

***“I should like to say two things, one intellectual and one moral: The intellectual thing, I should want to say to them, is this: When you are studying any matter, or considering any philosophy, ask yourself only: “What are the facts, and what is the truth that the facts bear out?” Never let yourself be diverted, either by what you wish to believe or by what you think could have beneficial social effects, if it were believed. But look only and solely at: “What are the facts?” That is the intellectual thing that I should wish to say.***

***The moral thing I should wish to say to them is very simple. I should say: Love is wise, hatred is foolish. In this world, which is getting more and more closely interconnected, we have to learn to tolerate each other. We have to learn to put up with the fact, that some people say things that we don't like. We can only live together in that way. And if we are to live together and not die together, we must learn a kind of charity and a kind of tolerance, which is absolutely vital to the continuation of human life on this planet.”***  
**~Bertrand Russel – Message to Future Generations (1959)**

- **Just so it's clear on my voter registration card it says **NPA**, ‘No Party Affiliation.’**
- **It does not say ‘Democrat’ on it.**
- **It does not say, ‘Republican.’**
- **It also does not say ‘Independent.’**
- **Its **NPA**...**
- **For A Reason...**

Robert De Niro's unsuccessful protest outside the Trump Courthouse with the Biden campaign team and his profanity-laced comments about President Trump during the Tony Awards, the View, and other shows has tarnished what was once a great two-thirds of his career. The Biden campaign tends to focus on personal attacks to and about Trump instead of addressing important issues and questioning the effectiveness of Biden's presidency. Donald Trump criticizes Robert De Niro for his protest outside the Trump Courthouse, calling it a failed attempt that *"bombed harder than Robert's last five movies."* Pppppffft, more than that. De Niro's career has been, sort of, in the trash bin since 2002. De Niro, who was expressing his support for the Biden campaign, was accused of letting his Trump Derangement Syndrome get the best of him.

*"Trump Derangement Syndrome" (TDS)* is a real thing. I have personally seen this at work. In the conversations I have had with all walks of life I will communicate with on a variety of topics. It is most often seen with lifelong Democrats—people who have been Democrats their entire lives. Apparently, if you're not a fan of Trump, you must be suffering from some irrational obsession. Most arguments, including De Niro's, is nonsensical. People who suffer from TDS often cannot articulate why Trump is so evil to them and for American freedom. It is usually things he Tweeted about or posted on his TruthSocial platform. Many with TDS cannot talk about policy and politics but usually tend to take these quotes from Trump that are often actually, sarcastic banter or straight-up *'assholic comments'* directed at the WOKE-Progressive-Left to infuriate them, which is what Trump's intention actually is with said quotes. Often many of Trump's haters out there cannot formulate logical concepts as to why he was a bad president and will be a president again, specifically when compared to Joe Biden, who has been labeled the worst president of all time by most. The only logical explanation for disliking Trump is an emotional meltdown, not genuine concerns or principled opposition. So, next time you point out something questionable he did, just remember: it's not because you have a valid point—it's because

you've caught a bad case of TDS. If you suffer from TDS you should call your mental health professional at once.

## **TDS Can Cause a Wide Range of Onset Symptoms:**

- 1. Developing an uncontrollable urge to dye your hair blue.**
- 2. Changing your name to Karen or Kevin for no apparent reason.**
- 3. Crying in the middle of the street at random intervals.**
- 4. Fumbling over your words while trying to articulate why you hate Trump.**
- 5. Mouth-vagina-vomit whenever you hear the word "Trump."**
- 6. Suddenly becoming an expert on Russian collusion theories and how the law works.**
- 7. Starting every sentence with "As a lifelong Democrat..."**
- 8. Feeling the need to protest at least once a week.**
- 9. A compulsive desire to correct everyone on social media.**
- 10. Developing an intense fear of red baseball caps.**
- 11. Finding yourself inexplicably compelled to watch CNN and CNBC 24/7.**
- 12. Uncontrollably sharing memes that compare Trump to historical villains.**
- 13. Losing the ability to engage in any conversation without mentioning Trump.**
- 14. Having an allergic reaction to the phrase "Make America Great Again."**
- 15. A sudden obsession with late-night talk show monologues.**

*(If you discover you have more than two of these you should take yourself to the ER immediately. Not only could you hurt yourself but others. You may even lose your job, and clients, if you are an independent contractor, friends, and family.)*

The liberal media has been embarrassed by the De Niro "Raging Bullshit" stunt, and some commentators suggested that it backfired and hurt the Biden campaign even more than it has been hurting itself. **Well, duh...** Celebrities getting involved in politics for Biden has been widely perceived as negative. Trump says De Niro got 'MAGA'D', the effectiveness of this messaging, as it doesn't seem to be resonating with voters based on polling data. One by-standard called De Niro a "mook." Probably the most factually accurate thing that got said at that presser.

