

**What Now is to be Done?
Reflections on USA Politics, 2016***

**Kai Nielsen
The University of Calgary**

[It] takes a lot of things to change the world:
Anger and Tenacity. Science and indignation,
The quick initiative, the long reflection,
The cold patience and infinite perseverance,
The understanding of the particular case and the
Understanding of the ensemble;
Only the lessons of reality can teach us to transform reality.
—Bertolt Brecht, *Einverständnis*

I

Much of what used to be called some kind or other socialist is now just routinely referred to as progressivist. Consider this in the context of the Bernie Sanders's campaign for President in 2016. Reflect on the fact, and the *why* of that fact, that his campaign had the massive committed support that it had and shows signs of it continuing though in a different form. Consider the number of young people who are a part of it. This is a notable fact. And it is not unreasonable to hope that it will not be a whisp gone with the wind. It is clear that the times they are a-changing. This also, though unfortunately, involves the populist rise of Donald Trump and his Trumpeters. Fortunately, there are also a considerable number of vigorous nay-sayers to him. Non-Trumpists or anti-Trumpists. This includes me on the anti-Trump side. I firmly think Trump would be a disaster. And a cruel bigoted one. He would make George W. Bush look good.

Sanders and, more vociferously and very differently, Trump stand against the elite. They do not go along with the things done politically and this is probably a source of their popularity. It is

becoming obvious that politically the times they are a-changing. On the Sanders side, changing for the good; on the Trump side, changing for the bad. Clinton will not be of much help, if any at all, in making things better, though, like Obama, but not as eloquently, there will be with her a lot of sweet talk.

However, for all his popularity Sanders and his Sandernistas are now electorally defeated and Sanders himself has gone over to Clinton with a surprisingly strong endorsement. But not many of his supporters have followed him there. Many walked out of the Democratic Party Convention after Sanders's defeat chanting 'Jill not Hill'. One of Sanders's delegates, when asked how he would now vote, said there was a genuine contest between Clinton and Trump and that Clinton, though bad, was not in the same league for badness as Trump. And indeed Trump was dangerous and so we should follow Noam Chomsky and hold our noses and vote for Clinton. In a non-swing state—for example, Mississippi that is very distinct from Ohio, a swing state—we should not say how we would vote, if we would vote at all, or vote perhaps for some tiny political party. The Greens perhaps? That is exactly what I would do if I could vote in the United States. Only where there was a genuinely contestable matter of defeating Trump should we hold our noses and vote for a Goldman-Sachs weighted Hillary Clinton. I would like to vote for a woman. It would be a very good thing for there to be a woman president. But not Hillary Clinton. I feel about her how I would have felt about Thatcher in the U.K.

While it *may* be over for Sanders, it need not be the end of the world for his supporters and for supporters of Jill Stein, the presidential candidate of the Green Party, a party that *may* now gain far beyond the present 3% of the presidential vote. She offered her position including the leadership of the Green Party to Sanders. The Green Party in a merge with Sandernistas would be a considerable contender. Sanders did not take her up on her offer. Probably in fear that it would divide the non-Trump vote and lead to a Trump victory. He might well have thought of the Nader phenomenon. Still, after Hillary Clinton is safely back in the White House, things can rightly and reasonably be different than what it was under Obama. There could and should be a merger to get the Greens and the more

massive group of Sanders supporters into a new mass party that either with Sanders's leadership or one of his intellectual Young Sandernistas Turks or with Jill Stein, any of them could perhaps defeat in the election four years later both the Democratic Party candidate and the Republican Party candidate, particularly if the Republicans are reduced to a smallish rump party because of the debacle caused for them by Trump's candidacy, whether or not he is in the White House. Where Trump has a chance nose-holding voting for Clinton now is in order. Next time vote for a political revolution in Sanders' style. That is a reasonable matter though by no means a certainty. With it the Sanders phenomenon would not be lost, with or without Sanders himself but if not him with the Young Sandernistas or with Jill Stein or someone like her or like Sanders. With their eventual victory life in the United States would be much better as a result. Even without their victory their extensive presence will be a good thing. Then there still is the next election, though we can feel how much longer.

Things are again stirring in the desert of American politics. Something that has not happened since the 1960s. People in considerable numbers are getting nailed by the rapacious rule of the ruling classes, wiggling around, controlling and exploiting in all societies. The existence and rule of the super rich is worldwide. China is no exception. Nor is Vietnam. The super-rich or their cultural equivalent in all societies are getting increasingly richer and the poor poorer. It isn't, as so many say, envy that usually moves people against this but hate of the gross injustice of it and of the misery it causes. And along with the misery the utter uncaring of it by the rich and the powers that be. While some starve, or nearly so, others wallow around in superfluous and sometimes senseless luxury. That is intolerable. But it is widely the case. That's the way the ruling elites work. At least in most cases. Washington D.C. is not Stockholm.

Even the Middle Class is feeling the pinch. One percent of the world's population has fifty per cent of the world's wealth. Ninety-nine percent of the world's population has to make do with the other fifty percent of wealth. This is a monstrous inequality impoverishing many people, often in a

grotesque manner. Life for many people in some parts of the world is hell. Where it is not, there are various extensively harmful deprivations. To say this is unfair is to put things mildly but obviously. But the super-rich generally uncaringly go on grossly enhancing and protecting their wealth no matter what the cost to the rest of humanity. This is felt in various harmful ways worldwide.

The Swedish population is better off than the population of the United State, the so-called greatest as well as the indispensable nation. Or so Obama and Clinton tell us. That was not true about Sweden and the United States in the late nineteenth century. However, people are better off in Stockholm now and it is a more pleasant place to live than in any of the great cities of the United States. In various ways the population of Senegal or Kinshasa are much worse off than the population of the United States. There are places in the world such as Senegal where only a few are somewhat flourishing and where most of the people are miserable. Then there are the refugees in Libya maltreated by smugglers as these refugees take the perilous trip to Italy on which many lose their lives. There is no human flourishing here. Only the hope, the not unlikely illusory hope, for a place where they can live with decency and without fear.

The super-rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. Sometimes, indeed often, the latter are in wretched conditions. This is not only true of much of our world but even in the so-called 'indispensable' nation. But things roll along and keep getting worse. With Trump in the White House the getting worse would accelerate. And its being dangerous would be increased. The return of Hillary Clinton would not be as bad as Trump in the White House but Clinton would still be cold comfort. Not as bad as Trump but still bad. The United States lost a lot with Sanders' defeat.

