

Why we get the wrong politicians Manual

Why we get the wrong politicians

The question of why societies often end up electing leaders who fail to serve the public interest, or who embody corruption, incompetence, or self-interest, is a complex and multifaceted issue. Despite the availability of numerous qualified individuals, countless communities around the world continue to see the rise of politicians who do not genuinely represent their constituents, often leading to disillusionment, policy failures, and social unrest. Understanding the root causes of this phenomenon requires examining various societal, psychological, political, and economic factors that influence electoral outcomes. In this article, we explore the deep-seated reasons behind the persistent problem of electing the "wrong" politicians.

The Psychological Factors Behind Voting for the Wrong Politicians

Cognitive Biases and Heuristics

Voters are human beings subject to cognitive biases that can distort judgment and decision-making. Some of these biases include:

- Confirmation Bias: Favoring information that confirms existing beliefs, which can lead voters to support politicians who align with their worldview, even if those politicians are flawed.
- Availability Heuristic: Relying on immediate examples that come to mind, often influenced by media coverage, which might focus on sensationalized or negative aspects of a candidate.
- Halo Effect: Allowing a single positive trait or appearance to influence overall perception, leading voters to overlook flaws.

Emotional Appeals and Fearmongering

Politicians often exploit voters' emotions rather than rational analysis:

- Fear of economic decline, cultural change, or security threats can lead voters to support candidates promising quick solutions.
- Emotional appeals can overshadow critical assessment of policies and integrity.

Voter Ignorance and Lack of Political Knowledge

Many voters do not possess comprehensive knowledge of policy details or candidate backgrounds:

- Limited understanding of political issues leads to superficial voting decisions.
- Reliance on simplified narratives or partisan loyalty can skew judgment.

Partisan Loyalty and Identity Politics

Voters often prioritize party allegiance over candidate qualities:

- Partisan identity can override critical evaluation, leading to support for flawed candidates simply because they belong to a preferred party.
- This loyalty can perpetuate cycles of electing unsuitable leaders aligned with specific ideological groups.

Structural and Systemic Factors Contributing to the Election of the Wrong Politicians

Electoral Systems and Their Flaws

The design of electoral processes can influence the quality of elected representatives:

- First-Past-The-Post Systems: Tend to favor major parties and can marginalize alternative voices, leading to less representative choices.
- Lack of Proportional Representation: Limits voter options, often forcing voters to choose the "lesser of two evils."
- Gerrymandering: Manipulation of district boundaries to favor certain candidates undermines fair representation.

Money and Campaign Financing

The influence of money in politics often distorts democratic processes:

- Wealthy donors and special interest groups can sway candidate selection and policy agendas.
- Candidates reliant on large donations may prioritize donor interests over public welfare.

Media Influence and Misinformation

Media outlets shape public perception and can propagate misinformation:

- Sensationalism, biased reporting, and fake news distort voters' understanding.
- Social media algorithms often amplify divisive content, polarizing voters and elevating populist or extreme candidates.

Political Patronage and Corruption

Corruption and clientelism undermine democratic integrity:

- Politicians may be selected or supported based on loyalty or bribe-taking rather than merit.
- Patronage networks reinforce the election of unsuitable leaders who owe favors to specific groups.

Weak Institutions and Lack of Accountability

Institutional weaknesses can allow incompetent or corrupt politicians to thrive:

- Limited checks and balances reduce consequences for misconduct.
- Voters lack effective mechanisms to hold leaders accountable after election.

Societal and Cultural Factors Influencing the Choice of Politicians

Economic Inequality and Poverty

High levels of inequality can skew political representation:

- Marginalized populations may support populist leaders promising simple solutions.
- Economic hardship can lead to desperation, reducing the capacity for critical voting.

Education and Political Literacy

Levels of education influence political decision-making:

- Lower education levels correlate with reduced political literacy.
- Without understanding policy implications, voters may default to superficial cues.

Cultural Norms and Historical Contexts

Historical experiences shape political preferences:

- Societies with histories of authoritarianism may have entrenched distrust in institutions.
- Cultural attitudes towards leadership influence acceptance of certain types of politicians.

Social Fragmentation and Identity Politics

Divided societies tend to favor leaders who appeal to specific identities:

- Ethnic, religious, or regional loyalties can override considerations of competence.
- Such divisions often lead to the election of populist or divisive figures.

