TRUMP: The Mirror America Doesn't Want to Look Into

What our reactions to Donald Trump can teach us about pride, God, tribalism, forgiveness, and human consciousness

By Dr. Mike Van Thielen, PhD.

Donald Trump may be one of the most emotionally activating people in modern American life. To millions of people, he represents strength, disruption, patriotism, resistance to political institutions, religious liberty, and a willingness to challenge conventions they believe have failed them. To millions of others, his words and conduct represent qualities they deeply oppose. These contrasting perceptions have made him far more than a political figure. He has become a symbol onto which enormous amounts of hope, fear, loyalty, anger, admiration, resentment, and moral judgment are projected.

This article is not an argument for or against Donald Trump. It is not an assessment of his presidency, his policies, or whether someone should support him politically. Instead, I want to use the extraordinary emotional response surrounding Trump as an opportunity to examine something much older than American politics: the human struggle with pride, ego, identity, morality, religion, forgiveness, and consciousness.

Trump publicly invokes God and Christianity and has made religion a visible component of his presidency. In February 2025, he established the White House Faith Office, and in May of that year he established a Religious Liberty Commission. His administration has explicitly described protecting religious liberty as one of its priorities. Public perceptions of Trump's personal religiosity, however, are quite different from simply acknowledging those governmental actions. In an April 2026 Pew Research Center survey, 70 percent of U.S. adults described Trump as "not too" or "not at all" religious, while 29 percent described him as somewhat or very religious. Republicans and Democrats differed substantially in those perceptions.

That contrast raises a much more interesting question than whether Donald Trump is sufficiently religious. None of us can reliably see another person's inner relationship with God. We cannot know from speeches, policies, photographs, social-media posts, church appearances, or political alliances what exists within another person's soul. The more useful question is what

religion itself asks of the human being, and what happens when those teachings collide with power, status, competition, identity, and ego.

That brings us to pride.

Pride: The Vice That Can Hide Inside Virtue

Within Christian moral thought, pride has traditionally occupied a unique position among human failings. It is often described not merely as another vice but as a condition capable of feeding many others because it places the self at the center of reality. In its destructive form, pride says that my importance, my status, my correctness, my recognition, my group, or my desires deserve elevation above those of others.

This is very different from healthy self-esteem. A person with healthy self-esteem can believe "I am valuable" without needing to conclude that somebody else is less valuable. Healthy confidence allows us to recognize our abilities without requiring another person's inferiority. Pride becomes something different. It is frequently comparative. It wants not simply to succeed, but to be seen succeeding. It may not merely want to possess something; it wants to possess more than someone else. It does not merely want to be correct; it can become invested in another person being wrong. At its extreme, it does not simply seek respect; it seeks superiority.

This helps explain why pride is so difficult to satisfy. Many human desires contain natural stopping points. Hunger eventually encounters fullness. Exhaustion eventually encounters rest. Physical thirst can be quenched. Pride has no comparable biological signal telling us that we have finally accumulated enough status, admiration, influence, recognition, wealth, power, or certainty.

There can always be another victory, another competitor, another critic, another insult to answer, another accomplishment to announce, another person whose recognition we want, or another threat to our carefully constructed identity. Pride therefore possesses an unusual capacity to perpetuate itself.

This is also what distinguishes pride from many of the virtues traditionally celebrated by Christianity and other moral traditions. Courage does not require another person's cowardice. Compassion does not require another person's suffering for us to feel superior. Generosity does not require public recognition to remain generous. Patience does not need an audience. Gratitude does not need to win. Forgiveness does not need to dominate. Humility does not need to demonstrate how humble it is.

Pride is different because its fuel is often comparison. Humility allows for the possibility that I may be wrong, while pride resists that possibility because being wrong can threaten the identity it has constructed. Gratitude recognizes that much of what we possess has also depended upon other people, opportunity, circumstance, grace, luck, or gifts we did not create ourselves. Pride can interpret success primarily as evidence of personal superiority. Compassion becomes curious about what another person has experienced, whereas pride can be quicker to ask what is wrong with them. Service asks how we can contribute; pride becomes preoccupied with whether our contribution has been noticed.