**mook /mooĕk/**

**noun**

- **A foolish or contemptible person.**
- **A disagreeable or incompetent person.**
- **A manipulated or rigged set of business accounting ledgers.**

During De Niro's badly acted performance at the podium; he was talking about Michael Fanone and Harry Dunn being heroes for America, who at the time were police officers that stood their ground during the January 6<sup>th</sup> capital building's mass trespassing of 'mostly a peaceful march' through the building. The left still swears it was an "insurrection" orchestrated by Donald Trump where no actual direct evidence exists. Most of what they have is semi-plausible assumptions based on subjective feelings. See TDS for better context. Most of the country doesn't actually believe this was an insurrection attempt. Just the democrat-lifers, which is now becoming a minority and the uninformed.

**I have had people challenge what I say or put down in essay/blog format but a lot of those arguments use pseudo-intellect and pseudo-logic along with a major dose of logical fallacies under the guise of rhetoric. Let us not forget what these words actually mean in semantics.**

- **"Pseudo" literally means 'made-up.'**
- **"Rhetoric" literally means 'smart talk with made-up facts.'**

**Rhetoric only has to sound plausible. If you can logically find a way to BS your way through teaching others that  $1+1=5$ , not 2, but 5. If you can somehow make that make just a little bit of sense in a speech. That is Rhetoric.**

### **Some Common Types of Logical Fallacies Include:**

- **Ad Hominem** – Instead of dealing with someone's argument, you attack the person who's making the argument.
- **Straw Man** – Making someone else's argument look weaker than it really is, so it's easier to criticize. (*Oversimplification*).
- **False Cause** – Thinking one thing caused another just because they happened together, without enough proof.
- **Circular Reasoning** – Using the conclusion of your argument as one of the reasons your argument is true, but it doesn't actually prove anything. (*Most popular and currently in play most days of the 2020s*).
- **Appeal to Authority** – Believing something is true just because an important person or source said so, without looking at the actual argument. (*Very common in the political landscape*).
- **False Dichotomy** – Making it seem like there are only two options when there could be more. (*Most binary information systems, like the two-party system*).
- **Hasty Generalization** – Jumping to a conclusion based on too little or biased evidence.

- **Appeal to Ignorance** – Saying something is true just because it hasn't been proven false, or vice versa.
- **Red Herring** – Bringing up something irrelevant to distract from the main point.

Recognizing and avoiding logical fallacies is essential for constructing sound and persuasive arguments, as they can undermine the credibility and effectiveness of reasoning. Critical thinking skills, common sense, and logic practicing are crucial for identifying and addressing logical fallacies in both everyday discourse and more formal conversations or debates.

### **Some of the Things Thrown at Me to Shut Me the FK Up Have Been:**

*(Some of these are directly related to the Trump hush money case and other political takes that have divided the people.)*

#### **1) How someone who is being held accountable for a crime is designed to divide us all?**

- I am assumed to be Right/Red/Republican because I talk so ill of the Left/Blue/Progressive/Democrats.
- Some on this side of the painted blue fence cannot fathom that I might not support either. It just doesn't even register to them as an option.
- This is an example of more binary, flat-dimensional thinking. We're divided because both sides of these arguments paint each other as wrong, bad, and evil.

#### **2) The crimes in the Trump hush money trial have been disclosed in full.**

- The misdemeanor, yes. The alleged, felony that doesn't exist? No, they have not. If they have no secondary crime the misdemeanor probably won't stick.
- They have to prove intent on all charges without any reasonable doubt.
- They cannot do that with the current information out there that I have seen. **Nothing definitive.** Mostly speculative, to be fair.
- The phone call? There isn't anything there. It's been reported many times over by now. If a man in America cheated on his wife wouldn't you want a NDA and to pay to keep that a secret? That still isn't illegal, in any context. NDAs are very clear.
- That is why they are NDAs. At the time of this writing news just broke that the jury found Trump Guilty of 34 felony counts of?
- **Yeah, about that.** We're not really sure. It's been said that falsifying financial documents to help sway the election.
- Or something like that. Some networks are more clear in Layman's terms what that is supposed to mean, but since no one really knows what that means, it means what it means how they can twist a thing.