Things are even colder when we look worldwide. There are many places where we have a super abundance of horribleness. Large swaths of the world are hellholes. This grossness is often either placidly accepted or wearily or ignorantly accepted by most people in the United States and increasingly more and more in Europe and the rest of the Americas, North and South. In the United States from the 1970s until the last few years, people either resignedly or inattentively slept away

politically accepting the *status quo*. During the Reagan years they snored while it was going on. However, in the last few years this has come to an end. The bitterness, resentfulness and sometimes resistance has blessedly sprung into existence, and rightfully so, with Occupy and Black Lives Matter movements and their like. The cops along with others belonging to other institutions have sprung into action to shore up the *status quo* in a reactionary fashion. The mass media has not been helpful. Sometimes this has been hidden from most people's view and understanding. This has exacerbated matters. In this circumstance, the Bernie Sanders's phenomenon has come into existence and has flourished. It had its parallel in Jeremy Corbyn in Britain. Sanders vigorously helped make political discussion and attempted action come alive in the United States. And indeed of a fundamental sort. This coming aliveness spectacularly include the youth, many of whom hitherto had been apolitical. That a-politicalness is understandable while still being unfortunate, especially given the political options in the United States of recent times. Sanders and even the much rightly derided Trump have stirred things up. Often not in the right way but they have stirred things up.

With Sanders we have a clear intelligent and humanly helpful political program that would make the U.S. political desert bloom and become a humanly and morally more flourishing place. Gone would be the *arid realpolitik* neoliberal nightmare that we have lived with for some time brought about for us by the Clintons, Blair, Brown and Sarkozy among others. By the whole neo-liberal contingent.

Moreover, Sanders galvanized large numbers of people include younger people who have our future in their hands. We older people have made a mess of it. The democratic establishment have with their wiles pushed things backward. But things, I say again, they are a-changing and we can reasonably hope and some of us can contribute to their changing in whatever way we reasonably can by joining in the struggle in alliance with a growing bunch of challenging others out to change the world for the better. With more than hope. Even reasonable hope.

It is understandable with Sanders's defeat that we should be bitter over his full-throated endorsement of Hillary Clinton. But we should keep in mind that this may be a purely tactical matter on his part to help ensure the defeat of Trump. The defeating of him is the immediate thing we political people should do. Surely Trump is a monstrously evil menace that must be stopped. We can't take any chance here. Trump plainly is a clear and present danger. Indeed, very likely a tremendous danger. Yes, there were those chants vis-à-vis Hillary Clinton of 'put in her jail', yet Sanders is right in saying after the vote at the Democratic Convention that even *if* it was rigged that Clinton was now the only way of stopping Trump. We cannot reasonably will the end without accepting the necessary means to the end. Now, rigged elections or not, just save us from Trump. Saving us from Trump is clearly the imperative now. There are times when we must do the terrible rather than getting something still more terrible. This is something that is philosophically contestable without it being practically humanly so. However, remember the presidential election of November 2016 will hopefully not be the last U.S. presidential election. Hitler will not be copy-catted. What the Sandernistas and their likeminded U.S. citizens should—indeed humanly speaking must—do is build a new political party broadly along Sanders's lines while there is still impetus for it but not before Hillary Clinton is safely in the White House and before the memory of the Sanders's initiative fades. We must prepare for this while the fire is still hot. While it will have massive backing.

Still, be careful not to repeat the Nader phenomenon which resulted in giving us George W. Bush without a majority vote when we could have had, if Nader hadn't intervened and with Bush's major opponent losing. Do we have to repeat the little party phenomenon that is stuffed full with good ideas but with no ideas of how to gain power to achieve this 'good idea'? Next time around the Sandernistas will have a mass base, sufficient enough to gain the majority. They should make good use of it while being well aware of the need *now* (2016), after Sanders' defeat, of getting Hillary Clinton into the White House. This is something not to be desired *sans phrase* but necessary in the dreadful situation we are in to keep Trump out of the White House. Clinton can indeed be relied on

to adeptly carry on the disastrous neoliberal policies in the interests of the rich and not in the interests of ordinary people. However, here that will pave the way in the *next* election for a Sanders's style political revolution that in time, contra Sanders, also will be an economic revolution where the economy will be in the people's interests and indirectly in their hands though with economists who will direct an economy that answers to people's interests. Where that is intelligently done it will take us out of the black hole that we are in now. Clinton will not do it but she will not make the black hole as deep as the monstrous Trump would.

I used to think there was nothing to worry about with Trump as only a few poorly educated people were his devoted followers. Now I fear that that may have been wishful thinking on my part. Trump is plainly on the verge of a neo-Fascist movement with plenty of support from the European far right. Can the U.S. social order withstand such an onslaught? An order that has proudly prided itself, though illusorily, as being democratic. But having the vote is a necessary but not sufficient condition for democracy.

Sanders was a good wind, but we have with Clinton a becalming wind supportive of the *status quo*. However, she may not be able to withstand a Trump hurricane. We are in for troubled times and we do not know what the outcome will be. We do not even have a good sense of it. We can only struggle rather blindly and hope.

We need to take proper cognizance of and understand how to react to something that Trump plays on, namely that there is a large number of angry people in the United States, though of course not only there, who feel left out, and are left out, by their government. And indeed they are. Many people are the most that are insecurely employed as well as others that are unemployed. There are many older formerly well-employed workers who are no longer so employed if employed at all. There is naturally a lot of anger about that and Trump keys into that. But in reality not helpfully. Though that may not be seen by many voters.

The underclass in the United States rightly has a grudge about their condition and are often caught up by Trump. Similarly situated Arab youth are caught up with ISIS, Trump's enemy. Leaders of both monstrosities of ISIS and Trump proclaim, illusorily and grotesquely, that they have the 'solution'. Many Americans believe that Trump has the keys to the kingdom. Indeed, something they should not believe. Trump's 'solutions' are at best in some important ways like the Nazis proclaiming Hitler's Thousand Year Reich. (Actually, in reality, what turned out to be the Twelve Year Reich was evil enough.) It is not only the extensively deprived, left out young that were captured by Trump's chant but contrastingly they are in an important part the angry, largely elderly white uneducated principally male population. People that have been left out of the 'American dream'. They, too, are deceitfully encultured by not a few politicians and extensively so by Trump. Many of the people mentioned above have indeed gotten a rotten deal and have come to feel it's time to rectify things and have become gung-ho right wing militants.