The Role of Political Parties and Candidate Selection

Party Dynamics and Candidate Vetting

Political parties often prioritize loyalty over competence:

- Candidate selection processes may favor loyal insiders or populists.
- Lack of internal accountability can lead to the nomination of unsuitable candidates.

Populism and Charisma Over Competence

Charismatic leaders can overshadow policy expertise:

- Populist rhetoric appeals to emotions and grievances.
- Charismatic candidates may win elections despite lacking substantive policy knowledge.

Media and Campaign Strategies

Effective marketing can mask deficiencies:

- Politicians with better media strategies may appear more competent than they are.
- Negative campaigning can destroy credible opponents, elevating less qualified candidates.

Conclusion: Addressing the Root Causes

Understanding why societies often get the wrong politicians requires a multifaceted approach. It involves recognizing human psychological tendencies, improving electoral systems, regulating campaign financing, strengthening institutions, and fostering political literacy among citizens. Addressing societal inequalities and promoting inclusive, transparent, and accountable governance are essential steps toward electing better leaders. Ultimately, a well-informed electorate, coupled with structural reforms, can significantly reduce the likelihood of selecting unsuitable politicians. While no system is perfect, sustained efforts to enhance democratic processes and civic engagement can help ensure that the leaders we choose genuinely serve the interests of their communities.

Why We Get the Wrong Politicians

In democratic societies, the selection of leaders significantly influences the trajectory of nations, yet time and again, societies find themselves grappling with the question: why do we get the wrong politicians? Despite the idealistic hopes for visionary, honest, and capable leaders, the political landscape often seems dominated by individuals who either lack integrity, competence, or both. Understanding the multifaceted reasons behind this phenomenon requires a deep dive into the social, psychological, structural, and cultural factors that shape our political systems and voter behaviors.

The Roots of Political Choice: Voter Psychology and Behavior

1. Cognitive Biases and Heuristics

Voters are not always rational actors. Instead, they rely on mental shortcuts—heuristics—that simplify complex decisions but can lead to poor choices.

Pros and Cons of Heuristic Voting:

- Pros:
 - Allows quick decision-making in complex political environments.
 - Helps voters navigate information overload.
- Cons:
 - Can lead to superficial evaluations based on personality or slogans rather than policy.
 - Amplifies biases such as favoritism or prejudice.

Impact on Politicians:

Candidates who excel at charismatic appeal or propaganda often succeed despite lacking substantive qualifications, as voters are swayed by surface-level qualities rather than competence.

2. Influence of Identity Politics and Group Loyalty

Many voters prioritize identity, ethnicity, religion, or class over policy details, leading to support for candidates who align with their group identities, regardless of their qualifications.

Features of Identity-Driven Voting:

- Strengthens community bonds but can fragment political cohesion.
- Promotes loyalty over merit.
- Can perpetuate cycles of poor leadership if group loyalty favors incumbents or corrupt figures.

Structural and Systemic Factors

1. Electoral Systems and Political Structures

Different electoral frameworks influence the quality of politicians elected:

- First-Past-The-Post: Often results in a two-party system, discouraging diverse candidate pools.
- Proportional Representation: Can lead to coalition governments, sometimes supporting less qualified candidates to secure votes.

Features and Consequences:

- Winner-takes-all systems may favor populists or demagogues who appeal to emotions.
- Complex systems can entrench establishment politicians, making it harder for outsiders with integrity to break through.

2. Campaign Financing and Political Elites

Money plays a pivotal role in modern politics:

Pros and Cons:

- Pros:

- Allows candidates to reach wider audiences.
- Cons:
- Favors wealthy candidates or those with wealthy backers.
- Encourages corruption and undue influence.

This reliance on campaign funds can lead to politicians beholden to special interests rather than the public good, perpetuating the cycle of subpar leadership.

Cultural and Societal Influences

1. Media and Information Ecosystem

The media landscape shapes perceptions of candidates:

- Sensationalism and clickbait often prioritize entertainment over substance.
- Misinformation and fake news distort voters' understanding.

Features:

- Politicians skilled at media manipulation gain undue advantage.
- Voters may base decisions on superficial portrayals rather than facts.

2. Education and Political Awareness

A society's level of civic education influences political discernment:

- Poor understanding of political processes leads to susceptibility to populism.
- Lack of critical thinking skills results in support for charismatic but unqualified leaders.