The most spiritually dangerous aspect of pride, however, may be its ability to disguise itself as virtue. Pride can wear the clothing of morality, patriotism, intelligence, activism, spirituality, religion, generosity, and even humility itself. We can become proud of how moral we are, proud of how enlightened we are, proud of how patriotic we are, proud of how tolerant we are, proud of how religious we are, or proud of how much more conscious we are than all those supposedly unconscious people around us.

At that point, vice has learned how to impersonate virtue.

Pride, Ego, Confidence, Self-Love, and Humility Are Not the Same Thing

This distinction deserves more attention because our culture often confuses confidence with arrogance and humility with weakness. It also casually uses psychological terms such as “ego” and “narcissism” as insults, which can prevent us from understanding the underlying human dynamics.

Confidence is not pride. Confidence recognizes that I possess certain abilities. Pride begins when my sense of worth becomes dependent upon those abilities, making me superior to somebody else.

A confident athlete can enter a competition believing that he can win while respecting his competitors. A confident entrepreneur can believe deeply in her idea while remaining open to criticism. A confident leader can make a difficult decision and still acknowledge uncertainty. Confidence can be internally anchored. It does not have to collapse merely because another person succeeds.

Pride is more fragile because its value frequently depends upon comparison. If my sense of worth requires being the smartest person in the room, another intelligent person becomes a threat. If my identity depends upon being the winner, losing becomes more than an outcome; it becomes an assault on who I believe myself to be.

Ego itself is not evil. In psychological terms, we need a functional sense of self. We need boundaries, identity, preferences, goals, and the ability to navigate the world as an individual. The problem begins when we mistake the identity constructed by the ego for the entirety of who we are.

The ego creates stories about us. We become successful, attractive, intelligent, powerful, spiritual, patriotic, progressive, conservative, victimized, enlightened, or uniquely capable of seeing what everyone else supposedly cannot see. These stories can gradually become masks, and once a mask becomes essential to our sense of worth, we must defend it. Evidence supporting the identity feels good, while evidence threatening it can feel surprisingly dangerous.

That is also why humility is so frequently misunderstood. Humility is not thinking poorly of yourself. It is not denying your talents, hiding your accomplishments, refusing leadership, allowing others to mistreat you, or pretending that you are less capable than you really are. A person can be extraordinarily accomplished and genuinely humble because humility does not require us to diminish ourselves. It simply removes the requirement to elevate ourselves above others.

True humility can recognize, "I am very good at this, and I still have things to learn." Pride usually struggles with the second half of that sentence.

Narcissistic Behavior and the Hunger for Reflection

Narcissism is another word that deserves careful handling. Narcissistic personality disorder is a clinical diagnosis and should not be casually assigned to a public figure whom we have never personally evaluated. Narcissistic behaviors and tendencies, however, can be discussed as general human patterns without diagnosing a particular person.

Such patterns can include a strong need for admiration, sensitivity to criticism, preoccupation with status, exaggerated self-importance, sensitivity to perceived disrespect, or difficulty seeing circumstances from another person's perspective. The useful question for this article is therefore not who deserves to be called a narcissist, but what these patterns reveal about the human need for validation.

Social media has made some of this extraordinarily visible. We count followers, likes, views, rankings, sales, awards, invitations, and applause. We carefully curate photographs and stories that present the version of ourselves we want others to see. Even spirituality can become performative. The ego can become proud of how thoroughly it has supposedly transcended ego.

This reveals something important about pride: beneath apparent superiority there can sometimes be dependency. If I constantly need other people to tell me that I am powerful, brilliant, beautiful, successful, righteous, spiritual, or important, then my self-image is not as independent as it appears. I have made other people partly responsible for maintaining it.

Self-love operates very differently.

Self-Love Does Not Need an Audience

Healthy self-love begins with intrinsic worth. My value as a human being does not rise every time somebody applauds me and falls every time somebody criticizes me. This does not mean becoming indifferent to other people. Human beings are relational creatures, and recognition, belonging, connection, and love matter enormously. The difference is that they no longer become the sole arbiters of our worth.