Trump is very irrational and shiftily so. And he is callously and extensively ignorant. He goes from one lie to another or from one made up thing to another. Hopefully the public will eventually see this. I hope they do early enough. I think his crude and false denigration of women has finally done him in.

The Bernie Sanders's phenomenon, by contrast, though importantly *perhaps* less effectively so after Sanders's electoral defeat, genuinely and rightly answers to people's needs and interests. It may unfortunately not be the case now but only at a later stage after Hillary Clinton is safely ensconced as President and going about being corporate capitalist inspired in her usual way. Perhaps future Sandersnistas will help bring about a United States' Spring? A Spring that will not have the short life that the Arab Spring had. Surely this potential Spring will be inspired and influenced by a new Sandernistas Party. Something that has not given up on the Sanders's phenomenon. The forming of what it could become, namely a new mass party replacing the Democratic Party with the old Democratic Party becoming the new Conservative Party. The party of the corporate capitalist *status*

quo. The 'Grand Old Party' of the Republicans becoming an unelectable. Only a conservative rump party blessed with a new small status.

Such a Sandernista Party will have come to have human resources as it already had at the time of Sanders's defeat to win the Democratic nomination and will win later down the road an presidential election and effectively govern. Don't let one election end things for this reasonable progressive advance. There are plenty of Sandernistas and similar types around. People who want to change the world for the better. They are not stale *status quo* Clinton devotees, Hillary and Bill captured types who are instrumentally massively orientated towards corporate capitalist interests. The old show.

Sanders, and he could readily be replaced by some of his followers, gives voice to a coherent and admirable perspective that is enthusiastically honored by numerous and often a sophisticated group, much of it not untutored or politically ignorant. They are *not* Trumpists or like the unbelievably fantastically crude and ignorant people who colluded with Trump for the Republican Party nomination. (For a skillful but distressing account of this, see Eliot Weinberger, "Why did they pick Trump" They could have picked...." *London Review of Books* Vol. 3, no. 15, July 30, 2016, pp. 7-8.) We have with Sanders, his followers and the likeminded, including Jill Stein, the leader of the Green Party, a well-educated and reflectively concerned group of people. They do not say as Trump does that he loves the uneducated people. They are not only generally speaking Sanders-sorts. They are not Clintonist *status quo*ists of a neoliberal bent. Something which, without being Neanderthal as the Republicans running for the presidency are, has come to be shown to be a new normal exploitive and dysfunctional. Another party for the rich, though clearly preferable to the Republicans and remarkably so to the Trumpists.

With the proposed Sanders party or Sanders inspired party we would have for the time a major party of a progressive emancipatory sort. We must not let that opportunity go. Don't let one election change things. The setting out of a new party of the sort I am characterizing will come after

Trump and I also hope, the fatal demise of the once Grand Old Party of Abraham Lincoln. For a long time, it has been the party of the rich but now it is also the party of the ignorant or one that makes ideological use of the ignorant for the interests of the rich. We must not try to launch this new progressive party *now* (2016) after Sanders' defeat or any other new party in this 2016-17 election but do so only *after* the 2016 election. Let Clinton do a little pseudo housecleaning first. We socialists, or if you want instead talk to turn to that vaguer way, progressives, must now turn our attention towards the next election in four years. Turn to building a party for that and beyond.

Sanders and Sandernistas articulated a well thought out politically and morally attractive humanist program that is a clear and attractive way of proceeding politically. It is different from the stupidity and crassness of such things as building a wall to keep Mexicans and other alleged undesirables such as Moslems out. And at the dreadful and disgusting outbursts against women that Trump makes. But it will also be distinct from the *status quo* corporate capitalist order preserving and enhancing the rule of Hillary Clinton. Hillary Clinton in practice is not be so far away from reality and ignorant as Trump. She, too, would not let alleged undesirables come tumbling over the borders in droves perhaps upsetting the apple cart. She would argue to replace the work they are needed for with robots wherever it can be done. Otherwise, outsource the work to where labor is cheaper. To Mexico itself or Vietnam, India, Bangladesh or some such place where it will be more profitable.

Trump's approach is clearly cruder than Clinton's and more reactionary and probably would be less successful. (Indeed, after the first writing of this at least seemingly decisively so.) But they both are meant to serve the ends of corporate capitalism. Trump just wants it to go his own eccentric way in accordance with his megalomania. He is more concerned about Trump than about capitalism. But he just assumes capitalism answers to his own interests. Indeed, a capitalism utterly unfettered. However, it is no accident that after Trump's nomination that so many of the rather educated conservative Republican elite are trying to organize movements of Republicans for Hillary Clinton. That's a way to keep the *status quo* and some kind of security. They do not want to make a mistake

like the German conservative elite made a few years before the Second World War when they thought they could control Hitler. Don't worry about his election. Just keep him in control. *Hopefully* Trump is not quite so dangerous. But whether that is so or not he is plainly dangerous. The thing is, these Republicans believe, to be rid of Trump. But that may not be as easy as many think. The German cultural elite got it very wrong concerning Hitler. The traditional U.S. conservative elite, the Bush dynasty for example, likewise may be making a mistake about Trump. But Trump is making it harder for them to carry on business as usual.

The Democrat establishment may have made a key strategic mistake in torpedoing Sanders. Perhaps, and *hopefully*, the days where the precariat can be quieted down and rendered passive are past. If the Democratic Party elite had supported Sanders rather than Clinton, it might have prevented that Trumpist challenging of order, at least for a while. Or it *may* be the Trump bunch are simply out to lunch. Are they just too Neanderthal even for the U.S. body politic?

Sanders' program was a reasonable one in a world where so many people are in one way or another suffering. Trump's ignorant militarism and draconian bombast and misogyny as well as Clinton's milder and less ignorant orientation can only on the Trump side achieve a destructive politics of fear. That is what Trump would deliver. A hold on to nurse for fear of finding something worse is the order of the day. Clinton's chanting is different *in tone* than Trump's or what George W. Bush once gave us. But is it different in deep substantive content? Well, it is about misogyny and racism. She is neither of these. But she is also militarist and a charter member of the corporate capitalist order. Trump aspires to be its master and rule what would become a draconian political order, though no doubt he is out for permanent glory as the person who can fix things as he celebrates his own glory and greatly enjoys putting others down with little thought of human amelioration or of caring about the lives of people. He is for making Trump great. Clinton, by contrast, seeks to be a well-paid and important cog in the corporate capitalist machine. She would be content with making people's lives better as long as it is also profitable for the corporate capitalist order. Sanders is at an

intelligent distance from both. He is concerned with a maximum human flourishing, or at least the closest we can get to it. Clinton, by contrast, is for preserving the *status quo* with a little tinkering to make the capitalist order work more efficiently as a profit generating machine for the capitalist order in the continuous service of the rich. She is as concerned as Trump is, or so he likes to repeat, with a way of dramatically fixing up the social order to even a greater enhancement of the super-rich of which he is a member. Clinton is also very rich and, though in a quieter and more moderate way than Trump, she serves the super-rich as a class with a few droppings for the poor. Probably she serves the super-rich as a class more than as a matter of fact would Trump. Trump is too fixed on his own glory and enhanced wealth to be effectively concerned with his class. Clinton is a safer bet for them than Trump. Certainly a megalomaniac wild man. But he is surely better at stirring the masses than Clinton is, concerned as she is with the stability of the *status quo*. Trump, by contrast, is concerned with his own wealth and glory with his claim that only *he* can make America great again, without making it clear what that would be.