It just is not 'clear' to me...

Apparently 'clear' means different things to different people.

Alright, fair enough...

### **Previously in Hollywood:**

"*Wag the Dog*" (1997) is a dark comedy that eerily parallels the 2020s phenomenon of fake news used to sway elections and public opinion. In the film, a scandal threatens the re-election of the U.S. President just days before the election. To sidetrack attention, a 'fixer' named Conrad Brean, played by Robert De Niro, of course it's him of all people, as a bumbling, yet oddly effective strategist, who coordinates a fake war with Albania. With the help of a Hollywood producer, they fabricate news footage and construct an elaborate 'false narrative' that captures media attention and manipulates public perception. This fake war is fed to a naïve AF legacy media and a mostly sleeping public, successfully sidetracking attention from the presidential scandal. The film's plot echoes the concerning and ongoing trend of the 2020s, where legacy media are often accused of disseminating false narratives to influence political outcomes, elections, and now, they help prosecute Donald Trump with speculative evidence, at best, on 34 felony counts of? Oh, yeah, that again... "*Wag the Dog*" is the best example out there where it played out almost the same way on how easily public opinion can be swayed by manufactured news, highlighting the dangerous power of media manipulation in shaping reality and affecting democratic processes. In this movie, the internet isn't a thing. They did this the old-fashioned way of doing things for real. Just keep that in mind when/if anyone thinks about these things. If anyone went to school for video editing they would know how one edits a piece of video can determine what the message or narrative is of the edited piece. We see this in our everyday lives daily.

### **3) Which side limits freedom more? Democrats or Republicans?**

- Both sides, limit freedoms.
- Both sides spend just as much time and resources giving/taking from the other side due to spite, not necessarily what is better for all of us.

### **4) Who is banning all the books?**

- Again, both sides... You mean the books designed for 10-year-olds teaching them how to have oral sex and full sex with the same gender? Those books? Or books like "*1984*," "*Alas Babylon*," "*Stranger in a Strangeland*," "*Brave New World*," and "*Lord of the Flies*?" What, movies like, "*The Outsiders*," and "*Schindler's List*?" Saw "*Schindler's List*" my senior year of High School, where I was the only adult in the class besides the teacher, crying my eyes out.
- The last time I really looked into the book-banning stuff was mostly books that were literally pedo-stuff or were so outdated on how people are today that the lesson learned in the book might not make much sense to a younger audience.

### **5) Look, Biden is bad, but not as bad as Trump, as president...**

- Not as bad as Trump "*the man*," or Trump "*the president*" would be part of my response, objectively. 2016-2020 compared to 2020-2024? Really? The majority does not feel that is an accurate assessment. Every pole out there says so, plus social media in general. I mean people's social media.

- Go on random profiles. Conduct your own passive research here/there. Trump the President, pretty sure most agree he did better than Biden and would so again if elected.
- The majority verses the minority.

## 6) Well Bidenomics is working man...

- I don't believe that for a second. Here is why I believe it is not Trump's fault. When Biden got in, he began undoing all Trump's policies.
- We felt almost an immediate impact dollars and cents wise vs the prices on everything going up over a very short period of time. You cannot just print money, and give it to the people who really need it and not expect a great many of them to **NOT** go buy some BS with it.
- We are in a crisis because no one wants to go back to work how it was before Covid-19. We are in this crisis because we give money to Ukraine instead of actually really helping them in the literal sense. We are in this crisis because we print money with no value to support it.
- We are in this crisis for some strange green plan that actually physically hurts both the environment and our country's ability to support itself. We are in this crisis giving relief to people who illegally enter the country when we have Americans who really need this help.

## That is the REALITY I see Happening. Not the latter.

### 7) If I have to pick one over the other?

- I won't support either one but if "I have to," based on the binary rule then, I would choose Trump just so Biden/Harris/AIDS doesn't get in. That is how I feel.
- To me both sides have put out a massive amount of irrelevant detail out there about each other. The one question I need to answer is who did it better, Trump 2016-2020 or Biden 2020-2024?
- That is the only thing that really matters to me. Wouldn't it be something though if Americans said, "FK-it" and voted RFK in?

## Now wouldn't that be a thing?

### 8) What about January 6<sup>th</sup>?

#### What about it?

This blog was started as a simple halfed-ass attempt at being ashamed of a once great actor in Robert De Niro, now known as 'Raging Bullshit' to some on the social media, where everything is getting really crazy that it runs how the real world reacts instead of the other way around. During De Niro's word salad of nonsense, he was saying: "They are the true heroes. These guys are the true heroes. They stood and put their lives on the line for these low lives (points at Trump supporters in the crowd)." De Niro was talking about the officers who stood their ground at the capital on January 6<sup>th</sup>. The alleged 'insurrection,' that never happened.