Pros and Cons:

- Pros:
- Simplifies complex issues for public consumption.
- Cons:
- Facilitates the rise of demagogues and demagogic policies.

Historical and Psychological Patterns

1. The Dangers of Charisma and Populism

History shows leaders with strong personal appeal can manipulate masses:

- Charismatic leaders often bypass institutional checks.
- Populist rhetoric simplifies complex problems, appealing to emotion.

Features:

- Can mobilize support quickly.
- Often leads to authoritarian tendencies or policies that disregard checks and balances.

2. The Cycle of Political Disillusionment

Voters' repeated disappointment with politicians fosters cynicism:

- Disillusionment can lead to apathy or support for anti-establishment candidates.
- Anti-elite sentiments sometimes favor extremists or unqualified leaders.

Why Do We Keep Making the Same Mistakes?

1. Lack of Accountability and Vigilance

Without continuous oversight, corruption and incompetence flourish.

Features:

- Weak institutions fail to hold politicians accountable.
- Voter apathy allows cycles of poor leadership to persist.

2. Entrenched Political Elites and Patronage

Political systems often favor insiders:

- Patronage networks reward loyalty rather than merit.
- This system discourages new, potentially better candidates from emerging.

Conclusion: Addressing the Root Causes

Understanding why we get the wrong politicians involves recognizing a complex web of psychological, structural, cultural, and systemic factors. To break this cycle, societies must invest in civic education, reform electoral systems to reduce undue influence, promote transparency, and foster a culture of accountability. Additionally, empowering citizens to think critically and engage actively in politics can help shift the focus from superficial qualities to substantive leadership qualities. Only through a multifaceted approach can democracies hope to elect leaders who truly serve the public interest, rather than perpetuate cycles of poor leadership driven by superficial appeal, systemic flaws, and societal biases.

By acknowledging these deep-seated issues, societies can begin to create political environments where the right leaders are more likely to emerge?leaders chosen not by chance or superficial appeal, but by merit, integrity, and a genuine commitment to public service.

QuestionAnswer Why do we often end up with the wrong politicians in office? Because voters may lack information about candidates, be influenced by superficial qualities, or fall prey to populist appeals, leading to choices that don't always align with effective governance. How does voter misinformation contribute to electing the wrong politicians? Misinformation can skew public perception, causing voters to support candidates based on false or incomplete information, which can result in electing unsuitable leaders. In what ways do political campaigns influence voters to choose the wrong candidates? Campaigns often use emotional appeals, negative advertising, and misinformation to sway voters, sometimes overshadowing a candidate's qualifications or policy positions. Can the influence of money in politics lead to selecting ineffective politicians? Yes, high campaign donations can give wealthy or well-connected individuals an advantage, sometimes favoring candidates who prioritize special interests over public welfare. How does voter apathy or low engagement contribute to electing the wrong politicians? When voters are disengaged or uninformed, they may vote randomly or out of impulse, increasing the chances of electing candidates who are not the best for the community. What role does media bias play in electing unsuitable politicians? Media bias can influence public perception by portraying candidates in a skewed manner, affecting voters' decisions and potentially leading to the election of less qualified leaders. Why do populist candidates often get elected despite lacking experience or qualifications? Populist candidates often appeal to voters' emotions, promises of change, or anti-establishment sentiments, which can overshadow concerns about their experience or competence. How does the lack of political literacy among voters impact the quality of elected officials? Limited understanding of political processes and policy issues can lead voters to prioritize charisma or simple slogans over competence, resulting in the election of unsuitable politicians. Can systemic issues within political institutions lead to the rise of the wrong politicians? Yes, systemic problems like corruption, lack of transparency, and weak accountability can create environments where unqualified or corrupt candidates thrive. What strategies can help voters avoid electing the wrong politicians? Voters can educate themselves on candidates' policies and backgrounds, seek diverse information sources,

participate actively in civic discussions, and prioritize competence and integrity over popularity.

Related keywords: political corruption, voter ignorance, campaign finance, media influence, partisan bias, political polarization, lack of education, electoral system flaws, candidate selection, voter apathy

The wrong side

The wrong side is a phrase that resonates in various contexts, from everyday life to specialized fields like sports, fashion, and even psychology. Understanding what it signifies, its implications, and how it influences perceptions and decisions is essential for comprehending its broader significance. In this comprehensive article, we delve into the multifaceted nature of "the wrong side," exploring its meanings, cultural relevance, and practical implications across different domains.