Trump is often accused of neo-Fascism. He is indeed that but also more. His central concern is with his own glory and ability to control others. This is centrally a part of Trump's conception of making America great again. He thinks of himself as the great fixer. But why should a people, any people, be made great? What a people should be first is to be decent with a mutual concern for human wellbeing and ultimately in their most extensive diverse flourishing. Something that is neither Trumpist nor Clintonist a la neither Hillary nor Bill.

Perhaps—hopefully perhaps—the world is a-changing to a concern with human wellbeing rather than with a Trumpist order or a Clintonist neoliberal order but to a generally humanistically socialist order. I struggle for it in my old aged way. But is what was just mentioned just a dream or is it something that can reasonably be hoped for and struggled for? I am for it wholeheartedly and in a non-evasive way. I don't know whether it will ever be achieved but it should be struggled for. And I am not alone in thinking so. We have a lousy human order, particularly when we look at the whole

world order. It clearly becomes imperative to struggle for this kind of change. But the horror or near horror goes on. Perhaps nothing even in the ballpark of decency will happen. We may have already walked down the garden path to ever greater horrors.

In struggling for a human order, a world order of maximal human flourishing answering maximally to human needs and interests, we must not, Obama-like or Bill Clinton-like or Hillary Clinton-like, treat the United States or indeed any nation as the indispensable nation, the greatest nation, the nation of a chosen people, or anything like that. Such attitudes have repeatedly led to one kind of horror or another. Or to at least a less than reasonable kindness concerning human order. Indeed, often to an ethnocentrism. Sometimes viciously so. That in any of its forms is something to be eradicated from world outlooks as something regarded as not even possible acceptable. It should never be the thing to be done.

Trump has crude and cruel ethnocentric attitudes and he loudly proclaims them. There is no such trumpeting by Sanders. Clinton is also mildly imbued with some of them. She is big on the United States being the indispensable nation. Sanders argued after his defeat that he and his followers should *now* strongly support Hillary Clinton in her bid for the presidency. However, should they do so *only instrumentally*? Make, that is, a big show about their disgust for Trump. And in the circumstances to help keep Trump out of the White House, dangerous evil that he is? That surely is the *only* reason I would vote for Clinton. That is the *only* thing that would lead me to vote for Clinton. I would make this very evident. It is, that is, the better of two *de facto* bad choices. But should Sanders and his followers do likewise? It certainly appears that he did not support her as the lesser evil but gave her ringing support. Did he do so by lying? I do not believe so and I have no reason to think so. Was it, however, possible that in good conscience he could have done so? I do not think we should engage in such speculation, but in any event Sanders should have done what he did even though *perhaps* not so fulsomely. He is, unlike I am, not in a position here of responsibly taking a stance simply as an individual. He was by contrast a major player in the political situation relevant here and

his rationale for acting in that situation very likely would have considerable public effect. He might have if he did what I would do so turn off his supporters that they would not vote at all or not vote for Clinton under the circumstances or some perhaps even might vote for Trump or vote for Stein. In any event, he would have enhanced Trump's chances of winning the presidency. So, bitterly or not, he should have and did support Hillary Clinton. A fully instrumental choice here for him is not unjustified. Indeed, it is what *he* should have done. Sometimes politics is a dirty business. Sometimes one must go for the less dirty. Sincerely engaged politically thinking people believe, and sometimes with good reasons have believed, they had to so vote willingly but bitterly in such a situation to tell a false story—a so-called 'noble lie'. Is it possible in good conscience for Sanders to do so? I don't know what was in his head and heart but he could have told such a 'noble lie' in good reflective conscience and not mistakenly. I would do the same thing *if I were in his situation*. It is possible in good conscience to *sometimes* do so. Was this one of those times? It was! It is desirable for Sanders in the 2016 voting to tell a noble lie in his position. This is not so for an ordinary voter in the same situation. Sanders should recognize that being in the situation that he is he should do so and that enough people should do so as to attain the secure defeat of Trump. Sometimes we rightly just tell fairy tales. But not always and no one should do it with genuine joy. One takes there one's bitter fruit.

The organization and proceeding towards a new political order should start before the next presidential round. Forming a new party with the mass structure that is necessary cannot be done in a few days. It is a demanding and difficult task. To be started well before the next presidential round is in sway and surely not before Hillary Clinton is safely ensconced in the White House again. It should be distinct and independent of the Democratic Party, though some of its former members, of course, can be members. Some may only switch when this new party is firmly in place as a functioning political party. It is not enough for it to be like a bright little political seminar.

At the end of the Democratic Convention, Sanders should have done just what he did do. We should not speculate what was in his heart but he had it right in his head. What he did was the right

thing to do in the circumstances. It must have been a bitter pill for him and it should be for all of us as well. But *after* Hillary Clinton is in the White House, Sanders should say that his reasons for endorsing and voting for Clinton then were *principally instrumental*. But not say that in the heat of the 2016 election. We should begin to work for what he called a political revolution and to endeavor not only to keep Clinton's feet over the fire when she is in the White House but there also should begin right away the forming of a new party with its distinct orientation. While the 2016 election is going on it should be low key or even non-existent. Many, but not all, if asked, will reveal that their reason for voting for Clinton was not because of the goodness of her program but rather it was to keep Trump out. That certainly was *a* reason but not *the* reason, or at least it should not have been. There is little that is attractive about Clinton's orientation or about her corporate-capitalism. That is my attitude. Is it or should it be Sanders's? I think it is reasonably clear that was not Sanders's orientation. But he is in a different position that I am or than that of other ordinary voters. Sanders didn't have the reasonable choice that ordinary voters in the USA have. If he, even secretly, only votes instrumentally, he surely will and should keep it to himself for his saying so might tempt many people not to vote at all or to deface their ballot or vote for a third party candidate—perhaps someone like Jill Stein with a fine program but not a whisper of a chance this time around of winning. But doing any of these things will increase Trump's chance of winning the election. Given his dangerousness and brutishness, this must be avoided. Holding your nose or not, you should still vote for Hillary as it is crucial that we keep Trump out. Only, as the election time proceeds and it becomes clear that Trump will be defeated should we shift our votes to Jill Stein. The world is not a rose garden but I do not think that instrumentalist reason was the only reason that Sanders had for robustly supporting Clinton, though it surely was one reason, and would be mine. But I also think there are some good elements in Clinton's program that are well worth voting for. Whether she got them under pressure from Sanders is another matter. Whether in power she will go for them is also another matter. We

should not be confident on that. As many people became aware she was not somebody to have trust in.

