

# If the Cultural Leftists and Their Media Think they Won, Then Why are They So Concerned and Uneasy?



By Steven Yates

Saturday, November 7, was a day of celebration for left-liberals not just in the U.S. but across the world!

As far as they're concerned, their man (and woman) won!

Even if the "win" was declared in corporate mass media *long* before all votes had been counted, and amidst large and growing allegations of fraud (dead people voting, hundreds of thousands of votes for Biden-Harris appearing out of thin air in crucial swing states, etc.).

In a media-saturated world, corporate mass media maintains the official narratives: allegations of a stolen election are then "baseless," "unfounded," "unsubstantiated," "unproven allegations"; or "unverified" and "without evidence" (or "evidence-free"), based on "false information" (Flakebook loves that one!); a product of "unhinged" "right-wing extremists"; "bogus conspiracy theories"; etc. This, in addition to "racist" and "fascist" (or "neo-fascist"), is a healthy (or *unhealthy*!) sampling of the brain-paralysis inducing phrases I've seen since the November 3 fiasco.

Facts no longer matter if they interfere with official narratives and agendas. Thus the largest narrative war I think

I've ever seen has unfolded, between those using the above demon words and phrases, and those who insist that documentation of how voting-machine technology was used to commit fraud is clear and factual, and backed with evidence that corporate media and Big Tech are censoring just as fast as they can (they could now cite [this](#)).

The particular brand of structural violence we are seeing, based on disinformation instead of deprivation, backed culturally (with huge financial resources), is almost fascinating to watch as it unfolds, day by day!

We've had events like [this](#), with all the standard mainstream misrepresentations like [this one](#) (reproduced uncritically from hard-left Salon). The truth as always: there was *zero violence* until leftists showed up under the cover of darkness, [as they tend to do](#). But as I said, facts no longer matter.

While I hear some QAnon type stuff ("Biden'll be arrested any day now!") I'll believe it when I see it. All indications are, Trump will leave the White House in January, and Biden-Harris will be coronated. There's no doubt they will lead the next lurch leftward (see [this](#), [this](#), and [this](#)).

Even so, there's a palpable sense of unease out there. You saw it in [an article I linked to last week](#). I've encountered it several times since.

First, cultural leftists know they don't control the Supreme Court. Trump has ensured that conservatives will have a presence there for years to come. Nor do Democrats control Congress. They actually lost ground. But it's more than that.

The far left knows it doesn't control the minds and hearts of the almost 73 million Americans whose votes for Donald Trump were actually counted as such, and that demonizing all 73 million as systemic racists, white supremacists, closet Klansmen, etc., is bonkers even by their standards!

Probably over 80 percent of those 73 million will put this behind them and get back to their lives. Assuming the national agenda doesn't lock them down, they have mouths to feed, mortgages to pay, lights to keep turned on, and with Biden-Harris ready to push anti white racism and restore the full globalist agenda against the country, they'll have their hands full.

Before this is over, many more will adopt the totally-fed-up mindset of [this woman](#) (warning: "salty" language).

But none of this goes to the heart of the real reason for cultural left's collective unease.

The problems that led to the Trump presidency in the first place are all still very much around.

What were these problems? Start with the economic assault on the middle class that began decades ago, and proceeded apace as the country financialized, globalized, and basically divided in two.

*Financialization:* those who learned to game the system got ahead, while those who continued with honest work and tried just to live their lives fell behind. Financialization is a corrupt "fake capitalism" that redistributed wealth *upward* at an accelerating rate. It is actually socialism for the wealthy elites and capitalism for the poor and middle class (see [this](#)). Politicians of the mainstream (Republicans as well as Democrats) and the Federal Reserve supported this transformation, which has saddled millions with unrepayable debt likely to worsen as inflation / currency devaluation destroys any savings they might have, undermines the value of their (often fixed) incomes, and drives down their standard of living.

Hence the emergence of "two economies," those of the financialized and globalized cities versus the patriotic rural regions, equivalent roughly to blue and red. Behind the red

insurgency of Trumpism was the collapse of narratives surrounding globalization, foreign wars of choice, and “liberal democracy” amidst the frustration of rising living costs. There was also the growing distrust of mainstream media outlets proclaiming these narratives, now including Big Tech. Finally, there was the surging anti white racism of identity politics, which actually grew in strength during the Trump years and will doubtless become still more brazen under Biden-Harris.

This leads to the deepest fear I see on the left.

That Trumpism, having gone nowhere, will give rise to a new leader with all of Trump’s strengths and none of his weaknesses.

That is to say, the next Donald Trump will be charismatic and know how to optimize both mass and social media, just as Trump did. He will specialize in “infotainment” and hold audiences spellbound without seeming self-absorbed.

He will oppose open borders but avoid referring to Mexicans as criminals and rapists. He won’t insult anybody. Instead, he will observe, correctly, that open immigration drives down wages for all – Latinos as well as Anglos. An anti-Communist, he will have Cuban-Americans who fled Castro and their direct descendants solidly on his side.

This person will probably be at least two and maybe three decades younger than Trump, and possess great quantities of what some call *emotional intelligence*, which Trump lacked. Assuming he’s a man, he will empathize and know how to talk to women, and will quickly have conservative women in his corner. He won’t have the “locker-room talk” baggage that dogged Trump. He will be married, possibly to a beauty-queen, and not have mistresses or porn stars hidden in his background. Nor will anyone find potential scandals involving taxes, lawsuits against failed businesses, or other such issues. This person

will understand that outsiders have to keep their noses clean as a whistle.