Self-love allows us to admit mistakes because a mistake does not annihilate the self. It allows us to apologize because saying "I was wrong" does not mean "I am worthless." It allows us to celebrate another person's success because their light does not extinguish ours. It allows us to receive criticism, examine it, keep what is useful, and discard what is not.

Pride protects the mask, while self-love gives us permission to remove it.

This is also why authentic self-love and humility are natural partners. If I genuinely accept myself, I have less need to prove myself. If I know that my worth is not dependent upon being superior, another person's greatness becomes less threatening. I can admire instead of competing, listen instead of immediately defending, learn instead of pretending to know, apologize without collapsing, lose without becoming a loser, and succeed without requiring somebody else to become smaller.

That is not weakness. It is psychological and spiritual freedom.

When Pride Finds God

Religion presents an especially interesting test because authentic Christian practice calls the believer away from the absolute supremacy of the self. Christianity repeatedly emphasizes humility, repentance, service, mercy, forgiveness, care for the vulnerable, love of neighbor, and even love of one's enemies.

This means that speaking frequently about God and surrendering the ego to God are not necessarily the same thing. A politician can speak about God. A minister can preach about God. A business leader can publicly thank God. A spiritual teacher can talk endlessly about consciousness. None of these things, by themselves, establish the person's inner spiritual condition.

The religious question is therefore not simply whether we mention God, carry a Bible, attend church, pray publicly, defend religious institutions, or identify ourselves as Christian. Those things may be sincere and meaningful, but the deeper spiritual question concerns what our relationship with God is doing to us.

Are we becoming more humble, truthful, compassionate, and forgiving? Are we becoming more capable of seeing the humanity of our enemies? Are we more willing to examine ourselves and admit error? Does our faith gradually reduce the need for superiority, retaliation, recognition, and domination, or have we simply recruited God into the service of the ego?

That last possibility may be among pride's most sophisticated disguises. Instead of saying, "I am superior to you," pride can learn to say, "God is on my side." Instead of merely believing that my opponent is mistaken, I can begin believing that my opponent is standing against God. Political disagreement can then become moral condemnation, and moral condemnation can gradually make contempt feel righteous.

This danger does not belong uniquely to Donald Trump or to his supporters. A secular person can accomplish essentially the same psychological maneuver without invoking God. "History is on our side," "science is on our side," "educated people know better," "good people believe what we believe," or "conscious people understand this" can perform a similar function when used not as arguments but as declarations of moral superiority.

The vocabulary changes. The ego does not.

The Most Convenient Sin Is Someone Else's

Imagine that I spend twenty minutes reading about pride and conclude that everything I have just read describes Donald Trump.

Something fascinating has happened: I have learned almost nothing about myself.

I have taken a teaching designed for self-examination and transformed it into an instrument for judging another person. This may be one of pride's greatest tricks. It can make us feel morally superior to recognizing pride in somebody else.

A conservative can watch a progressive activist and perceive arrogance, intolerance, moral grandstanding, tribalism, and self-righteousness. A progressive can watch a Trump rally and perceive some of the same qualities. Either may identify real behavior in particular cases yet can simultaneously remain unaware of similar tendencies operating within themselves.

This is why genuine spiritual work is uncomfortable. It continually turns the lens around. When I see arrogance in another person, I can ask where arrogance lives in me. When I see someone's apparent need for recognition, I can investigate my own need to be seen. When someone seems unable to tolerate criticism, I can observe what happens inside me when I am criticized. When I condemn another person's tribalism, I can examine the people I have dismissed merely because they belong to the opposite political tribe.

The mirror does not tell us that all actions are morally equivalent. They clearly are not. The mirror asks whether the human mechanisms capable of producing those actions also exist within us.

Usually, in some form, they do.

Trump as a Mirror Rather Than a Verdict

This is where Donald Trump becomes useful as a cultural mirror.