II

In trying to come to grips with what is to be done, what can be done now particularly in the United States, we should return to what is often the nasty nitty gritty of things. Consider how the Trump-Clinton saga is playing out. It is obvious that Clinton, no wonder herself, is plainly better than Trump, or for that matter any other Republican establishment contender. Compared to Clinton, Trump is a far nastier and more dangerous bill of goods. But it is important to keep in mind that Clinton is a patsy of corporate capitalism and the banks. No one should or reasonably could vote for her with any enthusiasm. Still, it is crucial to defeat Trump. There is still in this politically ugly state of affairs of voting for if not just the lesser evil the least bad. Many people are sick of voting in that way and rightly so. Trump is right but for the wrong reasons in saying the system is broken. It has been for so long that it is by now subject understandably to a lot of embittered criticism, including that it will stymie progressivism. I think back over the many years of my voting. (I am 90.) Only a few times have I, either in the United States or Canada, voted for anyone I was enthusiastic about or even approved of. The first time around for Obama was one of them. Moreover, I look at what we have now in the United States. Sanders is appealing but he is on the way to being crushed and we have the lousy choice between Trump or Clinton. In the United Kingdom there is not much chance Corbyn can achieve much. (I would like very much to be wrong and we certainly should not give up.) What we have instead is an exist—an irrational exit—from the European Union which is no glory in itself. But Britain out would make things still worse. It is a step backwards that will enhance misery for much of the population.

In many places in the world we have, to put it mildly, something that is bad. Often something that is horrible. This applies to Clinton's 'indispensable nation', to wit the United States. Orlando is

an exemplary paradigm. The United States is not now nor has it been for a long time what it was becoming when Franklin Roosevelt was president. The New Deal made a lot of difference for the better to many lives in the United States and over time the effect remained. Similar things were so for the U.K. for the first twenty years after World War II. In the 1970s things began to change. By now the U.S. and the U.K. are places where things are steadily getting worse for all except the super-rich. Wages have been stagnating for a long time and the rich are getting richer while the poor are getting poorer. And people are losing jobs. The U.S. is a funny kind of 'indispensable nation'.

Moreover, the USA is involved in little but bloody wars where many are killed or flee death and destruction in their homelands. It is the background of many of the political activities of the USA. And this is the atmosphere where Trump strides on stage. I initially thought that we could and should ignore Trump. He would in effect serve unwittingly a progressive cause by destroying the Republican Party, or at least reducing it to a rump status. Something I thought and still think would be a very good thing for the United States and for much of the rest of the world. But, or so I thought, Trump could never come near to winning. The Democrats would win even if their candidate was a moron that made George W. Bush look like a genius.

I no longer think that. But after the first week in October, I am not so sure. Things are volatile. I still think Trump will *probably* be defeated. But that is, I also now think, not so evident. Trump's activities make it unclear. Facing that makes me terrified of his victory. I think we are in a very dangerous situation. A Trump victory would be horrible for the United States and damaging for the world. It is crucial to minimize his chances of winning if we can. Not only the United States but the whole world would be badly off if he gains the throne. ISIS may even profit, but hardly anyone else. And that notwithstanding his commitment to go after them, full steam ahead.

I still think, though not with a strong confidence, that nothing like this will happen. Trump is too boorish and callously ignorant for the capitalist elite and its subservient media to abide his victory. Sometimes, his callous ignorance helps make money for the media. But there is danger that

he would so get things so out of whack that it would not answer to the interests of the business elite, including its media entourage. It might even unwittingly undermine those interests.

Mitt Romney's well taken claims that Trump is plainly a con artist and a fraud will sink in as something that is so and that will trump Trump out. That is *probably* how it will go. But it is worrying all the same that it might not be so. I did not think there would be a British exit from the European Union either but as irrational as it is it happened. Is Trump against rationality being canonized? Even Ryan and McCain are becoming a little less resistant to Trump and his ways. But after the revelations about Trump in October they are tightening their belts again. And there has always been the billionaire super-reactionaries like Adelson and the Koch brothers to bless Trump with their money and endearment. There is a lot of irrationality in the world. There is nothing even among present-day Republicans among their concerns like a standard respect for democracy and for persons where everyone is to count for one and no one to count for more than one. That sounds like a joke. It is wealth that yields power in the world. Money talks and holds sway. Morals go under. The mass media will go soft on Trump if he seems on the way for the establishment to be back in lockstep and in accord with him and for the mass media it also fuels profits that arise from Trump's 'reality show', including enrichingly his facial expressions and all.

Taking all matters into consideration, I still think that Trump is not going to win. But I now realize he is worrisome and dangerous. But he has insulted far too many women, Blacks, Latinos, Moslems and many gays. Including saying very degrading things about women. He has clearly become an enmeshment of danger and prejudices. He is like an elephant in the dining room and needs to be vigorously and intelligently resisted. Not just laughed off as a clown. He is a dangerous clown.

I want now, before I set out farther my own take on politics in the USA, consider a related editorial by Jonathan Freedland, "Don't hand presidency to Trump" (*Weekly Guardian* Vol. 194, no. 26, p. 22). Freedland is worried, and not unreasonably, that, as he puts it, "Hostility to Clinton on the Sanders side is now so deep that the Democrats are in danger of letting the Republicans win."

Freedland notes that now that Trump has reached the magic number of 1237 delegates supporting him, many, perhaps most, Republicans are uniting behind his candidacy. Some no doubt reluctantly. The *Never Trump* movement among Republicans is fading away. The Bush family, along with other Republicans, is ineffective. It turned out to be an unsteady dynasty. The Republicans now find themselves between a rock and a hard place. Democracy urges them, however reluctantly, to go along with Trump. Fear of a disastrous shipwreck for them moves them to sink Trump. But they can't have it both ways. You can't eat your cake and have it too.