## **One Trump-supporter, Joshua Fulfer, calmly called out De Niro and there was an exchange of words related to the two former officers standing behind De Niro:**

Joshua Fulfer:

*"They lied under oath."*

Bobby De Niro:

*"They lied under oath? Who lied under oath? What are you? What are you telling me?"*

Joshua Fulfer:

*"Those two traitors."*

*(Points to Fanone and Dunn)*

Bobby De Niro:

*"Excuse me?"*

Joshua Fulfer:

*"Those two traders behind you, they lied under oath. That's right."*

Bobby De Niro:

*"What do you say? They're. They're traitors. I don't know, I don't even know how to deal with you, my friend. I don't even know how to deal with you."*

Fulfer didn't plan to do this. He found out that Fanone and Dunn were there a few minutes prior and like most well-informed people who see what's going on, these are the heroes of the Democrat Party. These are the people that are responsible for keeping a lot of innocent people guilty of 'aggravated-trespassing' locked up in a gulag somewhere. Fulfer said in an interview later that day; *"my blood pressure started boiling when I seen them and I was just like, nobody calls these people out for what they are. And that is traitors. And you know, I wasn't going to yell and scream, I was there, but one thing that the media that was there, they don't do, is they don't ask hard questions."* Fanone, who made a big production out of fake-crying at the January 6th hearings where he misrepresented or directly lied under oath about the details he witnessed during January 6th. He also lied in his book about the events. Later, video evidence could not properly contextualize accurately Fanone's actual account he testified and later wrote in his book about. Nor could he explain the video footage related to the subject. Harry Dunn has also been accused of muffing the truth under oath about his own accounts of that day. These guys are not heroes but phonies and most know it. Had their heads down the entire time during De Niro's word-vomit platter.

## **9) The Jury's Decision:**

- The jury's decision to convict former President Donald Trump in the hush money case likely stemmed from a desire to avoid a hung jury and ensure further judicial inquiry. The only way that can happen is through a guilty verdict and later appeal of that decision.
- Despite the prosecution's claim of "**overwhelming evidence**," the primary charge of falsified business records rests on speculative testimonies without concrete proof that Trump directed these actions with criminal intent.
- Michael Cohen testified that he made the payment at Trump's direction to protect the 2016 presidential campaign, but it's more probable Cohen acted independently, using his own money to pay

Daniels, hoping to secure favor with Trump for a potential White House job for being a self-proclaimed “fixer” for Donald Trump.

- NDAs and hush money payments are common and not inherently illegal, and labeling these payments as legal expenses could be seen as standard practice, not necessarily a criminal act. It is only a criminal act if it was done with intentionality and purposefulness to hide wrong and/or illegal doing. This was never proved in court, in any way.
- The prosecution's reliance on the timing of the payments and testimonies from figures like David Pecker does not constitute direct evidence of Trump's intent to commit fraud. By convicting Trump, the jury ensures that the case receives further detailed inquiry through the appeals process, potentially leading to a more thorough judicial review.
- We do not have a clear understanding what this secondary crime is/was? The judge's instructions revealed the jury can find Trump guilty even if they disagree on the underlying crime. Which does not make a whole lot of sense whether or not:

**a) A crime was committed.**

**b) Whether there is direct evidence to prove that crime was committed.**

An appeal could challenge the conviction based on insufficient evidence and the speculative nature of the testimonies, highlighting the lack of direct, physical proof of Trump's intent to falsify records. This decision might reflect the jury's belief that an appeal would better address unresolved questions and provide a more comprehensive investigation into the case's handling. The jury is absolved of this responsibility if later Trump appeals and wins his appeal.

**10) What made the evidence “Overwhelming” in this case that it persuaded jurors?**

It is in part the narrowness of the New York law which, unlike the law in many states, criminalizes falsifying internal business records even when they are private and not used to cheat the tax system or defraud anyone. Even in New York falsifying private business records is a misdemeanor. It becomes a felony only if the jury can find the actions are used to cover up or conceal a crime. In this case, the jury may well have been persuaded by the prosecution's argument along with the Judge's bizarre instructions, that the crime covered up was essentially a scheme to defraud the American people by concealing information about the character and conduct of a presidential candidate. Because Trump was alleged to have deceived voters, perhaps the jury was unwilling to simply shrug this off as business as usual. Another factor is the fiction spun as fact rather than what it was, speculation. With speculation the prosecution needed to prove intent. My opinion is they didn't do that, but rather spun a fictionalized story that could have been true if they had hard proof. **This did not happen.** While they did present some things in a factual way, not much of what was said could be proven as definitive facts that A, B, and C actually happened. The prosecution had so many witnesses and documents that it could tell a retrospective but plausible story in high-specific detail. Politico is now reporting that Hilary Clinton was just fined for the same exact thing with no 6-week trial and all the bells and whistles that the Trump case has had.

