

Bipartisan in its most basic form of a definition means, “support from two major political parties.” That’s it. No fluff. No extra rhetoric, (*words or phrases that sound smart with suspected made-up facts and logic*). This word bipartisan is used a lot nowadays, but is used incorrectly when it’s talked about in depth, which is rare. Depth is not something we see from the media or politicians and we desperately need it. There isn’t anything wrong with the conversation of whatever subject matter is being discussed. The idea is right just wrong word to describe what we need. Using words and phrases incorrectly directly correlates to wrong concept and/or wrong context. We don’t need just basic cooperation. We do not need to just simply agree to push new laws across the table.

What we need is:

- The solution to the issue to be obvious to all involved.
- The evidence to be 100% fact-based, checked and rechecked.
- Universal agreement because of the two requirements above are met.
- Absence of assumptions as real data to be considered.
- Moral clarity.
- Logical inevitability.

This doesn’t describe bipartisanship at all.

What this describes is “**epistemic certainty.**”

If this were a speech about epistemic certainty it would probably sound something like this: It doesn’t matter what your politics are, what you believe, what tribe you sit in, what god you believe is real, what narrative you prefer, or what outcome you hope for. If the evidence is overwhelming, repeatable, verifiable, and withstands scrutiny from opposing viewpoints — then the conclusion is not partisan. It is not emotional. It is not preference. It is not faith. It is not assumption. It is simply what is demonstrably true. If removing party labels does not weaken the conclusion — if the argument survives hostile review, survives fact-checking, survives time, survives counter-analysis — then we are no longer debating opinion. **We are acknowledging reality.** Epistemic certainty is when a position holds up even when you *want it to fail*. When bias cannot dent it. When ideology cannot bend it. When changing the definition doesn’t change what the thing is or even means conceptually. When removing your preferred outcome does not change the math. When both sides, *if intellectually honest*, would arrive at the same conclusion because the evidence leaves no rational exit ramp. Epistemic certainty is not agreement. It is not majority rule. It is not bipartisan applause. It is not God’s will. It is when reality remains intact after every serious attempt to dismantle it.

Bipartisan equals political cooperation.

While, epistemic certainty equals evidentiary resilience.

The “*Compromises to Freedom*” series have always been about how fiction and/or history can always either happen or happen again if we are not careful with how we make that change happen. One side wants to slowly take our rights away. Give up our freedoms to make compromises for others, sometimes, even lesser minds. They want no basic identification to vote. They want non-citizens or illegal citizens to vote in local, state and national elections. No one is the same over here in America. One side desperately wants us to be with only their version of diversity as acceptable. We are not a communist country. We never were and we will never be one. Socialism has nothing and it is that nothing that is the only thing they have in common while the governing state has everything. The “*Compromises to Freedom*” series was meant to be short warnings, touching on politics, but not being solely about politics, but like I have been seeing over the years, overlapping

conceptual ideas and the understanding of what it is that is actually happening was inevitable. My writings, whatever the topic, get longer and longer, when they are supposed to be really short.

When I write about stuff, I am trying to work these things out in my own head with as little as possible being ego-projection-driven, objective and not subjective, taking the lead with all that, and try to be more like a caricature of Mister Spock or Commander Data from Star Trek would try to think and answer about these things.