I don't care about the Republicans. It is not what it was when it was the Grand Old Party of Abraham Lincoln. It no longer is even what it was when Republican politicians were usually Rockefeller Republicans. Now it is largely made up of a variety of Neanderthals, a big share of them super rich Neanderthals. It is now, *I hope*, on the way to the dustbowl of history. That would be a good thing. It has for a long time been in accordance with the financial and capitalist powers seeking to rule the world in their own best interests. And they have done very well. Trump is a part of those with that view of ruling the world in that extreme form. His presidency would, if he could, accelerate it so that the world would proceed in a capitalist manner but in a wild way and a corrupt way and in what Trump takes to be in his own interests. But it can be reasonably hoped and believed that Trump will unwittingly speed up the Republican Party's trip to the dustbin of history. Moreover, it increasingly looks to be so. The Republicans have for a long time been the primary party of the economic elite. But more recently that economic elite-hood has been shared by Democrats. But it should be remembered that the Democrats long ago claimed to be the party of the people. But by now that is clearly untrue. Indeed, a joke. The Clintons, like their political cousins across the Atlantic (Blair and Brown), have been fulsomely instrumental in that. Still, the Republicans are the kingpins here. This party is generally the party of choice of the capitalists and other people either embedded in capitalism, as much of the professional strata are, or people, not infrequently poor, who are befuddled by capitalism. Many of them end up under Trump steerage. But under Trump they would increasingly

be a bunch of shouting ignorant arrogant Neanderthals. If that would put the Republican Party in the grave *without* anything like or even remotely like a slaughter, I would applaud it. Trump, if successful, would dump a rightist big business friendly aristocracy such as the Clintons, McCain and Romney belong to. Trump will also shift things even further to the right. Something that plainly is not in democracy's wellbeing. But we must remember that Trump is a populist right-winger. And he unfortunately will bring along many of the disenfranchised poor white people, particularly white males.

But that is not Freedland's main concern. He is much more concerned about the Democrats. He worries that hostility to Clinton among many on Sanders's side is "so deep that Democrats are in danger of letting the Republicans win." He even worries, and rightly, that that would not only hurt the United States as a whole but also to some degree the entire world. Europe is becoming more and more business friendly and more rightist. Too many seem as well not to remember, or do not even know, what horrors fascism brought on their ancestors. Moreover, Russia and China, with their departure from socialism acknowledged in Russia but not in China, plainly are moving in the opposite direction to socialism towards consumerism and capitalism even while, as is true in China, continuing to sing socialist songs and to have a picture of Mao prominently on some of their currency. Moreover, China has a stock market. And remember (to go back to Trump and Trump-like others) that Hitler also never paid his income taxes (one of his minor crimes). Trump has *at least sometimes* done likewise. (Is he learning from Hitler?) Moreover, Trump also sometimes didn't pay his employees or people who did work for him. He is a fraud and a con man.

All plainly is not well in the USA. It is not only in the UK that things are going badly. Nor only in the Arab nations. Tunisia, perhaps somewhat apart, the Arab nations are not making us jump with joy. Nor does South Africa with the blessed Zuma running things in a corrupt, personally spendthrift, uncaring manner that rightly yields disdain. The ethos of Mandela is all but utterly gone. Nor does any other place in Africa seem to be much of a place for hope. Think of Ethiopia, Eritrea, South Sudan

and the Central Africa Republic for examples. Even Nigeria is far from a blessing. Perhaps Kwame Anthony Appiah is right about Ghana that it is a thriving tolerant community. That, if so, runs against the *de facto* norm for Africa.

I do not at all think that Freedland is blind or uncaring about such things but for his editorial that I am writing about here is about the American elections and its contenders. Particularly those more or less progressive Democrats with their strong anti-Clinton orientation. Often with a very strong critical orientation and with their well-grounded belief that the United States is in a mess and that it is getting worse, this particularly will be so if Trump makes it to the White House. This is so because large numbers of people are disgruntled with the Republican aristocracy and aware that Democrats are also joining the capitalist aristocracy. Being badly off many people refuse to vote at all or disgustedly vote for Clinton. The USA is in trouble as is many other parts of the world. George Monbiot is keenly aware of this and articulates what is troubling.

Freedland, along with Monbiot, is rightly aware that things are going very badly and he believes that the most pressing issue now for the citizens of the United States is to defeat Trump and to take him decisively out of his capacity to harm people. Large numbers, again rightly so, of progressive Democrats are also disgusted with Hillary Clinton and her establishmentarianism. In their not voting at all they unintentionally help the USA to the frightening pseudo-glories of Trump. Indeed, not only pseudo-glories but stupid ones as well and sometimes dangerous ones. That at its best is like having an elephant in your dining room.

Clinton may be, in fact, good for Trump. But thankfully Trump is wasting that. That aside, Trump was rightly more worried about Sanders than about Clinton. Though he should have been worried about both. How could anyone vote for such a callousness of ignorance? Well, that had been done recently before when they voted for George W. Bush, a minor league version of the major league Trump. Bush is just stupid, not vehemently vengeful. He is not a nasty woman thinker or sayer. Bush is not even in Trump's league for horribleness. This, horrible as it is, is just a way that recent history

has been going. But while it will be with fracking, war mongering and all such things with Clinton, Trump would make things still worse. Progressives of the United States unite! We can only hope that it has been learned from the earlier idiocy of not supporting Sanders. Anti-intellectualism is not unknown in the United States. Democracy is not coming to the USA.

I expect with bitterness that in these circumstances we must go for Clinton. We can only hope for the less bad, namely, the electoral demise of Trump. As Freedland puts it, there “is only one goal [political goal] that now matters: stopping the man [Trump] from becoming president.” That is also where I very bitterly but still rationally now stand. Rationality and reasonableness sometimes only yield what is less bad. But that sometimes is hard to take but it would be, as it is, the only practical human choice. Sometimes it does not even yield that.

