



rRemarks Data for October 20, 2026 Village Council Meeting

Agenda Section & Item: Comments of a General Nature

Commenter: David Rose

Comment: Trump's Shamelessness and the Absurdity of Present Day America, #2

Trump's desperation in the face of projected disastrous midterm election results is evident in his escalating bribes and promises of bribes to voters.

These beyond the \$5k check Trump promised to every adult citizen if Trump Party retains a majority in both houses of Congress.

Such as

1. A deal with an India-based company to bring a steel plant to Lee County, Iowa. A "done deal" with no evidence of anything beyond an MOU (Think Foxconn in WI). Lee County had less than 34,000 people in the 2020 census. Why there then? Probably nothing to do with fact starting in 2016 they went big for Trump after voting for Dem prez candidate from 1984 to 2012. Clearly not a bribe.
2. A \$54-billion dollar deal with a S Korean company for a natural gas project in Alaska. Part of S Korea's purported intention to invest hundreds of billions in the US thanks to Trump's offer of a deal they couldn't refuse. Trump's announcement conveniently timed to help the Trump Party candidate in a tight race for US Senate. (Think Foxconn again?) Clearly not a bribe.
3. Starting in late Sep \$500 Affordable Care "refund checks" to about 950,000 Americans in 30 states, along with a letter from Trump saying it was Biden's fault they overpaid. Which states have citizens getting checks? Check the list. Red states and swing states!! Timed to offset expiration of ACA premium subsidies. (Remind me. Which party was responsible for terminating those subsidies?) According to one news story's coverage: "Recipients have already been identified and do not need to apply." Clearly not a bribe.
4. A "plan" to import 300,000 metric tons of mystery meat (ground beef of unknown quality from unidentified countries of origin) tariff free. Why doesn't meat have country of origin information? Guess which party got rid of that requirement? Political calculus here? Ranchers complain but vote for Trump Party. Who does Trump Party need votes from? Meat eaters complaining about rising cost of food! Clearly not a bribe.
5. A deal with Russia to remove sanctions until April 2027 so Russia can export up 4.5 million tons of diesel fuel, to the US and others. One ton is roughly equivalent to 8 barrels. US consumption of diesel is 3.9 million barrels per day, so the projected max total export is equivalent to about 9 days of US consumption. The initial shipment Russia agreed to is about 1.5 days of US consumption. By the way, total global diesel consumption per day is about 3.75 million tons!

Zelensky is angry about the deal, but he doesn't vote in the midterms. And he's losing the war with Russia anyway. So does the US continue to support him and Ukraine's attacks or put a stop to them? Yes, both. Depending on which part of government one is talking about. Dems may be angry about the deal, but they don't vote for Trump Party candidates either. Who might be impressed? Truck drivers, especially those living in rural areas. "Trump is trying. The Dems didn't even talk to Russia while they were fighting them." Clearly not a bribe ... for those who are impressed because they cannot do math. But the diesel deal matters only if ...

6. The best deal of all works out. Which is:

Trump is going to annihilate Iran unless they accept the deal we offer them to end the fighting between them and US (and Israel). One element of which is: "we can't let Iran have a nuke weapon" when we've got 5000 of 'em and Israel is believed to have a couple hundred. But Trump magnanimously opts to give Iran another "last chance" to agree by not annihilating them until after the US midterm elections.

Clearly not a bribe to all those who want to believe the US has been in the past and must be in future the most powerful country in the world, Trump as prez is the most powerful person in the world (the biggest, baddest "Big Daddy"), and what he says goes: "You do as you're told, because I said so. Because I know what's best for you."

Hence, MAGA — "Make America Great Again".

Problem is: up till now Trump's and Israel's attack on Iran is unpopular with Americans, in no small part because it has not led Iran to capitulate.

Can Trump/US get Iran to capitulate or must he/US annihilate them? And why wait until after the midterms to annihilate them?

Let's assess.

+++++++ Deal or No Deal? Who Needs a Deal More? Iran or US? +++++++

Trump regularly contends the deal Iran wants is not a good deal for the US, so he has to keep the pressure on Iran by using economic and military force.

Trump rejected Iran's offer to open the Strait of Hormuz in return for certain US actions as a path back to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Iran and US negotiated, Trump signed and then ignored.

With negotiations seemingly going nowhere, Trump declare the US is going to annihilate Iran ... but will wait until after the mid-terms to do so.