Meaning and Interpretation of "The Wrong Side"

Literal and Figurative Definitions

The phrase "the wrong side" can be interpreted both literally and figuratively:

- **Literal:** Refers to the side opposite to what is considered correct or conventional. For example, in clothing, the "wrong side" of fabric is the reverse side that often appears less finished.
- **Figurative:** Denotes being in an unfavorable position, experiencing misfortune, or being on the losing side of a situation. For instance, someone might say, "He was on the wrong side of the argument," indicating disagreement or conflict.

Origins of the Phrase

The phrase has historical roots, often associated with social and cultural norms. For example, in traditional Western etiquette, walking on the "wrong side" of the sidewalk or street could imply improper conduct. Similarly, in legal and political contexts, being on the "wrong side" of an issue or debate signifies opposition or dissent.

The Cultural Significance of "The Wrong Side"

Fashion and Clothing

In the realm of fashion and textiles, the "wrong side" of fabric or clothing refers to the reverse side, often less decorated or finished. Recognizing the "right" and "wrong" sides is crucial for:

- Ensuring proper garment assembly
- Achieving the desired aesthetic
- Maintaining quality standards

For example, when sewing or tailoring, attention to the correct side of fabric ensures a professional appearance. In fashion design, the "wrong side" might be hidden or turned inward, but understanding its characteristics is vital for craftsmanship.

Social and Moral Connotations

Historically, being on "the wrong side" of social norms or moral laws carried significant stigma. For example:

- In social class contexts, someone on the "wrong side of the tracks" might be from a less privileged background.
- In moral debates, choosing the "wrong side" could imply making unethical choices.

These connotations highlight how the phrase is intertwined with perceptions of morality, privilege, and societal status.

Implications in Different Domains

Sports and Competition

In sports, "the wrong side" often refers to the team or competitor that is losing or has made a mistake. For example:

- In tennis, players switch sides after certain games, but choosing the "wrong side" might mean facing unfavorable conditions like wind or sun.
- In team sports, being on the "wrong side" of the score indicates defeat.

Understanding the strategic importance of side selection can influence game outcomes, making "the wrong side" a critical concept in athletic performance.

Legal and Political Contexts

In legal disputes or political debates, being on "the wrong side" signifies opposition to accepted norms or laws:

- Opponents may be described as being on "the wrong side of history."
- In courtroom scenarios, the defendant may be considered on the "wrong side" of justice if found guilty.

Recognizing this usage helps in understanding debates about morality, justice, and societal progression.

Psychology and Personal Development

On a personal level, "the wrong side" can refer to:

- Making poor decisions or choosing paths that lead to negative outcomes.
- Being in an unfavorable emotional or mental state.

Self-awareness about being on "the wrong side" of one's goals or values can motivate positive change and growth.

Common Expressions and Idioms Involving "The Wrong Side"

Understanding idiomatic expressions enriches comprehension of the phrase's usage:

- **On the wrong side of the law:** Involved in illegal or criminal activity.
- **On the wrong side of history:** Opposing social progress or moral consensus.
- **On the wrong side of the bed:** Feeling ill-tempered or unwell upon waking.
- **On the wrong side of someone:** Having a conflict or disagreement with someone.

These expressions permeate everyday language, emphasizing the phrase's versatility.

Strategies to Avoid Being on the "Wrong Side"

Being aware of the implications associated with "the wrong side" can help individuals and organizations make better decisions. Here are some strategies:

1. Cultural and Contextual Awareness

Understanding social norms and cultural expectations helps avoid inadvertent missteps. For example:

- Learning proper etiquette in different settings
- Respecting local customs when traveling

2. Ethical Decision-Making

Prioritizing integrity and moral principles ensures alignment with societal standards, reducing the risk of being on the "wrong side" morally or legally.

3. Strategic Planning

In competitive environments like sports or business, analyzing risks and making informed choices can prevent unfavorable outcomes.

4. Personal Development

Self-reflection and continuous learning help individuals recognize and correct their missteps, moving toward the "right side" of issues and relationships.

