bona fide communist country disregarding their border and in essence declaring "we don't have a country, we don't have a border, feel free to come in at any time." I also don't recall a government "moved to the left" letting illegal immigrants into the country w/o testing them in the middle of the pandemic. That's anarchy.
- As oppose to the "If you are not against us, --you are with us" slogan, the Progressive-Anarchist Party and their servants in media, social media, various industries and their roughly 60M-70M worshippers (a.k.a. "voters") instituted the "If you are not 100% with us, we hate you and will work to destroy you." On March 15, 2021 Newt Gingrich's posted on Twitter: *"If there is a covid surge in Texas the fault will not be Governor Abbott's common sense reforms. The greatest threat of a covid surge comes from Biden's untested illegal immigrants pouring across the border. We have no way of knowing how many of them are bringing covid with them."* Twitter locked the former Speaker of the House's Twitter account. This is what the Progressive-Anarchist Party calls "freedom of speech."
- In a further confusion, the very same crowd who tags these anarchists as "moved to the left", also tagging them as "liberals." Nancy Pelosi, Chuck Schumer and 95% of the Progressive-Anarchist Party's leadership (approx. 150 people) have as much common with "liberalism" as Hitler had with the "Preservation of Jewish Artifacts." This fact in itself well underlines my thesis stated above; these 150 mindless, anti-American anarchists are published, advertised, praised in the mindless anti-American anarchist media to be bought hook line and sinker by the mindless, primitive (many times "highly educated"), unintelligent American voting block. Since Obama was elected in 2008, there has been very few ideas, opinions, statements, concepts by these 150 "leaders" they didn't say or do the opposite within weeks, many times within days. I mean having even a half-intelligent voting block Obama would have been beaten by a blind goat in the 2012 election after lying about "you can keep your doctor", the "Syrian "red Line" and other lies. There has practically not been a single on-camera statement by Pelosi and Schumer they didn't say the opposite within a month (also on camera) ---counting on their adoring crowd's dumbness and unintelligence.
- In a completely wrongly skewed arithmetic 100% of the US media portrays what China does with i.e. the Ughyurs as a "communist doing." Someone, some day will have to wake up to the fact that "Socialism and Communism" are ideologies; killing millions of people are not in their playbook. That's fascism. In the Chinese case "China is committing fascist activities against their Ughyur population" (as much as what the Castro brothers, Stalin, and others). China -in order to do that- can be "communist", "capitalist" or anything in between; what they are doing is criminal and fascist. Just like what the "150 leaders" of the Progressive-Anarchist Party have been doing; it's not "right", "left" or "center"; it is criminal and it is anarchy.

It is very important to use the correct terminologies because people must be educated of their meaning. The entire Progressive-Anarchist Party and their servants have been hiding behind the "Democrat" and "Liberal" tags. The critical nature of this will be clear if we understand that large percent of the population have accepted Facebook as their "major news source." *"....A survey (10.2.2019) from the Pew Research Center found that more than half of the U.S. adults surveyed by the group this past July — some 52% — already get their news from Facebook, making it the most popular social platform for news sourcing, with YouTube and Twitter the second- and third-most popular at 28% and 17%, respectively, and a variety of other platforms like Instagram, LinkedIn, Reddit and Snapchat also making smaller but notable appearances. Overall, a full 88% of all those surveyed believed that social media has "at least some control" over the news people...."* (<https://techcrunch.com/2019/10/02/bad-news-social-media/>)

Nothing can summarize/conclude/underline the thesis of this paper than the already passed \$1.9T **"Covid Relief Bill"** of which the exact amount tagged to address "Covid" related issues is \$171B. The remaining \$1.729T is an anarchist and corrupt grab-bag. The one in the works named **"Infrastructure Bill"** for \$2.25T has \$125B for "infrastructure" such as roads, bridges, airports, etc. in it (even the "electric cars subsidy" is \$175B, almost 40% more than what the bill was named after). The total grab-bag amount of these two alone is 3,804Trillion Dollars.

The problem that -since over 50% of the people take their "data" from Facebook and other platforms- adoring voters are practically wondering around like zombies parroting what they heard on various media outlets. In a

(Tragically) Mistaken Terminologies

April 7, 2021

sense, the Progressive-Anarchist Party is correct; they are able to sell their garbage to a population this informed. The reason why the Progressive-Anarchist Party leaders want to take "voting right" to age 16 is to further increase the saturation; children at that age are "the" most frequent users of social media. So long as the conservative side of the country will assist in perpetrating the lie as to who these anarchists are the voters will be under the false impression who they are dealing with (as they are with the Covid Relief Bill and the Infrastructure Bill), this trend is going to advance.

As I stated elsewhere, there is no one in Venezuela today who repeatedly voted for Hugo Chavez by clearly understanding that in a short twenty years Venezuela will be not a third but a fourth world country. People voted for Chavez based on identical lies the American Progressive-Anarchist Party has been pushing on America for the last three decades. As a result, --we have an excellent chance to end up where Venezuela is today.