

## Just a Thought .... On Trump's win

Anyone who comes out with explanations of why Trump beat Harris within a day or two of the results is clearly just beating their own drum. Neil Ferguson for example has a shopping list of 'woke' issues that he claims turned off the average American voter, a list that naturally coincides with his own inclinations and phobias. To be balance about it, Bernie Sanders has also come out with his view that the Democratic Party abandoned the working class (only socialists acknowledge a working class in America, to all other politicians they are middle class... or underclass as the severity of the street-sleeping homeless people will testify) and the working class abandoned to Democrats. In a sense, Ferguson and Sanders are close in their assessments. They both recognise that black working men broke 50:50 Trump: Harris which is a huge shift away from Harris... or is it? Trump's total vote of 74 million was only a fraction above his 2020 vote, when Biden got 83 million. Against that Harris only managed to attract 68 million votes, 13 million less than Biden's score. This seems to imply that there was NOT a shift to Trump but an abandonment of Harris by Democrat voters who did not turn out for her: black men and women of all colours despite Roe-Wade. It's the failure to turn out for Harris that needs explaining first and foremost.

I sense from listening to various YouTube videos of commentators, activists, voters, etc. (YouTube videos have really come into their own as a medium of opinions across a huge array of subjects and topics, from news to archaeology to sports to particle physics, to hiking in Yosemite...) that Harris was perceived as bereft of policies on economics/cost of living and, of course, on immigration, the two issues Trump focused upon. The immigration issue is the one in which there may have been a shift among Hispanic voters, as opposed to a boycott (but this is speculation at the moment). I recall 20 years ago reading in either The Economist or the Far Eastern Economic Review (no longer published) a highly aggressive and racist comment about Asian immigrants from Southeast Asia by a resident of Vancouver who it turned out had been an immigrant from Southeast Asia one generation earlier. There seems to be some evidence of the same today among many Hispanic residents of the USA. Just as left-behind white men are often very racist against black and Hispanic men, so many immigrant-cum-residents who are one rung up on the ladder want to saw off the rung below them.

There is an irony here, because most economists and demographers would agree that US economic growth, and therefore job creation, has been driven by immigration. Further the NAFTA agreement between the US, Canada and Mexico has greatly benefitted Mexico, to the point that USA supply chains and even manufacturing has shifted over the border to take advantage of lower costs. In consequence, Mexican migrants are turning to local jobs, which will deny their labour to the USA. This is a bombshell hiding in plain sight. As an interesting aside, marijuana is now being smuggled into Mexico from California where it has been legalised, rather than the other way around, while the drug cartels in Mexico have largely shifted from more costly to produce cocaine and heroin to very cheap and much more potent synthetics such as crystal meths and fentanyl mixed with other drugs such as Xylazine – known as tranq as in fentanyl tranquilizer. The cartels don't need to worry about Trump's threat of mass expulsions of illegal immigrants because they recruit locally within the USA, and smuggling large numbers of small amounts of synthetic drugs is apparently a piece of cake compared with large blocks of coke.

The homeless problem in the USA, which is very evident in California, where the drug problem is endemic, is perhaps the most visible sign of a country with apparently insuperable problems. But my presumption is that most voters live and work in areas which marginalise (spatially and in their

consciousness) the homeless and when Trump calls the US economy a “disaster” or worse, it’s really only the cost-of-living crisis that hits home. Homeless people don’t vote. Trump did not focus upon social problems, as opposed to economic ones, at all, except to berate illegal Haitian immigrants (who were actually legal immigrants) for ‘eating cats and dogs and family pets’ (TikTok memes had a field day) and of course warned voters of rapists and murderers and God-knows what streaming across the Southern border, despite immigrant numbers being down due to Biden’s closing of the border. Interestingly, commentators have pointed out that due to turf battles within the White House, Kamala Harris was shunted out to tackle, without any policy influence at all, immigration on the Southern Border. That seems to have come as part of her baggage in this election.

The Democrat Party is a party of corporate America. The New Deal coalition put together by Roosevelt in the 1930s consisting of “labor unions, blue-collar workers, big city machines, racial and religious minorities (especially Jews, Catholics, and African Americans), white Southerners, and intellectuals” [Wikipedia]. This has long ago faded away, although its constituent parts still exist. Today students, voters with higher education, and women would be obvious additional categories. But what is the message and how is it conveyed.

The conveyance: like the opinion polls, the Democrats seem to have relied upon traditional media, and largely neglected social media and often right-wing chats shows. One can see why, but as they say, if you can’t beat them, join them. Kamala Harris was widely criticised for by-passing much of the journalism that was baying for feeds.

The message: harmony, peace and unity now sound like aspirations more at home in UN statements and corporate ESG statements. Hegel (if I am not wrong) once stated that it is evil not love that makes the world go round, in the sense (again as I understand it) that resistance to evil and fighting evil energises, whereas living peacefully does not. Trump scored well on that more aggressive stance, at least as a way to herd his MAGA supporters. Who knows, maybe by default he will also stir an equally strong reaction to resist his more outrageous actions as President. But will the Democrats ever be able to coalesce such a resistance? Step forward, Bernie Sanders? (See [https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/bernie-sanders-response-presidential-election/story?id=115582079&utm\\_source=pocket-newtab-en-us](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/bernie-sanders-response-presidential-election/story?id=115582079&utm_source=pocket-newtab-en-us) ) This is not a suggestion that the Democrat Party should appeal to the far Left, that will never happen, but there is evidence that evident passion and sincerity is well received. Bernie Sanders was easily re-elected in Vermont to the Senate for the fourth time with over 63% of the vote. Democratic radical congresswomen Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez was also re-elected in NYC, another passionate and sincere politician, which sounds like an oxymoron, but not in her case. Is there a lesson here?