

# Trump Derangement Syndrome

13 May 2020

If you have not heard this term, sometimes abbreviated TDS, I envy you. For you fortunate unaware readers, it refers to emotional, angry and sometimes unhinged opposition in the USA (*and elsewhere*) to the current US president, not just political disagreement. It isn't new; every US presidential election includes it during the campaign, reaching a new level twenty years ago with Bush vs Gore. Select supporters of one candidate say & do everything possible to prevail, and I mean anything. After the election, pressure release valves open a little and the opposition turns to winning next time.

The current derangement syndrome however, is not about public policy; no madam and no sir, that is well below this topic; we're talking about virulent hate and disgust, sometimes first concealed but eventually boiling over for all to see. I recognize, admit & acknowledge my simplistic, naïve point-of-view, which is: the answer seems to be to win the next election, to make efforts to that end, not launch endless, mindless attacks.

What are the causes and effects? Why does this happen? I turn to The Committee.

*Q: Esteemed Committee, have I made an accurate assessment?*

C: Yes.

*Q: I know it's not precise, but I'm not far off base?*

C: No, you are more precise than you believe. You do not suffer from political derangement syndrome.

*Q: Please explain in as much detail as we can absorb, why this happens.*

C: Well intended efforts aimed at the wrong target.

*Q: I think more detail than that can be digested. Working to achieve what? How do they mean well?*

C: These manifestations of disgust arise from emotion, not analysis, representing a reaction to many things which have long preceded the election of the current US president. An objective does not exist for many public manifestations of disgust and dislike. What is seen is an effect, not a goal. The well meaning aspect of the process is desire for goodness and well being, itself often naïve but adamantly opposed.

*Q: How is desire for goodness and well being naïve?*

C: It often ignores reality. Cute kittens today will rip apart live birds in one year. The desire to end all war has almost no effect upon adversaries who stand to gain from engaging in war, it rather motivates. A disliked thing which represents the opposite of perceived goodness, must be analyzed for causes, motivations and learned reactions.

*Q: So what is the problem with Trump?*

C: Many of his detractors have been surrounded by soothing, superficially pleasant

mannerisms and speech, and have grown accustomed to it. Standard political strategy is for the candidate to appeal as broadly likeable as possible, yet employ surrogate mercenaries to launch bitter attacks.

*Q: Mr. Obama sounds like an example.*

C: Among many others, yes. He is not unique, simply recent. Mr. Trump took a deliberately different approach, one not used in generations, which was to recognize the existence of opposition which would not vote for him ever, no matter what. To gather winning support, he did not take the likeable approach, even though he knows better than most candidates how to achieve this. His skill and experience as an entrepreneur, business executive and eventual media star did not reach the levels seen because of his apparently brash, abrasive manner. Quite the opposite, he can be charming, facilitating and accommodating as well as anybody, often better. This is his default approach but he recognizes how it will lead away from political success if employed too often. Mr. Trump chose to attack adversaries, understanding this would attract frustrated support more than it would repel disaffected voters offended by his false manner.

*Q: In his private life, he is not crass, crude or abrasive?*

C: No, not in the least.

*Q: OK, so why the bitter opposition to his candidacy?*

C: Perception of government's role in society. He appears to be a reversal of progress to people who have enjoyed seeing and using central authorities to make changes.

*Q: What is the problem with using a central authority?*

C: It is hypocrisy. The same power collectively created which obtains what someone or a group wants today, will have that same authority used to force them against their will, tomorrow. This is human nature.

*Q: Trump is accused of being authoritarian.*

C: He uses authority decisively, and is transparent about why. The solution here is to lessen authority, something his political opponents will not do. The process to reduce executive authority will not be easily reversed once the preferred candidate takes office, and s/he who comes next will have equally reduced authority. The power players in politics who understand this well, are content to allow the voters to spew forth endlessly. The noise is a convenient distraction.

*Q: Distraction from what? Away from which thing they'd prefer not be emphasized?*

C: The true ends, which are increase government's role, thus power in society. Government is a tool, a mechanism used by more powerfully aspiring interests to get what they want. We refer to term limits; as these became popular for elected officials, the true reason was to allow the behind-the-scenes interests to rotate their puppets to & from, and in & out, of key positions, especially The White House.

*Q: So why do people become so deranged with Trump?*

C: He is a sour note to their taste preferences and habits. This is not new, what have

developed are the desire and need to express bitter dislike, even hatred. That is taught & learned behavior, which has occurred as part of a deliberate, well orchestrated plan.

*Q: People have been indoctrinated?*

C: Yes, more now in the USA than ever.

*Q: Please supply an example, puh-leeze.*

C: Homicide, intentional murder. An quick examination of perpetrators and victims would reveal immediate ways to effect improvements, and we suggest that you who read these words, pursue that brief analysis, if you wish. Neither this topic nor even solutions, reach the greater number of you. The obvious aspects of the problem are not discussed. This is not accidental.

*Q: Another example, please.*

C: The discussions of slavery reparations, payments to descendants of former slaves. This would largely require money be given to great grandchildren of victims. Only the great grandchildren of perpetrators likewise remain alive; what responsibility can be put on them? What burden must the society as a whole pay? If great grandchildren of victims are exempted from payment of incomes taxes, the means by which such payments will be generated, the idea begins to make at least financial sense. Obviously the thirteen percent of American citizens considered black thus descendants of slaves, are not going to be excepted from payment of income tax. Is this aspect ever mentioned or discussed?

*Q: I'm beginning to see how we are attempted controlled.*

C: And how derangement builds. It must be planted, cultivated. It cannot be imposed. It has worked to good success, even great success. Huge segments of American society will intolerantly insist upon tolerance, and when this contradiction is suggested, have learned to erupt in bitter counter attacks, tossing accusations and epithets.

*Q: How does this lead to derangement syndrome, a là monsieur Trump?*

C: The development of habits and views. As violent crime overall and the portions of it involving firearms steadily reduced across the USA, reactions to ownership of firearms changed. Opposition became and remains loud. Mr. Obama's election brought about a several year long buying spree, built on fears of restrictions. Despite the oft cried message of more guns means more crime, the crime rate overall, of the violent variety and specifically involving guns, continued to drop through the Obama years as president.

The logical next question would become, what causes and why does a delay or lag in increased crime occur? This question is not asked, because the increase does not occur.

Instead, the people are shown an endless stream of mass shooting event images. These shape public opinion. The natural desire for goodness and well being is shredded when such an event occurs, thus ideas and approaches are re-considered.

Mr. Trump did not follow this thinking; he did not suggest restrictions. To the contrary, he proclaimed his support for firearm ownership. This became sandpaper rubbed in the face of many people.

The many of you have learned from the natural human desire to control your surroundings and environment. This leads to survival and eventual well being, and naturally feeds a normal desire to do something to fix a problem.

Humans have been deliberately taught and instructed to believe all surroundings can be influenced if not controlled, and that unpleasant, unwanted and unintended changes are at least influenced, if not outright caused by humans. Many examples exist, and these are extrapolated to ends they do not match.

Humans believe humans activity changes weather and the climate. It does not, yet many of you have been indoctrinated to offer and accept this arrogance as normal, and find the idea it is labeled arrogant, arrogant itself.

*Q: Trump certainly seems to want to control surroundings.*

C: All leaders do, the idea this would be bad comes from people who prefer different controls, different authorities and different policies but even more vigorously enforced. Just different.

*Q: So why the derangement?*

C: It is seen as the means and manner to reach objectives and assert control. An adult temper tantrum, in other words.

*Q: Thank you, esteemed Committee.*

C: An honor to be asked, as always.