Conclusion

"The wrong side" is a multifaceted concept that extends beyond mere physical positioning to encompass social, moral, and strategic dimensions. Whether in fashion, sports, politics, or personal life, understanding what it entails allows individuals and organizations to navigate complexities more effectively. Recognizing the implications of being on the "wrong side" can motivate proactive behavior, ethical decision-making, and cultural sensitivity, ultimately guiding us toward the "right side" of issues, relationships, and societal progress.

By appreciating the depth and breadth of this phrase, we can better interpret its usage in everyday language and make informed choices that align with our values and goals.

The Wrong Side: Navigating the Complexities of Perspective and Reality

The wrong side is a phrase that carries weight across cultures, disciplines, and contexts. Whether invoked in a courtroom, a political debate, or a moral dilemma, it signifies a position deemed incorrect, unethical, or unjust by prevailing standards. But what exactly does *the wrong side* entail? Is it an absolute truth, or a matter of perspective? This article explores the multifaceted nature of *the wrong side*, examining its implications in history, psychology, law, and societal

norms. We will uncover how perceptions of right and wrong are constructed, challenged, and sometimes manipulated, revealing the complex terrain that separates the right side from the wrong.

The Concept of 'The Wrong Side': A Cultural and Historical Overview

Defining 'The Wrong Side'

At its core, 'the wrong side' is a relative term. It is often used to describe a position that opposes what is considered morally, ethically, or legally acceptable. However, the criteria for what constitutes the 'wrong side' vary widely across different cultures and time periods. For instance, in some societies, certain political ideologies or social practices once deemed acceptable are now considered morally wrong.

- Historical Shifts: Consider the institution of slavery. For centuries, it was legally and socially accepted in many nations. Today, it is universally condemned. This shift illustrates how the boundary between right and wrong is not fixed but evolves over time.
- Cultural Relativity: Practices such as arranged marriages or capital punishment are viewed differently depending on cultural, legal, or religious contexts. What is the 'wrong side' in one society may be the accepted norm in another.

Examples from History

- World War II and the Holocaust: The Nazi regime's actions are universally regarded as the wrong side of history. Their policies of genocide and oppression stand as stark examples of moral failure. Yet, at the time, propaganda and state control shaped perceptions, illustrating how 'the wrong side' is often defined by those in power.
- Civil Rights Movements: In the United States, segregation was once legally sanctioned, placing those opposing integration on the 'wrong side.' Over time, societal consensus shifted, recognizing the injustice of racial discrimination.

Psychological Dimensions: Why Do People End Up on the Wrong Side?

Cognitive Biases and Groupthink

Understanding how individuals and groups arrive on the 'wrong side' involves delving into psychological mechanisms. Several cognitive biases and social influences contribute to this phenomenon:

- Confirmation Bias: People tend to seek information that confirms their existing beliefs, ignoring evidence that contradicts them. This can entrench individuals on the wrong side of moral or factual debates.

- Ingroup/Outgroup Dynamics: Loyalty to a group can lead individuals to justify actions or beliefs that are otherwise unacceptable, aligning them with the 'wrong side' due to peer pressure or identity.

The Role of Authority and Obedience

Research by psychologist Stanley Milgram demonstrated how ordinary people could commit harmful acts under authoritative command. This underscores how individuals may find themselves on the wrong side of morality when obedience overrides personal judgment.

- Situational Factors: Authority figures, social pressure, and perceived legitimacy can influence individuals to act against their moral compass.

- Moral Disengagement: Techniques like dehumanization or diffusion of responsibility enable individuals to justify wrong actions, placing them on the 'wrong side' without perceiving it as such.

The Legal Perspective: When Is It the Wrong Side of Justice?

Law as a Reflection of Morality

Legal systems are designed to codify societal norms, but they are not infallible. Laws can be unjust, and what is legal is not always moral. Conversely, some immoral acts are technically legal.

- Legality vs. Morality: Historical examples include apartheid laws in South Africa or Prohibition-era alcohol bans. These laws faced moral opposition, positioning their defenders on the 'wrong side' of justice.

Cases of Legal Wrongness

- Nuremberg Trials: Nazi officials argued their actions were legal under German law, but the international community recognized their crimes as morally and legally wrong.

- Civil Disobedience: Figures like Martin Luther King Jr. challenged unjust laws, placing themselves on the 'wrong side' of legal authority but on the 'right side' of moral justice.