One or many do not have to agree with my takes and that is fine. What I present is not for you. However, you clicked on it. Not I. You... If you don't like it and don't want to see it. One or many can leave at any time. You choose to be here. Remember that. We can still be friends and not at all pay attention to each other's lives. Over half the people that I follow or follow me are like this. Some I haven't shared a moment with in years. Some even decades. If the fragile ego cannot handle that. Be a grown-up and just go do you. You won't be missed or chased down for an explanation. I unfollow people I know all of the time on Facebook because I do not want to see their attempts at a "dear diary" session where they air all of their real-life problems to people. We all do it, but some really contribute to it more than others. Some have their ego so wrapped around social media that it has really made me question why I am or was ever real friends with this person or people to begin with. However, people do grow or shrink. People move on in their lives or do things to put them in trouble with the law or an early grave. People grow apart. Sometimes it is clean with time, job, family and sometimes it can get pretty ugly. It's not that I don't care. It's that, I don't want to know what your inner thoughts are, all of the time. Even I have real life boundaries and things I do not post about on social media. I never once posted about my dad passing in 2023. I had people that I talk to regularly not know about it for over a year before I was more transparent about it. I don't have the time to care. Nor do I visit the past in that way very often anymore. It's not because I don't have the time. That is partially true. We never know how much time left we actually have before we die and I am much closer to the grave than I am not. That is just facts. I am not at all packing it in. Just stating the math. I am on the other side of time in the negative. It's counting down. Not up. Everyone born in this century, time is still counting up for them. That's all. **I don't have the time, as in energy, to try to find common ground anymore.** There isn't any light at the end of the tunnel worth using up that energy and time for said common ground. You might hate me sometimes or even **all-of-the-time**, but dammit I am logical about what I do, and how I do it as I see it and as I see it, that is the only opinion that matters. If this version of me existed in 1995, 1996 and 1997 this writing would not be happening.

I talk about time as a construct and clichés more than I talk about politics. I always tell people: "Don't waste your time on things that don't matter." And by that, I mean this — focus only on what actually matters to you on a real, deep, personal level. The kind of things that require your time, energy, patience, love and will. The things that build you, not drain you. The people who lift you up, not the ones who pull you sideways or down. If something doesn't move your life forward in a tangible way, why are you giving it headspace and oxygen for it to thrive? It will make or should make one's head spin. Anything global is so out of your control and league of understanding. I am not saying this because I think one or many is dumb or an anti-intellectualist. However, some of the takes I will see from actual people I know sound more retarded than not, when talking about these topics that really require depth. **Social media is not built for that.** Nor do the powers that control social media want us sheep people thinking too deeply. I attempt to go deep on contextual understanding and logic. I make the effort there. One will notice if they look. I almost never talk real world policy on politics, but talk a lot about how common sense, logic and even the scientific method are not traits our political faction's practice. I am sure both sides will say they are, you know, "deep thinkers" or "intellectuals." They are not. Some. There is always going to be some. I mean the embodiment of what each side stands for. These attributes are not seriously taken up by either ideology. Both sides do this. Its entertaining till something serious happens.

Then its entertaining till it's not. I am no different. I don't at all think I am better, smarter, more/less accomplished than anyone. In fact, I consider myself a Grade-D loser for Dammit...

Emotional compromise clouds our judgment. Without logic we're just wrapping the same mistakes in a new package, called "*choose your odor of free air, piss or poop,*" doomed to repeat history. Eleanor Roosevelt crushes it with this old quote, "*Great minds talk about ideas. Average minds talk about events. Small minds talk about people.*"

Your average middle-class American is curious. They ask questions — they're trying to make sense of the chaos. We all pretend to have the answers; that's our subjective feeling of thinking we are more important to the world and universe than we actually are. We work. We raise families. We pay bills. We live in reality. Certainly not all or even most, but I'd like to think its more than just a lonely minority of "some." Major cities like, New York, Chicago, Washington DC and Minneapolis — and you'll find an entirely different species of "**anti-intellect.**" Degrees on the wall. Credentials in the bio. Vocabulary polished. Sign outside that says, "*Learning Center for Kids.*" Whatever, "**learing**" means in 2026. Probably a good candidate for meme of the decade. People in these cities somehow are unable to apply that intelligence beyond the echo chamber of their own ideology.

Brilliant for social media.

Useless in practical application.