But what Freedland ignores is that there is a time after November 2016 that is very relevant and about what Sanders should do after the election. I think perhaps around six months after the election and after some initial low-key consideration and planning, Sanders should make an announcement with much fanfare about starting a new party, either in conjunction with Jill Stein or not, relying on his extensive support of his young Turks particularly those with political know-how including normative know-how. It would be important to have Stein on side, but not utterly necessary. But it would then be a grand coalition. A party ready to move into an activist though also intellectually so mode. But also not encircled by ideal theory. There it must also be like the extant political parties (i.e., the Democrats and the Republicans), with political savvy as well as ideals and vision. A party of reasonableness and morality that is still rooted on the ground. But not Romney-like or Clinton-like rooted in the *status quo* with its capitalist and neoliberal orientations.

But that is for the future. Something that is embedded in what we are caught in. The Democratic Party is now stuck in the mud with its establishmentarianism. Something that Hillary Clinton is unfortunately a firm part of.

The new party I envision beginning should be a Sanders-like party. Not initially really a socialist party with a thorough *public* ownership of the means of production but the party Sanders defends, though he calls it socialist, is a social democratic party. It would be an updated version of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's party of the New Deal or what the British Labour Party was for twenty years after the end of the Second World War. Or as progressive parties are and sometimes governments are in Scandinavian countries. They fit with what they call socialism or the welfare state where the state activity is there to enhance human welfare and wellbeing of all people and to stand against capitalist abuses. Sanders's account of what he calls socialism fits well into that. Perhaps it is something to initially support but that of an eventual morphing of social democracy into a genuine socialism that keeps its initial gain, of eliminating corporate or at least curbing capitalism but still keeping small Mom and Pop private enterprises. That is not necessarily harmful. Look, for example, at such small cafes and how much better they are than the big corporately owned cafes. But, as Sanders well stresses, it is the big corporate enterprises that bring trouble. But this social democratic way is to go on the Sanders's model first. The big corporate enterprises including big banks must be eliminated or at least culled of their control and exploitation of people or at least to drastically clean them up as a system. But we should realize this will be very difficult. We must remain determined and worried about what compromises, if any, we are to make. We must have intelligence in our struggle for a new different world. Exploitative societies should be morphed into caring societies first and eventually into a world where big private corporate enterprises doing as they do now should be moved away from as Sanders happily and vigorously advocates.

By contrast, Clinton only very reluctantly does a little cleaning up. It *may* not be ideological to suspect that when Clinton seems to care about such matters that it is only for strategic and instrumental reasons. It is for what actually squares with the interests of the capitalist order. We must be wary of 'compassionate conservatism'. Remember how she goes on about how the United

States is 'the indispensable nation', as she calls it. She also, though more of practical relevance, takes hawkish turns. Clinton does not inspire. She is hard to trust.

Both Clinton and Trump are militarists. Though Trump was very wild about it. We would have to worry about him, if he becomes president, much more than about Clinton on nuclear affairs and what comes of his talk of law and order. Trump might even get us involved with a Third World War which might become nuclear. Clinton would more likely follow the Bush-Obama tradition with little non-nuclear wars, some of which are seemingly endless as in Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria. Trump is more likely to go all the way militarily than Clinton would. He is wild about making America great again. Whatever that means. In doing so it seems that for him it needs to go militaristic. It is very unclearly characterized by him.

Clearly all these wars are thought to be, and perhaps are, in part, for the world's present struggles for hegemonic imperial power and to keep law and order. The USA, not without considerable success, aims to be the world hegemon. Trump and Clinton share this vision but Sanders does not. Sanders and Jill Stein, if she could get into the picture, would have none of that chauvinistic hegemonic imperialism.

Trump would no doubt scoff at that and probably regard it as un-American. Perhaps bringing to mind Reagan's conception of a Sanders-like and Stein-like political order as making for 'welfare queens'. Setting up the 'Nanny State'. A creation of Reagan's imagination rather than that of poorly paid laborers laboring under harsh extractive and exploiting conditions. Including workers working on the contingency of a telephone call or its older equivalent of standing around in the morning waiting for whether there will be work for them that day.

Similar things attune Bernie Sanders as attune Jeremy Corbyn though in somewhat different contexts. And that Corbyn as one would expect is to the left of him. Things are changing in the world with both of them and we should as part of that be heartened by both Sanders and Corbyn.

However, at the Democratic Party Convention Sanders and implicitly Corbyn are under attack. But it is by no means a blow for such a phenomenon. Though Sanders has himself badly retreated, though perhaps only instrumentally retreated, from the movement he inspired. But the movement has not. I try to establish a case if not for Sanders then for Sanderism. I speak here principally to the people of the United States and to what should be done now (2016) in the United States politically and socially. The United States is neither the United Kingdom nor Sweden. And they are themselves not the same.

It is against corporate capitalist power and control that Sanders has set himself. However, Sanders has taken a beating from the Democratic Party elite. With or without Sanders, his determined supporters should not fold their tents and kneel down with Hillary Clinton to corporate capitalism and its control. They must recognize that this is the way things are going now and set themselves against it. The Democratic Party elite along with the Republicans will accept and work in the interests of corporate capitalism. And utilize all the power given to them by corporate capitalism. The world certainly isn't a rose garden. These elites are the tools of corporate capitalism. Such an ensemble will use dirty tricks to discredit Sanders and people like him. Remember the reminders of his Jewishness and atheism made by some right wing opposition. There should not be anything bad about that or subject to criticism. But some of the Democratic Party political forces tried to make it so.

I hope, as does Noam Chomsky, that Sandernistas will massively hold their noses and vote for Clinton while continuing to oppose her capitalist and war mongering policies. This support for Clinton must be done in order to defeat Trump. But it will be done without any enthusiasm at all. However, the Sandernistas and their like must continue to struggle for a political revolution that answers to human needs and interests. We also need an economic revolution going with the attaining of a political revolution. We must have public ownership and control of the major means of production. An economy controlled or even structured by the rich and for the rich will not do.

All of this will involve compromises to actually make the advances we have gained in Scandinavia. We get compromises in politics often when there is a need for bargaining. It is usually a matter we don't like but it is often necessary. Indeed, under many political circumstances it is the only thing to do. Such matters are sometimes not happily made but there will be times, as unhappy as they are, that that is the only thing we can get is in compromising. And *sometimes* we must just live with that. But we must not be too quick to compromise.

Such an instrumentalist background often matters. Half a loaf, Franklin Delano Roosevelt said, is not a whole loaf but it is better than nothing or just a few crumbs. However, settling for half a loaf can become a bad habit. A too readily caving in to the powers that be. I expect that Clinton is addicted to that, thinking that it is political realism. We often get only crumbs in our 'wonderful world' but crumbs are not nearly enough nor is a half a loaf enough. But *sometimes* we are trapped. It is the only thing that is reasonable to do. Living in an unsatisfactory state of affairs but take every reasonable chance to break out of it. Be hardnosed.