**11) Tried the Case through a Very Biased-Left AI Prompt.**

I did an interesting experiment with ChatGPT while writing this essay. Not only was I attempting to have an objective opinion here I wanted to up the stakes here. I have felt from the beginning this is/was a hit job to get Trump to drop from the race because Biden cannot win on his merits. **This country right now is in the shit.** Biden has blamed Trump from day one when it has been him undoing all of the things Trump got going

for America from 2016-2020. Granted it wasn't perfect and there was still problems but compared to where Biden has driven us? It really isn't debatable but yet, **here we are**. It's clear as day as much as anyone that wants to argue Left/Right politics. Me being not affiliated, NPA (*No Party Affiliation*) I never really care about either side's grievances with the other. However, these last four years have really sucked. Not just for me and a lot of Americans but when I flip on the TV, or see my timelines on social media I feel like we live in a society like the movie "*Idiocracy*." Where it isn't even really possible for mankind to get that dumb, but there, in that movie, anything is possible and anything possible could happen. **We are not that far out now**. My AI experiment took a CNBC article that was very biased against Donald Trump as background information, along with all the "*overwhelming evidence*" presented in the case and the results were very interesting. The name of the article was "*Evidence against Trump in hush money case is 'overwhelming,' prosecutor tells jury in closing argument.*" ~Dan Mangan – [Link](#). The prompt I used was: "*Here is an article below. Based on the article where/how/what is this "overwhelming evidence" suggested that was introduced in the case?*" I then copied and pasted the article into ChatGPT for analysis. It summarized the "*overwhelming evidence*" which wound up being just "*speculative-data*." I argued these viewpoints logically, and even with a very left-bias; the AI agreed the guilty verdict was more likely due to the Judge's bizarre instructions and the only way justice could actually be served for both sides of the equation is to make him guilty and allow the appeals process, which is just a fancy way of saying they are going to audit the case and re-try it. This would include all the protocols the Judge used to interpret the law along with all the evidence, checked and rechecked.

## **I2) The Appeals Process:**

Lawyers Alan Dershowitz and Mark Geragos have recently talked about how Trump could appeal his guilty verdict and possibly take his case to the Supreme Court. Because the lower courts are heavily Democratic, they suggest Trump should skip the usual appeal steps in New York and go directly to the New York Court of Appeals, thinking the Manhattan judges might be biased against him.

### **Dershowitz suggests focusing on three main points for the appeal:**

1. That irrelevant and shameful details about the Stormy Daniels case were brought in and do not have relevance to the charges.
2. That the judge didn't instruct the jury properly about a missing witness.
3. That Trump was denied a public trial, which is a right protected by the Sixth Amendment.

Dershowitz points to the Harry Weinstein case as an example where such issues were important. When it comes to sentencing, Dershowitz believes the judge in Trump's case might be influenced by Weinstein's overturned conviction. Trump's lawyers are expected to argue for no jail time at all during the sentencing on July 11th, although the District Attorney might push for jail time. They are ready to ask for a delay on any sentence while they appeal.

## **I3) Major Issues with the Trial:**

- We don't know what the secondary crime is/was. The actual part that literally translates to '*Trump did this by his own order with intent to sway an election.*'
- The judge's instructions reveal the jury can find Trump guilty even if they disagree on the underlying crime.

- Alvin Bragg said: *“He did his job.”* How, exactly? The study of semantics is the study of what words and phrases actually mean, not what they imply. The study of semantics is just like how one studies mathematics, where numbers and equations have precise, universally agreed-upon meanings and outcomes. Not pseudo-meanings where pseudo literally means ‘made-up.’
- *“No state prosecutor has ever charged federal election law as a state predicate crime. Not in New York, or any other state, ever. It has never happened in the history of this country, ever.”*
- This is true and this is what the Trump team, the Right, and Independents alike, have been saying this whole time. Just the other side keeps ignoring that detail, which is evident even when the non-fence-siders look at it.