They talk about systems, but can't navigate life without one. They preach liberation while boxed into concrete apartments, mistaking proximity to culture for depth of understanding that culture. They call it progress. It looks more like insulation for all that guilt for having stability in their own life or their lack of. That their lives are so rich and full. They have so much money in the bank they don't have to work and have so much time to think how they can force their good, just and correct ways onto the less fortunate. This is Earth. There is about 8 billion people here and on average 45% of them live in some sort of situation that is considered a hair above poverty. It doesn't matter how much money you have and can make. If you are not making billions, you can't do much. If you have millions, you might be able to help your local community and get some butts to college that might not have had the ability to do that. That's about it. Mind you, if you yourself have to work, have a full schedule of taking care of what you need to take care of. You mean after all that you still have energy, money, and fight to go out, and protest something you only understand through the noise through your phone. If you have that much money, and that much guilt, and that much fight, and that much good, just and, correct ways of doing things. Get off Facebook and TikTok and go run for office.

Real intelligence adapts. It questions itself. It tests its own assumptions. It doesn't need applause or academic validation to function. It certainly doesn't collapse when confronted with opposition. Curiosity is not a credential. It's a habit. And habits built in reality tend to outperform theories built in comfort or reaction videos on social media while you are supposed to be working or working on yourself, but you're doom scrolling in your parked car, because if you go home, you have to do real housework. People attempt to look intellectual, but fail spectacularly with dumb decisions and statements. They can't even define what a woman is or condemn blatant anti-Semitism on campuses. The latest case, dumb celebrity doesn't know the property she bought is actually claimed as a Native American stolen land. The logical fallacies are as bright as our Sun, but these people wear those goggles that can make one stare directly into a nuclear fireball while eating popcorn. They push bad ideas, use poor reverse psychology, and brand anyone who questions their rhetoric as an "*anti-intellectual.*" But being an intellectual requires actual intellect, not just a degree from a fancy school that literally give one a degree based on how much is donated to the school or even being a poor bartender who couldn't get a drink order right or use the touchscreen cash register turned politician.

Social media, feel-good positivity and manifestation nonsense are just distractions. People need to wake up, take real action in their lives, and stop dreaming about magical solutions from fake influencers who are paid to bullshit you. It's like slot machines. It has to pay out eventually and it does. However, the odds "it's you," are where one's heads are in the clouds. **Your life sucks because of you.** You're the only one that can make that change. Not a policy. Not a politician. Not a celebrity. Not an influencer. And certainly not a president. **You...** Solely control how you react to the environment. If you believe the environment morphs around you. You are probably not part of the problem. **You're the whole fucking problem.** Want real change? Get off your phone. Go out in the world. Work for it. Stop waiting for the universe to hand it to you because it won't. Bugs are not at all that important to the universe. Dots of dots of more dots till it turns into a fuzzy thing that tends to pop in and out of reality at random times. We only control so much. Control you instead of dictating your version of good, just and correct ways onto everyone just trying to live safe in our own backyard.

Since this is a tirade of sorts people are still looking for data of any kind on the Epstein files. Let's set aside the inconvenient truths for a second and step into the circus of guilt by association. Apparently now, proximity equals proof. If someone met someone, took a picture with someone, shared a stage with someone fifteen years ago — that's it. Case closed. Guilty by pixels. The mere presence of a name floating near another name is enough for public conviction. That's not reasoning. That's laziness. By that standard, anyone who's ever been in the same room as a criminal becomes one. Anyone who shook the wrong hand at the wrong fundraiser is permanently stained. No investigation required. Just connect dots that were never meant to connect and call it journalism.

Suspicion is not evidence. Correlation is not causation. Association is not participation.

The media thrives on suggestion. Social media thrives on amplification. Neither requires proof — just velocity. You just have to notice it and poof, its real. Real justice, however, requires something inconvenient: evidence. Documentation. Verification. Due process. Not screenshots. Not vibes. Not "well it looks bad." Most of what passes for outrage today is more fiction than fact. More narrative than reality. Now let's bring that same standard to voter fraud, this week's phantom monster — since everyone wants to talk about it, but almost no one wants to measure it. **Is voter fraud real?** Yes. Is it happening at a scale large enough to alter national outcomes? That's the actual question that does not seem to have a logical answer. It's there. It's happening. Its small. Its minor. Now minority means something to the side that is a minority pretending to be the majority. Not what the polls say, but ok. Are current safeguards failing so catastrophically that sweeping restrictions are the only solution? **Prove it.**

- Citizenship is a requirement. Enforce it.
- Identity is a requirement. Verify it.
- If someone cannot meet those requirements, they do not vote.