We can feel trapped and indeed be trapped. We get something lousy, whatever way we go. It seems like we must firmly try to keep the devil out but that sometimes requires letting the witch in. Whatever we do, we are damned. Feeling this way, we want instead of voting for Clinton to either not vote at all or to vote by defacing our ballot in protest or voting for a Third Party candidate who has no chance of winning. But we should not do any of these things. In the present situation, that is, we should not do any of these things but to instead hold our noses and vote for Clinton. And as *status quo* indoctrinated as Clinton is we still should vote for her in our circumstances with a deep and bitter consciousness. But after she is securely again in the White House we should lay out the justification for not voting for Trump and why it was that his defeat was essential.

III

Keeping all this in mind along with the discontent that now obtains between Democrats and Republications, the political attention should turn, after defeating Trump, to forming a new mass party along roughly Sandernista lines. Perhaps a uniting of the Sandernistas and the Greens. This must come into existence for emancipation to obtain. It must for us to politically gain something of a mass party and not just a little third party often with good ideas but with no power to change the world. Think of Ralph Nader. Any such candidate would have been better than Romney or Obama, Clinton or Trump. But they had and have no actual chance of winning. They present better ideas than candidates from either of the two major parties but to little or no effect. Though for *negative* effect Nader's candidacy did get George W. Bush into the White House. Most of the time, third party candidates are largely ignored and just left out in our plutocracies that are falsely called democracies.

But now some considerable amount of the American population has awakened or is awakening, though not yet nearly enough. There is considerable bitter discontent about being left out as life goes on in the United States and elsewhere as well. With that bitter discontent and disillusion opposition is rising. Things are changing. A mass emancipatory party has become possible in the United States and it is not just as a pious dream or wish of a few politically oriented people. Let us hope it will become a progressive turn and not one that repeats the fascist or neo-fascist movements coming to life in Europe. These are already nicely settled in in Hungary and almost so in Austria, in Greece (the Golden Dawn) and France (the Front nationale). They are becoming serious contenders for power. Yes, things are changing but not necessarily all in good ways. Trump could be laying the groundwork for a populist neo-fascist regime. He must be stopped. But he may gain power.

Many people are reacting against the ruining of their lives. As I write this at the end of August 2016, little Iceland has gone radically to the left. Things are topsy-turvy in many ways all over. Some of them good, some of them bad, and some of them we know not what. The question is not just

whether things are changing but also of how and how deeply. Will or can Clinton put us in the old rocking chair unnecessarily and perniciously, sticking with the old ways of doing things? The center may, however, be deconstructed and things go either right or left or we may get just an incoherent mess claiming, in memory of George W. Bush, 'Mission Accomplished'. But amidst this turmoil, there is a living space for a new party of the left that could lead us in a coherent emancipatory direction. That belief is not utopian or just utopian. It could very well be a Sanders-Stein like party that is not doctrinaire but still forceful and emancipatory. But not too destabilizing of existing sensibilities while still challenging many of them. We have some fine red lines here. We must remember that people, many people, are fed up with the *status quo* and a few of them are committed to a thorough change. And perhaps in time many. They certainly will not get that with Clinton, to say nothing of Trump.

This sentiment, attitude and commitment for a fundamental change should also come to have an existence soon. The United States government, whether Democratic or Republican, tries, and so far successfully, to keep the two-party system with two rotten parties. But now the time is ripe with all the discontent with the *status quo* to fundamentally change things. The times, to repeat, are a-changing. Both with the Sanders effect in a *good* way and the Trump effect in a very *bad* way. But in both cases the capitalist applecart is being upset.

Reflect on this. Taking the ills of capitalism to heart and to head and focusing on the *next* presidential election. That election *need* not be to *no* emancipatory effect. If the current political disaffection continues to obtain, as is very likely, we will be getting increasingly sick of waiting. And there is the not implausible fear of climate change at work as well. In spite of Trump's climate change denial. But things need not collapse as did the emancipatory struggles of the 1960s. Ours may have more staying power. We should take the risk. We must not—morally must not—fold our tents. We must not abandon a determined emancipatory struggle even when we have a very inadequate understanding of what *specifically* should be done. Holding back as to what should be done until we have a clearer understanding is in our situation committing suicide. We will never have a wholly

adequate understanding of what to do here. But we should act with the best understanding we can muster from a careful examination at the time. But with adequate or inadequate knowledge we must act. We do not have the luxury of waiting. Something must be done.

We must act with the best understanding we have. Neither Trump nor Clinton will help here. Trump, human made climate change denier that he is, is actually dangerously destructivist here. To recognize and clearly address climate change is clearly absolutely essential. It is intolerable to not do our best to make it clear that we do not deny it or avoid attention to it. Clinton will dither around and above all not challenge the corporate capitalist order, something that very much needs challenging and changing. In that deep way she will go with the *status quo* and harm us dearly.

One thing that is required here is the forming of a new political party taking up firmly an emancipatory turn in a well-informed way. A plausible form is a Sanders-like and Stein-like party. They will mesh together. Hillary Clinton may inadvertently help to bring it about by doing nothing or precious little that is emancipatory or even helpful. Let us hope she is so enmeshed in her neoliberal hawkish dogmas and/or captivated by her own self-interest that she will trigger a Sanders-like or Stein-like alternative that will be of mass import. But I would not pray that it will happen but I would stand in solidarity with those who do but I would insist that we also strive forcefully and intelligently to change the world so as to escape this impending disaster. Even if the best informed accounts tell us that it is too late we must struggle on as forcefully as we can to avoid the impending disaster.

* I finished this article just a few days before the 2016 presidential election, To my surprise and disgust, and that of many others, it did not go as I thought it would. Unhappy as many of us were about Hillary Clinton, we thought she was the best thing under the dismal circumstances. We did not believe that the U.S. population would be so irrational as to vote in the number it did for Trump. But they did, or at least the Electoral College went his way, though the popular vote did not. That antiquated procedure should go into the dustbin. Should I have written this article differently? No! What I have written was and is reasonable to expect and hope for, though I should have emphasized more than I did the danger and fear of a Trump victory. A poll taken by *The Guardian* of Canadians noted that 80% of them would have voted against Trump. Is there a good reason that Canadians are so different from their North American neighbors? Should have been more clear on the danger of the rage among the disaffected over their economic decline and feeling left out. Their rage about that is justified. The sad thing is that Trump will make it even worse for them.