One does not need to speculate about his inner motives to observe that themes of winning, strength, success, loyalty, opponents, criticism, and personal achievement recur prominently in his public political style. Supporters and critics interpret that style differently, which is precisely why Trump creates such a powerful psychological experiment.

Instead of asking only whether those qualities are admirable or objectionable, we can ask what our reaction to them reveals about ourselves.

Someone who admires Trump might examine exactly what they admire: confidence, independence, resistance to institutions, strength, or willingness to violate social conventions. They can then ask whether admiration ever makes it easier to excuse conduct they would criticize if it came from an opposing political figure.

Someone who strongly dislikes Trump can conduct the same experiment in the opposite direction. What happens internally when his name appears? Can his actions be evaluated without converting political opposition into contempt for millions of people who support him? Can behavior be criticized

without needing to believe that everyone who interprets that behavior differently is stupid, immoral, or malicious?

Neither set of questions tells anyone how to vote. They ask something much more intimate: are my principles really principles, or do they change depending upon who is behaving?

That may be one of the most revealing tests of moral consciousness.

When Pride Becomes Collective

Pride becomes even more powerful when it stops saying "I" and begins saying "we."

Individual pride elevates the self above another person. Collective pride can elevate our group above theirs. This seemingly small transition changes the scale of the problem enormously because the ego can now hide inside a group. My identity becomes fused with my political party, religion, nation, social movement, profession, ideology, community, or worldview. The accomplishments of the group feel partly like my accomplishments. Criticism of the group can feel like criticism of me. Threats to the group can become personal threats even when I have never met the people supposedly threatening us.

This is how tribal identity can begin replacing individual reflection.

The language changes accordingly. We stop talking about human beings and begin talking about "those people." Liberals become a single kind of person. Conservatives become a single kind of person. Christians, atheists, immigrants, academics, elites, rural Americans, urban Americans, MAGA voters, progressives, billionaires, activists, and countless other groups become simplified categories.

Individual complexity disappears.

Once that happens, moral reasoning can become dangerously flexible. Behavior we condemn when the other tribe engages in it can suddenly become understandable when our tribe does it. An insult from the other side becomes evidence of hatred, while an insult from our side becomes justified frustration. Their refusal to compromise demonstrates fanaticism; ours demonstrates principle. Their misinformation proves dishonesty; ours becomes an unfortunate mistake.

The behavior may be similar. The interpretation changes because the jersey changed.

This is why collective pride can be more difficult to recognize than individual arrogance. It often feels virtuous from the inside. We are not defending ourselves; we tell ourselves; we are defending our country, our children, our religion, our freedom, our democracy, our values, our community, or justice itself.

Sometimes those concerns are entirely legitimate. Human beings should defend principles they believe matter. The danger begins when the perceived nobility of the cause convinces us that whatever our side does in pursuit of it must therefore be noble as well.

At that moment, pride has found perhaps its most effective disguise: righteousness.

Religious pride can convince us that God belongs uniquely to our group. Political pride can convince us that intelligence and morality reside predominantly on our side. National pride can evolve from healthy gratitude for one's country into a belief in the lesser worth of outsiders. Intellectual pride can turn education into presumed moral superiority. Spiritual pride can convince people who speak constantly about love, consciousness, and unity that anyone who disagrees with them must simply operate at a lower level of consciousness.

No political tribe has exclusive ownership of these human tendencies.

The underlying mechanism is human.

Perhaps the ultimate test of our principles, therefore, is not how consistently we apply them to our opponents. It is how consistently we apply them to our allies.

When morality changes according to the jersey, morality has become tribal loyalty.

Why the Brain Loves a Tribe

If collective pride can distort judgment so powerfully, an obvious question follows: why do otherwise intelligent, caring, rational people become susceptible to it?

Part of the answer is that belonging is not merely a political preference. Human beings are profoundly social creatures. Throughout human history, group membership has provided cooperation, protection, resources, identity, meaning, and social connection. Modern political parties are obviously not identical to ancestral tribes, but the psychological mechanisms involved in belonging remain powerful.