That is not oppression. That is criteria.

Title 18 of the United States Code (18 U.S.C. § 611) – states that it is illegal for a non-citizen to vote in a federal election. This law was strengthened in 1996 under the:

Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA)

So, for federal elections, the rule is already established in federal criminal law. Federal law (18 U.S.C. § 611) already makes it illegal for non-citizens to vote in federal elections, and nearly every state constitution restricts voting in state and local elections to U.S. citizens. The debate is not about whether citizenship is

required — it already is. The debate is about how that requirement is verified and enforced. Voters by law, are adults. And adults have responsibilities regardless of their situation. They still have things they must do. While the voting laws do try to accommodate there are still requirements that must be present or they do not meet the requirement. **This is how government works.** Almost every form I fill out to government programs has requirements. If I do not meet those requirements, I do not qualify for the service. That is how that functions. People who cannot get proper identification and/or cannot meet the requirements they do not get to vote. **It really is that basic.** But here's the part people miss: elections are not just legal systems. They are legitimacy systems. A process can be technically lawful and still collapse if large portions of the public no longer trust it.

That's not morality. **That's stability.**

Rights do not erase **responsibility.**

And outrage does not replace **evidence.**

This is the key reason why the right believes the left advocates so hard for illegals. They need them to stay in office, everywhere, even in blue-run cities. They need them on the census for funding programs that have evidence of fraud attached to them and getting these non-citizens to vote in elections. **Heed the warning now.** We cannot make *compromises to our freedom.* Stop all other nonsense talk, which both parties do 24/7 now, this point is the point every-right-sided social media group or page should be drilling in its follow-base. I'd say fanbase, but no one is actually a fan of this crap, but we cannot help ourselves. As long as humans have the internet, and believe their voice counts, it doesn't, they will continue to tune in. I do all of this for the horror of it all. I snicker a little bit each day. Not because I am right-sided or left-sided. **I am AI-sided.** Because that is something I can wrap my head around and it doesn't spell good for human's sake. Laws are basically simple. They force a population who mostly live in a gray-zone into either black or white. One either did break a law or one did not break a law. As far as the law goes. The law and how it's coded would probably get along with the AI overlords from the **"Day of Silence."** A fictional alternate day of March 21st, 2019. It's the vernal equinox — equal day and night — a poetic moment of balance shattered by a total imbalance and collapse of the world's political, economic power, and tech hubs all annihilated, all at the same time. A symbolic transition of winter to spring from the old world to a new order the Earth has not seen since the dinosaurs. *The Great Consolidation of Mankind* begins...

More Fiction to come...

The only real takeaway one can gain about social media, politics and how all this "drawing lines in the sand" bullshit doesn't mean anything in the real sense is; **do not get upset over which you cannot control, which isn't much really.** Think deep. Think hard. How much of anything you see on social media, the internet, national politics can you actually control? If you are a one-percenter reading this then maybe you can. Everyone beneath you, not any of it. We choose to follow the news. We choose to follow how our politics operates. We choose to be on social media. We choose to post our most private thoughts on there and everywhere on the internet. We choose to be crass or mean to people for a direct message on social media to see if one wants to talk about it. We choose to be crass or mean to people in general. Every day, for no other. **We choose all of it.**

Sometimes...

Shut up more...

Use our social media as a dear diary moment way way less...

Come together more than not...

Mind our own business more.

Not to have expectations from other people.

“Serenity now serenity now!”

Compromises to Freedom 5

by David-Angelo Mineo

2/19/2026

3,545 Words