Does he wait because he doesn't want to risk any disastrous effects of such bombing producing an even greater Trump Party electoral disaster than is extrapolated from political polling?

Reports swirl on the internet the US and Israel are planning a three day bombing campaign against Iran, which may happen BEFORE their respective elections — late Oct for Israel, early Nov for the US.

So Trump saying no bombing before mid-terms will lull Iran into a false sense of security? Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me. Fool me a third time? Do you really think I am that stupid/gullible?

Iran says, "we are ready. we will act should we detect you taking steps to attack us."

The standoff has grown more complicated with the intensification of fighting between Yemen's Ansar Allah and KSA.

Trump rejected KSA's request for help in putting down Yemen's Ansar Allah fighters counter-attack to KSA's recent attacks on Yemen. Why did he refuse? Likely because the

previous joint effort failed to defeat Ansar Allah, suggesting a new joint effort is unlikely to produce any better results this time around. Especially in light of reported US munitions shortages.

So Ansar Allah has used the opening to take its fight to KSA. Attacking their oil facilities and their airports in Riyadh and Jeddah in early Oct.

If the US doesn't come to the rescue, will/can anyone else? Turkey or Pakistan, in light of their recent mutual defense pact with KSA? Maybe. Except Ansar Allah bombing KSA airports makes it difficult for anyone's military to fly into KSA in large numbers at a time. And bombing KSA oil facilities cuts off KSA's ability to pay for significant outside help. AND the populations of Turkey and Pakistan reportedly do NOT support the idea of their nations' militaries being used offensively against Yemen.

So KSA for now goes it mostly alone. Which, given the reputed questionable effectiveness of its army and the apparent inadequacy of its air defenses (relative to Ansar Allah's improved missile and drone capabilities), leads many analysts to ponder the previously unthinkable — overthrow of Prince MBS and the Saud family's control of the kingdom!

It's so unthinkable, what will happen is unpredictable given the potential for both internal strife and external attack. What is thinkable and predictable? Thanks to the destructive effects of the fighting, KSA oil is unlikely to be a major factor in future world supplies for many years to come. Since KSA has been the linchpin of US hegemony in the world, does Trump's refusal to provide military assistance hint at how hard-pressed his military advisers believe the US military is right now? While Trump may say he may change his mind about helping KSA, what military support can the US provide? Or is the claim simply Trump code-speak for linking bombing Yemen with his professed intention to bomb Iran? After the midterms.

Many analysts argue Netanyahu needs US to join it in bombing Iran in order to increase his chances of being re-elected. Right now, according to polling he trails. The logic: if he loses the election, he will probably wind up in jail. Thus far the Israeli prez has refused to pardon Neta, in spite of Trump's pressure/request. Not helping Israeli voter support or sympathy for Neta? News reports indicating he knew about but did nothing to stop Hamas attack on 07 Oct.

My question: Why do analysts believe bombing Iran helps Neta? Iran has promised to retaliate/preempt in kind any attack. So the only apparent 'advantage' to Neta is canceling the election, at the significant price of further damage to Israel's economic viability as a country. With little reason to believe delay improve his prospects whenever the election is held.

Indeed, depending on the intensity and scope of an attack and Iran's (pre-emptive/)counter-attack, such fighting threatens to do immediate and lasting damage to the world economy!! Because it sends gas and diesel prices even higher!

Are Neta's and Trump's political fates aligned here? In terms of both timing and objective in bombing?

What constitutes 'success' in bombing Iran? Unless the US and Israel find a way to prevent counter-attack, what leads one to believe our damage to them will be worse than their damage to us? Does Trump bomb, somehow declare victory, leave the region, and let others figure out how to end the fighting? When Israel has clearly shown it will NEVER end the fighting until it dominates the region!

If a bombing campaign were able to yield actual victory, why would Trump wait until after the midterms?

Is Trump merely blustering to avoid having to admit US defeat and his party getting hammered even worse at the polls for his attacking Iran in the first place?

Or does Trump Admin believe bluster will cow the Iranians into submission? We see little evidence of that happening; quite the opposite. The US killed Iran's former leader, for goodness sake. He was among many the US has directly or indirectly killed/assassinated over the years! Iranians act like they've had enough, and now have the means to change the dynamics in the region.

Does Israel attack Iran and 'force' a 'reluctant' US to join in? Why will a joint attack work better this time? If the US doesn't join an attack but helps with Israel's defense, does it get 'pulled in' anyway when American military personnel operating from inside Israel are killed?