The judge in the case has shown some bias against the rule of law here. While a Judge can interpret the law how they see fit, there are also protocols that a Judge must abide by so that his decision doesn't get either thrown out or appealed later. There is enough reasonable doubt here to at least get a new judge prior to the case. It was not once even looked at as a possibility. Trump's lawyers tried and the Judge himself shot it down. It should have been someone else's decision. That would have been fair. Trump is within his rights to have that peace of mind for his guilt or innocence. Again, most on the right and independents see it this way. It is only one side here that sees it like this. We see this in boxing sometimes with scorecards being radically different when two of the three judge's scorecards make sense to what most saw but one is radically different, leaving the other two scores, ring-by-standards, and most that saw it on TV, scratching their heads.

- **Reasonable doubt?**
- **Plenty to go around.**

*“The Judge's instruction to the jury in this case is also something that has never happened before. He told a criminal jury, your verdict against this defendant does not need to be unanimous. You can choose from any number of things that I'm going to give to you that you can find the President did wrong and even if it's not unanimous, you will find him guilty and that's what happened. Donald Trump is largely guilty of that. How to appeal a case when no one in the country still knows what the underlying predicated crime he was convicted of? They don't care because they think that they got what they wanted, which is to label Donald Trump a convicted felon. Sure doesn't seem like it's working. Not with the American people. They know what's up, why it's up, and they know who likely got this going.”* –Quotes in this section from: Former Director of National Intelligence and US Attorney John Radcliffe.

#### **14) Election Interference in the Trump Trial:**

Election interference is also a very silly detail thrown out there. Both sides have done this and it's obvious to anyone really paying attention and not just listening to clickbait articles full of nonsense displayed as ‘real facts.’ Their facts are based on subjectivity, not objectivity, nor is there ‘real facts’ to support most of these concepts. That is the problem with the case. Day-one I would have thrown the case out on that alone. A grand jury had to be persuaded based on a legal theory, not evidence a crime had been committed. **We are talking about a clerical error here.** What they are saying there was an intent to keep the money off the books. That isn't what happened. His lawyer paid out of his own money then later was paid the money back and it was labeled as a legal expense, which it was. Paying someone and having them sign an NDA is not a crime. Labeling it wrong is a technicality. You get a little fine, and talking to so one doesn't keep screwing up the paperwork. These don't go to trial. Also, they'd have to show not only intent but where and how that intent was exercised as *“part of the crime.”* That evidence was never explained in court from what I understand of it. For those reasons alone, I'd say nope, this is done, let's move on, if I were the judge. If I were a juror. I'd probably would have been let go. Let's assume I was a real juror, normal person, well, they are New Yorkers, as normal as a New Yorker can be, I'd be so freakin' confused I'd ask one question and that is it. **What did**

**Trump do that was a crime?** If they cannot show where that is, it's not guilty all day long. Plenty of reasonable doubt there alone.

**After Donald Trump announced he was going to run for president. The timeline of events goes like this:**

- Four different sets of prosecutors went to Joe Biden's White House to meet with Joe Biden's lawyers and his Department of Justice from Georgia, New York, Letitia James, Jack Smith, shortly before the indictments were brought.
- Alvin Bragg who not only met with Joe Biden, Joe Biden's lawyers in the White House, he took one of Joe Biden's lawyers from the Department of Justice to have him bring this case.
- All of these lawyers in different jurisdictions met with Joe Biden's lawyers shortly before they brought indictments against Joe Biden's political opponent.

**Is that just a coincidence? Most on the right and independent sides do not think so. This is their big claim to election interference.**

**The American people see through this.**

**President Biden was asked about that very question a day after the verdict. He turned around and gave the reporters this really weird devilish smile. He didn't answer. He just smiled weirdly.**

**15) Donald Trump Tale of the Tape:**

- Indicted four times.
- Mugshot taken.
- Impeached twice.
- Guilty, 34 felony counts.
- Hated by most of the Media.
- Hated by Hollywood.
- Leads in all relevant voting polls.
- Loved by the majority of the American people. (*The only opinion that matters.*)
- Still the most likely to win the Presidency.

This conviction really won't change any of that in the perception of the American people. When we go to the store, we're going to still feel those pains of high prices. We feel it every day. Prices on most goods, fuel, insurance. Many of us in Florida are still rebuilding after Hurricane Ian. Nothing has changed except this decision poked a sleeping bear. That bear went to all their friends and now they are united against the bear-pokers.