The Challenge of Legal Reform

Legal systems are often slow to adapt, and entrenched interests resist change. This can result in periods where the law lags behind evolving moral standards, temporarily placing certain groups or actions on the "wrong side" of justice.

Societal Norms and the Fluidity of "Wrong"

Social Construction of Morality

Societies continually renegotiate what is acceptable. The "wrong side" is thus not static but often a moving target.

- Moral Panics: Media-driven fears can cast certain groups or behaviors as dangerous or immoral, stigmatizing them as being on "the wrong side."
- Progress and Regression: Civil rights, gender equality, and LGBTQ+ rights illustrate societal progress where previous "wrong side" positions become accepted norms.

The Power of Narrative and Propaganda

Control over narratives influences perceptions of right and wrong. Governments, media, and interest groups shape public opinion, sometimes framing opponents as morally reprehensible to justify policies or suppress dissent.

The Moral Gray Zone: When the Lines Blur

The Complexity of Moral Dilemmas

Not all situations are clear-cut. Many ethical dilemmas involve competing rights and values, creating gray zones where determining the "wrong side" is challenging.

- Trolley Problem: Deciding whether to actively cause harm to save more lives exemplifies moral ambiguity.
- War and Conflict: Soldiers and civilians often find themselves on the "wrong side" of a conflict, yet their moral agency remains complex.

The Danger of Absolutism

Labeling a side as unequivocally "wrong" can lead to dehumanization and justification for violence or oppression. Recognizing the shades of gray fosters empathy and nuanced understanding.

Challenging the 'Wrong Side': How Change Happens

Recognizing and Confronting Wrongness

Progress often begins with acknowledgment. Movements for social justice, legal reforms, and moral awakening challenge the status quo, exposing the wrong side of history.

- Activism and Advocacy: Civil rights movements, anti-apartheid campaigns, and gender equality initiatives have shifted perceptions and laws.
- Education and Dialogue: Promoting critical thinking and empathy helps individuals question their assumptions and avoid blindly following the wrong side.

The Role of Leaders and Thinkers

Leaders who stand against unjust norms—Martin Luther King Jr., Nelson Mandela, Malala Yousafzai—embody the courage to challenge the wrong side and advocate for what is right.

Conclusion: Navigating the Complex Terrain

The 'wrong side' is a fluid, multifaceted concept rooted in perceptions, norms, and power structures. Recognizing the complexity behind moral judgments requires humility, critical thinking, and a willingness to question assumptions. History teaches us that what is deemed wrong today may shift tomorrow, and understanding this fluidity is key to building a more just and empathetic society.

Ultimately, the journey from the wrong side to the right involves education, activism, and moral courage. By examining the factors that place individuals and groups on the wrong side, society can foster a culture of reflection, growth, and justice—moving closer to a world where fewer find themselves on the wrong side of history.

Question What does it mean to be on the wrong side of history? Being on the wrong side of history refers to making decisions or holding beliefs that are later viewed as unjust or incorrect, especially as societal values evolve over time. How can I avoid ending up on the wrong side of an argument? To avoid being on the wrong side, listen carefully, consider multiple perspectives, base your opinions on credible evidence, and be willing to adapt your views when presented with new information. What are common situations where someone might be on the wrong side? People might be on the wrong side in debates about social justice, political issues, or ethical dilemmas if they oppose popular or morally accepted positions or ignore facts supporting the other side. How does society determine who is on the wrong side of history? Society often judges based on evolving moral standards, legal decisions, and collective values, recognizing that what was once accepted

may now be viewed as wrong or unjust. Can someone change from being on the wrong side to the right side? Yes, individuals can change perspectives, learn from past mistakes, and align their views with current ethical standards or societal progress. What are the risks of being on the wrong side in a legal or political context? The risks include social stigma, legal penalties, loss of credibility, and the potential to contribute to injustice or harm within society. Why is understanding the concept of 'the wrong side' important in social discussions? Understanding this concept helps promote empathy, critical thinking, and awareness of how societal norms and values evolve, encouraging more informed and ethical decision-making.

Related keywords: incorrect side, opposite side, adverse position, unfavorable side, wrong direction, wrong lane, wrong turn, misguided choice, incorrect position, incorrect side

Read the full article online: [THE WRONG SIDE](#)