How would Americans react if Iran in counter-attack sank a US aircraft carrier and most aboard were lost? Would Americans recognize it's time to admit defeat or would they demand US nuke Iran in retaliation? Is that the reason Iran has NOT yet opted to sink an aircraft carrier?

++++++ Planning for Annihilation ++++++

Reports suggest Trump has asked the US military for plans to attack Iran, plans which his public rhetoric ('annihilate' 'to hell') leads many to conclude will involve the use of nuclear bombs.

On Iran. AND Yemen (Axis of Resistance—AoR), if Ansar Allah continues to have success in its attacks on KSA? To prevent Ansar Allah from destroying KSA oil facilities even more than they have already.

Reinforcing the interpretation that annihilation means nuking is Sec of State Rubio's recent speech in Greece declaring the dispute between US and Iran is ultimately a battle of civilizations.

So what must the military planner consider/establish to make such an attack a success? How about ...

That neither Iran nor Yemen has the capacity to wipe out Israel, KSA, and other US allies in the region in a counter-attack. Or the capacity to counter-attack the US directly, not even by cyberattack.

And that no country able to attack the US with missies (N Korea? Pakistan?) will do so in sympathy/support of AoR. And neither Russia nor China will attack the US with nukes ... because we didn't attack them directly with nukes. Because their attacking us with nukes would necessitate our counter-attacking them with nukes. Which our planners believe they would be reluctant to do ... in spite of their growing friendly relations with Iran and others in the region?

If Trump goes for annihilation of Iran, how many years/decades will its oil and nat gas be unavailable to the world? Is this a welcome or unwelcome effect of such an attack? Or does the US military somehow "sort-of annihilate" Iran and not destroy its reserves and production facilities?

Larry Johnson has been citing energy analyst Karl Miller warnings that once the war ends the global oil market is about to experience years of uncertainty, thanks to the need for rebuilding facilities throughout the region damaged by the fighting.

<https://sonar21.com/americas-diesel-surplus-is-an-illusion-an-update-from-karl-miller/>

<https://sonar21.com/the-gulf-restart-trap-why-reopening-hormuz-wont-end-the-energy-crisis/>

Which raises a key question:

<https://sonar21.com/the-five-year-fuel-crisis-why-the-world-economy-is-paying-for-a-war-it-thinks-is-ending/>

How can US remain global hegemon if it nukes AoR but is unable to use KSA as the linchpin of its hegemony thanks to the adverse effects on KSA's ability to influence oil market supplies once the battlefield settles down? Russia and Iran have the oil and nat gas reserves to be a linchpin, but both are leading proponents of a multi-nodal world NOT dominated by a single nation. And both are under US attack.

The predicament Trump and the US military face is that the situation has escalated beyond the US capacity to declare (some kind of symbolic) victory and 'leave'. Like the US did in Vietnam and Afghanistan, for example.

Most analysts, including those in the alt media universe of the internet, do not see the fighting in Ukraine and West Asia as a fight motivated by the US desire to remain global hegemon. That motivation, I argue, is what makes the military situation so dangerous. Because alt media analysts agree what the mainstream media cannot say: the US is losing on both the Ukraine and Iran/Persian Gulf battlefronts, and now a new battlefront opened in KSA is also being lost. Which means there is no US path to victory using conventional military forces. Ergo, nukes. Although attacking Russia with nukes seems folly, military leaders in Europe continue to invoke the usual "any means necessary"/"all options are on the table" position that implies their potential usage. On the other hand, US attacking Iran with nukes feels more tempting. However, since Iran has shown itself morally against nuke bombs, willing to negotiate, willing to be inspected, and so forth, how does attacking Iran with nukes to keep it from getting nuke bombs do anything other than (further) confirm US depravity?

If the US shows itself willing to open that Pandora's box in order to remain global hegemon, should the US really expect no counter-attack? Why would Russia not use nukes against Europe and the US when the US has shown the consequences of its refusal to give up being hegemon? How can either Russia or China expect to have non-antagonistic relations with the US should the US annihilate Iran? How could the US have non-antagonistic relations with anyone should it annihilate Iran?

Why does Trump think his un-diplomatic, mafia-like language of annihilation is an effective invitation to a deal? Who does he think it impresses?

Which leads to a related set of issues for the military planner ...

What impact does a nuke attack on Iran and Yemen have on domestic politics and tranquility inside the US?