**16) The Spite of Americans:**

The Biden administration undid Trump's work out of spite, regardless of right/wrong for the country. It was literally like 15-yr-old high school TikTok drama and then they turn around and tell us, it is all our fault too. That to me is crazy. It would be ok if the left was; "*hey, we FK'd up, we'll do better if we win.*" No. They say

we're better now with Biden than we were with Trump and here is the proof. **What proof?** The reality is we are not better. They keep on telling us bad is good and we need to accept it. We try to vote, talk, say things that make sense and they turn around and use more language that logically makes no sense. The American people are going to vote Trump due to spite against the Biden administration. For everything they try to gain support from the people, the more people are pushing back against it. The left still does not have a grip on this. They still think it is just that we are all crazy, gun-toting, phobes of some kind. If it wasn't serious, it would be laughable. Even though 'spite' can be seen as petty and even be a sociopathic trait. People have had enough unwanted-frustration in their lives. Most do not have the time to look into things properly because they are working too much and do not have enough time, energy, resources and cash to take time to become more informed about their surroundings. However, people know what the score is. Everywhere you turn more people are speaking up about what they feel, while one side of the equation keeps scoffing at those that do.

***“Just when they think they know all the answers, I change the questions.” ~Hot Rod Roddy Piper***

### **Nihilistic and Cynical Mindset:**

My nihilistic and cynical mindset about life, love, God (*or there lack of*), existence and reality itself doesn't allow me to care too much about events in the world. Granted I have written and write about these things. However, it is from a purely objective viewpoint. My lack of natural empathy for that stuff and the people it affects has always been filled with dismissiveness. I point at a pink elephant walking across the hall because I see one. I am not the sort to pretend if something isn't there maybe it will go away. A lot of people act that way now. Especially when discussing binary politics like our current two-party system. **Never been my style.** I am not for everyone. I am not for anyone. I am not for any, one, single person, **ever.** I am content with that. I need no saving. I choose this. Trust me, to whoever reads this and believes I require saving. You are safer for it 😊 😊 🙄 😊 😊

**When I get frustrated I will not even think about the less fortunate. I never have. I just don't. I am in a near-constant state of discomfort. Be it physically, mentally and/or both working together to create this state and no form of manifestation will correct that. Why would I care about other people's misery, overly? Why would I give that headspace? Why do I give this headspace?**

**Easy...**

- 1. This is mine.**
- 2. This isn't yours.**
- 3. Confused? See #1.**
- 4. It's fun seeing how crazy people get over someone else's opinion of something, any-thing, really.**

**Especially when what I think, feel, believe, absolutely, 100%, doesn't affect them...**

If it was in my face, perhaps I'd care more than I do. **I do care.** I am not a narcissistic-sociopath. However, destructive-nihilism is a narcissistic-sociopathic trait, but not all nihilists are narcissistic-sociopaths and not all narcissistic-sociopaths are nihilists. They often get lumped into the same group though. That is what Government does. Lumps everything in groups to be easier to manage. Life isn't easy, it never was. Managing other lives takes a lot of energy. Does the Government put in that energy? That could be both debated objectively and subjectively. **Take your pick with that...**

Anyone who follows what I do and what I write about should know by now that is what I do. I make others around me deal with uncomfortable topics and the things that go along with all that. I have always been that way. Be it online or in the flesh. If you are just learning this. You're late to that party. I post on my own website where I say what I want, how I want, and no one can ever comment in public about it. They can either read it or don't. They can email me or direct message me on the social media. I don't care either way. I do not post on my site for you, or any of you, or all of you. **I do it for me.** So there is a record of my thoughts and feelings about whatever it is I am writing about; while I still remember my thoughts and feelings about a subject.

- **There will be a day I won't be able to.**
- **There will be a day I won't be here at all to do anything.**
- **That is just the reality of life.**
- **Live and learn, ha...**



That is why *'The Veil of Ignorance'* is so important to understand. Conceptually, people just dismiss that they could be caught up in the Trinary machine or the Matrix. Trinary is just my way of saying 3D vs 2D. The two-party system is setup to be 2D, but the reality is it exists in a 3D and 4D frame of reference. I will be doing a full-blown essay solely on dimensional thinking. I know that right now it's confusing to understand without getting into serious math-talk and special dimensions.