Although this person won't necessarily be a man.

Imagine a much politically savvier Sarah Palin, not needing to be plucked out of obscurity by a John McCain.

He or she will successfully navigate the tightrope of being able to speak even to those he/she may despise with carefully measured words – having learned how (and when) to disagree without being disagreeable. That's a key part of being emotionally intelligent.

On the other hand, at just the right moment, perhaps in the debate context, this person will know how to strike his opponent(s) as with a rapier blade. It will be a thousand times more effective since it's unexpected, and might even employ *humor* to full effect, leaving opponent(s) looking ridiculous.

He/she will know how to speak to foreign leaders and international bodies. He/she will likely have access to the information that exposes real elite privilege before their peoples.

At the same time, he/she will remain calm and collected in public at all times, whereas Trump often was not.

Elites will dislike him or her, but won't be able to do a thing about it. They will be more stymied than they were by Trump back in 2015-16.

His/her use of social media will be restrained, without the late night tweet storms for which Trump was famous (or infamous).

My guess is, this person will be self-disciplined, nutrition-conscious (Trump was not), and avoid news programs and pointed exchanges with mainstream media.

When before its representatives, his/her manner of speaking and carrying himself/herself will be disarming rather than confrontational.

Actor Robert deNiro, notorious for his hatred for Trump, summed up well what I have in mind when [he recently appeared on MSNBC's \*The Beat\*](#) (scroll to 2:42):

"Somebody's going to come along who's a lot smarter, more sensitive, more mercurial and not so boorish and will be able to pull the wool over the eyes of the public. And then we will have a more serious ... deeper problem ... and one that might actually get further than what Trump has done ..."

Unlike DeNiro, I sincerely hope so, and will not view the person as "pulling the wool over" anybody's eyes because he or she has circumvented any and all elite maneuverings.

But is there any such person waiting in the wings?

I don't know, but some leftist authors are clearly afraid of something.

What we Americans conveniently call Trumpism is in fact a global phenomenon (because financialization and globalism with their trappings are, after all, global phenomena). We see variants in Hungary, Poland, the Philippines, India, Brazil, and elsewhere – everywhere a leader strong enough to win and continue winning elections has emerged to represent a critical mass of those fed up with being dominated by agendas imposed from outside their countries.

Consider, from the [Atlantic Monthly](#):

"Make no mistake: The attempt to harness Trumpism—without Trump, but with calculated, refined, and smarter political talent—is coming. And it won't be easy to make the next Trumpist a one-term president. He will not be so clumsy or vulnerable. He will get into office less by luck than by

skill. Perhaps it will be Senator Josh Hawley, who is [writing a book](#) against Big Tech because he knows that will be the next chapter in the culture wars, with social-media companies joining “fake news” as the enemy. Perhaps it will be Senator Tom Cotton, running as a law-and-order leader with a populist bent. Maybe it will be another media figure: Tucker Carlson or Joe Rogan, both men with talent and followings. Perhaps it will be another Sarah Palin—she was a prototype—with the charisma and appeal but without the baggage... Perhaps someone like the QAnon-supporting Representative-elect Lauren Boebert of Colorado, who first beat the [traditional](#) Republican representative in the primary and then ran her race with [guns blazing, mask off](#), and won against the Democratic candidate, a retired professor who avoided campaigning in person. Indeed, a self-made charismatic person coming out of nowhere probably has a better chance than many establishment figures in the party.”

[This article](#), from Great Britain’s left-of-center *The Guardian*, notes that Biden-Harris will enter the White House with a mark against them even from some of their own.

Both are regarded, rightly or wrongly, by a “populist” element on the left as Establishment flunkies. Some of this element speak of a “nefarious elite” no less than some on the right, and they see it in many of the same places: global corporations promoting job-destroying trade deals, secretive organizations such as Bilderberg and the Trilateral Commission, financiers who own Wall Street, the CIA, and the foreign war machine.

These folks suspect that while Biden may lock down the country in the name of Cap’n Covid until a vaccine is made generally available (whatever *its* real purpose and effects – this is another article), when push comes to shove neither he nor Kamala will do anything to further causes they care about such as (e.g.) national health care, because there is just too much profit to be had from a population that is sickly and

lethargic.

Now if Trump should form Trump Media as I suggested [here](#) (see also [this](#)), he could have a hand in establishing this person's credibility and even providing him with a platform in the early going – provided he then stays out of the way, as this person will have the skills to continue on his/her own merits.

Are we seeing a preview of 2024 here?

At the moment, it depends on what the Biden-Harris team presidency (it'll be that, after all) does, how fed up the red insurgency remains (especially if anti white bias continues to worsen and mainstream media continues to bury the fact), and whether someone appears who can channel that anger in the right way. I doubt that a rinse-and-repeat of 2015-16 will work.

I'm also assuming here that Biden-Harris won't do anything to cause the national cold war between red and blue to turn hot. If that assumption is wrong – if, for example, Biden-Harris try to confiscate guns – all bets are off.

© 2020 Steven Yates – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Steven Yates: [freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com](mailto:freeyourmindinsc@yahoo.com)