Does Trump hold off nuking Iran because Trump Party internal polling reveals only Trump Party loyalists are in favor of trying to carry out the annihilation? Which means domestic chaos ensues in reaction to nuking? But why then wait until after the midterms ... when domestic chaos before Election Day allows Trump to cancel the election and avoid electoral reckoning? Or does the Trump Admin believe a nuke attack would not lead to domestic chaos? Or that if chaos occurs, the admin has the armed forces (local, state, and federal) to quickly subdue it? In WWII the Truman Admin was able to lie about the reason it dropped nukes on Japan ('save American lives'). Can the Trump Admin claim nuking Iran protects the US and/or protects what little is left of Israel? The latter flies only if Americans are propagandized enough to believe Israel and/or we are innocent parties threatened by the crazy Muslim evildoers, which requires the citizenry to believe Trump and Neta's lies and blissfully ignore the history of Israel's (and US) conduct in the region. Which many (most?) Americans have done up till now, as evidenced by commemoration in the US of Israel's 07 Oct. Is nuclear annihilation of Iran a bridge too far?

Evidence suggests the usual propaganda narratives are becoming a much harder sell to Americans.

Israel's conduct in recent years/decades has damaged its support within the US for years to come. Young people, including young Jewish Americans, lack the sympathy and support for Israel that older generations, certain portions of the ruling class, and mainstream media still show towards it. Even MAGA now seems divided.

The US has destroyed whatever good will, respect, and trust it had from the rest of the world by the support both Dems and Repubs extended to Israel in its paranoid rogue lawlessness and genocide and their equally dubious support for Ukraine (a problem whose roots go back to at least the Clinton admin). Recent history suggests to anyone outside the US paying attention that the US and Israel uphold the rule of law only when the doing so works to its/their advantage.

Will election results have an impact on a Trump decision to annihilate Iran after the midterms?

If Dems win the mid-terms in a "wave" election, what happens to all the US warring? Will Dems come to accept that the US has no path to victory against Russia and no path to victory against Iran and Ansar Allah and vote to stop funding the wars? If Dems don't accept US military defeat, what do they propose the military do differently in order to win? What do Dems understand winning the war(s) looks like at this juncture?

Or will a wave election bring in enough 'new' Dems to stop the thirst for war, in both the US and Israel? Is there enough sense of community left in both countries to abandon nuke madness and come together to chart a new direction?

Does the US continue its economic and military support for Israel? Without US support, it's not obvious how Israel can continue to exist, let alone pursue its genocide of Palestinians and attacks on its neighbors in the region. Does Israel seek peace with Palestinians and its neighbors; or does it pursue its so-called Sampson option, firing off its nuclear arsenal anywhere and everywhere, inside the region and beyond, in retaliation for its demise?

The US in effect faces the same questions.

Or ...

Is voter polling in the US that portends a Dem wave election wrong again about the extent of Trump Party support? Are MAGA voters again underrep'd in polls, and likely to turn out in large numbers to support Trump Party candidates?

Maybe. Except reports suggest Trump Party leaders are already seeing where races are lost and moving its campaign money to salvage races still deemed winnable. And Trump's boast of how much campaigning he's doing up till Election Day speaks of fear, not confidence. Reports suggest his rallies aren't drawing as well. Trump replies "fake news." And the quality of many Trump Party candidates leaves much to be desired. Can Elon Musk's hundreds of millions in campaign donations turn back the wave?

History shows and Trump has threatened that the Trump Party is not going to lose these elections. Other risks? Suppression of Dem voter turnout (ICE? Fewer polling places?

Canceled/deleted voter registration? Trump Party 2020 election deniers ensuring 'voting integrity'? etc.). Vote count tampering by Trump Party election officials (2000 Fla redux? Mail in ballots rejected or lost or late? Provisional ballots rejected? etc.). Trump Party candidates refuse to accept defeat? Trump-leaning judges rule in favor of Trump Party candidates in court cases over outcomes?

How do war planners take domestic politics into account when it's not clear whether and which voters approve or disapprove Trump's professed intent to annihilate Iran? Which suggests while

having public support for annihilation would be welcome, in this case it seems not to matter. Either on the war-fighting or on the midterms.

So, as Trump has said, it's up to him to decide if, how, and when he 'annihilates' Iran.

+++++++ Bombs Away. And Then What? +++++++

So assume Trump holds off on bombing Iran (and Yemen?) until after the mid-terms.