Politically, I am more a both sides of the coin are exactly the same, just look different but actually are one in the same. Just when you all comment on the social media post-version of a thought between each other, keep it civil. I will not play ref. I will just remove both side's comments, again, mine, not yours. Have some respect for one another. Also, have some respect for me. If you think you might be disrespecting me, personally, on a comment, then you probably shouldn't comment. I take blind disrespect seriously, as the ones that comment are supposed to be my friends. Would you treat your friends out in public like that? So why is it ok to do it on social media posts? **So what if it is a hot-take?** It's ok to not agree on anything. It's even ok to be passionate about the conversation or the topic, that is always the intention. It's not ok to be dickhead or **Cee U Next Tuesday** personality because you got your feelings hurt and want to dig back. If I see something, I will deal with it. I am objective AF. I call it like I see it, not how you want me to see it; nor will I backpedal or agree with a counter-assessment to avoid a confrontation. **I excel at that.** You might as well be Jake Paul and think you are gonna KO Tyson because you are younger, stronger and faster. That is why I am Mineo, and that is why very few go out of their way to piss me off intentionally.

## **Don't be tool bags...**

Something about tool bags. Tool bags hold tools. While **TOOLS** build interesting and useful things. The tool bag does indeed hold the tools. However, the tool bag itself does not contribute to the tools actually creating interesting and useful things. Tool bags sit in silence on the dirty ass floor watching the tools do interesting and useful things. When the tools are finished, the tool bag may then offer its very limited

support (*usefulness*) to carry the tools, the interesting and useful things, back to the van. The moral of the story. **DO NOT be a TOOL BAG...** That is social media's true power.

People who want to try and prove me wrong or have their pro-wrestling-style drop-mic of a moment at my expense. **Just know;** I am far more prepared than most of you probably are at a given random scroll. Not always but most of you are on your phones. I am sitting behind a full computer system, with multiple web browsers open on multiple pages, topics, notes, my own blogs, videos. I can talk to AI at a high level. I have 200+ mbps powering all of it. I have all that right in front of me, in the moment, live. Just remember that if anyone wants to debate. I am not always right about what I say, but I have looked into things extremely deep when compared to your finger scrolling on your iPhone. **Just sayin'.**

**All I do is read/watch, ask questions, write, read some more, watch some more, talk to people, talk to real people and talk to fake people, talk to WOKE people, talk to trans people. I even talk to Christians. However, no Muslims. I am good on trying to understand narcissistic-sociopathy with your neighbor's God's dick is bigger than your God's phat ass 😊😊👍😂😊**

**That is how I feel...**

**Nothing anyone says is gonna change my mind by default.**

You'd have to be the greatest salesjerk ever to even get me to consider something you said. I am also **racist against salespeople** 😊😊👍😂😊, so there is that... To me, when your literal life is almost lost due to illness or ever a trauma of some kind, a lot of the BS noise gets drowned out by pure **Who-Gives-A-FK-Cold-Vulcan-Logic**. The minority gets louder and volume has never been a measurement of quality. Just because something is loud and clear doesn't make it good, right and just. **Just sayin'.**

The concept of the '*Veil of Ignorance*' suggests that each person perceives reality through a filter that distorts the actual truth of reality. This veil separates us from objective truth, leading individuals to project their own subjective-truths onto the world and label that subjectivity as truth/facts/reality. By consciously passing through this '*Veil of Ignorance*,' we can expand our knowledge and gain a clearer understanding of the true reality we all experience. The concept of the '*Veil of Ignorance*' was popularized by philosopher John Rawls in his work "*A Theory of Justice*" (1971). Rawls used the term to describe a thought experiment designed to ensure fairness in the principles of justice. He proposed that individuals should design societal rules from an original position of equality, where they are behind a '*Veil of Ignorance*.' This means they do not know their own social status, abilities, or personal biases, ensuring impartiality and fairness in the creation of just policies, common sense, logic, and self-reflection. By stripping away personal biases and self-interest, the '*Veil of Ignorance*' encourages more logical decision-making and a deeper understanding of universal truths. '*The Veil of Ignorance*' in our culture right now is very powerful. More powerful than love and more powerful than hate. In the 90s the saying "*ignorance is bliss*" was very true in my reality. In 2024, it isn't a very bright idea to hold that concept in high regard. The 1990s and the 2020s, yeah, we're not the same.

**In a binary system one has to be the good guy and one has to be the evil dick. That is how binary works. That is also why it doesn't work. You cannot just lump everything in a 0 and/or 1. You can do a lot of things in reality using binary systems but using binary rules to govern humans is not one of them.**

***"There are two types of people in this world. People who think government is looking out for them, their interest, and people who think." ~Nathan Fraser***

The Veil of Ignorance  
by David-Angelo Mineo  
5/29/2024  
7,496 Words