Will the bombing be Biden-like, symbolic aggression with no real significant damage done? The geopolitical equivalent of a movie fight. What's the point of such military theater? Especially if it's after the mid-terms.

Speculation on the internet is that Trump Admin talk of the US dropping a MOAB, an 11,000 ton bomb, on Iran is intended to provide a face-saving way for the US to declare victory and go home.

Iran would have to again be 'in on the campaign's intent' because speculation about such an attack includes admission that the plane required to deliver the bomb is not stealth and must be in Iranian airspace to drop it on its intended target. Which means Iran could deploy countermeasures to blow up the plane and bomb in midair, i.e., before the plane can drop the bomb. Does Iran have the capability to blow up plane and bomb before plane even takes off? Color me skeptical that the US has the option to 'save face'. That assessment implies an underlying expectation, which many analysts have, that the US will remain hegemon nevertheless and simply carry on. As my argument above implies, saving face and remaining hegemon is not possible in this conflict. Saving face is a less destructive way of admitting defeat; and defeat is an admission that the days of one's hegemony are coming to an end.

Or will bombing be 'serious,' even nuking?

Because if it's serious, the Trump Party and the acquiescent Dems will have taken the crucial step of bringing the global economy to its knees. Europe is already reeling. Less reported in the US are conditions of countries of the Global South, nations which are thought to be hurting badly already by rising prices and shortages thanks to the shutdown of product coming out of West Asia (aka Persian Gulf).

Serious bombing in the region takes the world economy to its knees for years, quite possibly (probably?) decades. Because of the aforementioned impact on oil and nat gas shipments. And the impact on export of helium, urea, and other products no longer coming out of the region for a long while.

Up till now, the Trump Admin and many so-called 'moderate' Dems believe the US still holds the best political economic cards in its hands. Which suggests they also believe the US will be able to withstand a tanking global economy better than others can. No question the US seems better off than its fellow members of the rich nations club, especially Europe. But if the global economy tanks, isn't US financial wealth exposed as an illusion? Isn't that why the rest of the world is currently trying to reduce its holdings of US debt and USD?

Unlike after WWII, at this juncture in history the US is NOT the world's leading, unscathed, oil-rich industrial economy. Over the past decades, US hegemonic leadership structured a global division of labor in which the US 'urged'/compelled the rest of the world to produce what it wanted to buy, claiming the arrangement worked to everyone's benefit. Nuking/annihilating Iran and Yemen does not alter US economic dependence on this arrangement but clearly undermines the legitimacy of US domination of it.

+++++++ Elections Matter. Maybe. +++++++

The upcoming midterm election is obviously the test: Will enough Americans vote to keep Trump Party in power because they think even though they exacerbated the mess they will get us out of it? Or do Americans see enough new blood (and thinking) running as Dems or independents to produce a wave of change in the Congress and the country?

The Trump Party prevails if enough Americans still believe what Trump has been saying all along: only he knows what to do.

Believe he's the greatest, the smartest, the toughest, the _____ (fill in the blank). The greatest president ever, the greatest political leader in the history of the world.

Only he knows how to solve the problem. Whatever the problem. Because every problem is solved by a deal. And he better than anyone knows how to make deals.

Because what better arena of business to learn how to make deals than NYC real estate? That and how many bankruptcies?

Or has his schtick grown not only stale and embarrassing, but demeaning and dangerous because of the corruption, incompetence, and cruelty from which the schtick (sometimes) tries to distract?

Or perhaps most intriguing of all possibilities, and perplexing (given his personal history) ...

Is Trump's threat to annihilate Iran but not until after the midterms simply a misdirection, intended to avoid giving the impression Trump recognizes the US military has no path to victory and must negotiate with Iran following the MOU he signed. But he has to sound tough before the midterms and has to wait until after the midterms to avoid hurting Trump Party candidates! After all, Trump's diesel deal with Russia is being criticized by Dems and Trump Party officials alike as evidence Trump is 'abandoning' ally Ukraine and 'siding with' enemy Russia.

In other words, what if what is really going on here is:

Trump is trying to change US policy on both battlefronts in light of military realities but is hamstrung because the current belligerent policy is supported by other parts of government (e.g., CIA, elements in the military), by Dems (leaders and party faithful) and many within the Trump Party (leaders and party faithful), by the military industrial complex, and by key elements of the ruling class.

Unfortunately for him, one obstacle to Trump shifting US policy is that he lacks the personal political skills, political capital, and a set of subordinate administrators and diplomats able to pull it off.

Another potentially bigger obstacle: European leaders seem hell-bent on war with Russia. This even though their militaries are incapable of attacking Russia, and their populations are against fighting Russia either directly or through proxy Ukraine. The danger: the Europeans resort to using nukes to make up for their deficiency in conventional forces! Are they crazy enough to want to use nukes to pre-empt a Russian attack they see coming not because of what Russia has said or done but because they have conjured up the attack in their own minds? Because that's what they would do if they were in Russia's shoes!

So rather than develop a mutual security agreement with Russia, which Russia has steadfastly stated is one of its core objectives in its SMO in Ukraine, the Europeans want to go for asymmetric security for themselves by subduing/annihilating Russia.

The potential obstacle to the obstacle in Europe? The student protests now spreading across Europe raise a guns-versus-butter debate about the direction of European political economic life.

Imminent elections will reveal if European voters prefer guns or butter.

The Russians have gotten the message. Europe does not want to be their friend and economic partner. Russia has turned toward the rest of the world for economic partnerships, and now views Europe principally as something from which it must protect itself, given Europe's long history of animosity toward Russia's Slavic people.

If Europe attacks Russia with nukes and Russia counterattacks with nukes, what does the US do?

Which begs a related question:

Do the warmongers push Trump from office because they worry he's not hawkish enough?

Does Trump become more hawkish to avoid being removed from office?

If Dems take control of one or both houses of Congress in 2027, do they try to impeach Trump?

What do they do about impeaching Trump if the economy is tanking? If the US and global economies are tanking, does Congress approve the US keep fighting in both Ukraine and the Persian Gulf?

Does either major party have any idea what to do about the US and global economies tanking amid reduced global energy supplies, diminished thanks to the fighting? With US fed govt debt over \$40 trillion and rising at the same time interest rates are rising? With US trade deficit rising in spite of Trump's tariffs raising product prices? With the stock market as overpriced as it has ever been? With household debt and corp debt (especially for AI-related corps!!) becoming more burdensome (un-payable?)?

Is it any wonder US citizen/consumer confidence is so weak and faltering right now?

How does one justify increasing military spending in the midst of a tanking economy? Yes, yes; wartime spending in WWII is what finally ended the Depression in the US. But the situation in the US today is vastly different, as suggested earlier.

Perhaps the biggest, most problematic difference in that regard is that we have exposed ourselves as morally bankrupt. We have exposed ourselves not as the combatant who should be followed but as the one who must be stopped.

Trump won in 2024 in part because he promised no more wars. That sentiment remains strong (dominant?) among the citizenry. What we can now recognize, however, is that the political economic problem the US faces runs much deeper than Trump. As the Russians phrase it, in foreign policy the US is "agreement incapable". Which is to say: the US remains committed to being global hegemon because no political force inside the US has been strong enough to move it in a new direction.

The initial years of Trump 2.0 have shown that Trump Party policies (Project 2025, the policies of the right and far right) are extremely unpopular and strikingly ineffective and/or damaging.

Once the midterms have passed and the race for 2028 begins, the paramount question will be: Can the left and far left put forward a vision of a new direction for the US, not only domestically but also in terms of its role in the world?

That's what's really missing in American political life right now.

What is that vision and who will carry it?

What is the substance of a political message of hope for an American empire in decline?

Or is the country so politically economically bereft, the best we can work toward is to minimize the damage we do to both ourselves and the rest of the world as we try to find our place in the new vision others put forward and the new structures they build?

Trump's bribes and promises indicate he is clearly worried about the mid-terms ... because a wave election against the Trump Party likely (undoubtedly?) means he will get impeached again AND this time may (will?) be convicted.

While some have speculated Trump might resign before facing that fate, Trump feels so unpredictable he could just as easily bomb Iran and Yemen and/or resort to extraordinary measures (martial law?) to stay in office. Which as we saw in 2021 his supporters seem likely to endorse enthusiastically ... again.

How will Trump Party supporters react if their candidates lose in a wave election and Trump leaves office (for whatever reason)? And the economy is tanking?

How will Dem Party supporters react if their candidates don't win in a wave election and Trump remains in office? And the economy is tanking?

Thus far, polarization among voters has not manifested as civil war. Given the geographic melding of the polarized American people, what does a civil war even look like in 21st century US during a time of global crisis?

Are we having fun yet?

Why is all this relevant to DG and VC? Because it all suggests to me DG's and VC's cocooned way of living and thinking will not go on for very much longer.