Modern political psychology finds robust evidence of partisan ingroup favoritism. A major 2025 review in the *Annual Review of Psychology* concluded that partisans show systematic tendencies to seek, believe, and remember information supporting their political beliefs and affinities. Importantly, the researchers also emphasize that the causes are complex. Motivational and cognitive processes both matter, and scholars continue debating precisely when political reasoning should be considered biased or rational.

That nuance matters. Political disagreement is not proof of irrationality. Intelligent and sincere people can examine complicated realities and reach different conclusions because they possess different experiences, values, priorities, information, assumptions, and perceptions of risk.

The problem begins when discovering what is true becomes less important than protecting who we believe ourselves to be.

Once a political belief becomes fused with identity, contradictory information can acquire an emotional dimension. I am no longer merely being told that one of my ideas may be incorrect. I may experience the message as threatening my people, my worldview, my belonging, or even my understanding of myself.

Evidence supporting what we already believe can then feel immediately plausible, while evidence challenging it receives intense scrutiny. We investigate the opposing side's mistakes while explaining the context surrounding our own side's mistakes. We notice hypocrisy across the aisle while finding understandable reasons for inconsistency within our own tribe.

Intelligence alone does not guarantee immunity. A sophisticated mind can investigate reality more effectively, but it can also become extremely sophisticated at constructing arguments for something it already wants to believe.

Education does not automatically produce consciousness. Neither does religion, wealth, success, spirituality, political engagement, or intellectual sophistication.

Consciousness requires something additional: the willingness and capacity to observe the machinery of our own mind while it is operating.

When Politics Enters the Nervous System

Political beliefs do not exist merely as abstract propositions floating inside the intellect. They can become connected to emotion, memory, family, identity, belonging, relationships, morality, and perceptions of threat.

This helps explain why two intelligent people can sit at a dinner table discussing the same political event and gradually become physiologically activated. Voices become louder. Breathing changes. Muscles tighten. Facial expressions change. Attention narrows. Each person begins anticipating the other's argument rather than listening to it.

The conversation may appear to be about politics, but the nervous system may increasingly be responding to perceived threat.

Research offers an intriguing demonstration of how much emotional context matters. A 2025 study published in the *British Journal of Political Science* found that participants could be persuaded by both politically congenial and uncongenial information when adversarial emotional triggers were absent. When participants were experimentally induced into a more adversarial state, however, they became more dismissive of information challenging their partisan position.

That finding contains an encouraging message.

Human beings are not necessarily prisoners of political bias. Context matters. Emotional state matters. The way information is presented matters.

Our biology can help explain why tribal impulses are powerful, but explaining an impulse does not require surrendering to it.

We may not consciously choose every reaction arising inside us, but we can become increasingly conscious of those reactions.

That is the difference between automatic reaction and conscious response.

Your Brain Likes Certainty, but Consciousness Can Tolerate Not Knowing

Certainty is psychologically attractive. "I know what is happening" is generally more comfortable than "I am not entirely sure."

Political tribes can provide remarkably comprehensive interpretive frameworks. They help tell us which institutions deserve trust, which sources deserve skepticism, what events mean, which values are threatened, and what explanations make sense within the group's worldview.

That can make an enormously complicated world easier to understand.

Unfortunately, reality rarely fits perfectly inside one ideological framework.

Mature consciousness therefore requires developing an unusual capacity: remaining present within uncertainty without immediately escaping into a convenient explanation.

This means becoming comfortable saying that I do not know enough yet, that my side may be wrong about this particular issue, that somebody I usually disagree with may have a legitimate point, that someone I admire may have behaved badly, or that somebody I strongly oppose may occasionally do something I consider beneficial.

These statements sound simple, but inside a powerful tribal identity they can become surprisingly difficult.

Research also gives us reason for optimism. The simplistic idea that contradictory evidence always makes political partisans become more entrenched is not supported universally. People can change their minds in response to evidence, including information running against their partisan preferences, although hostile emotional contexts can make that considerably more difficult.

Political tribalism is therefore not destiny.

We are influenced by identity, but we are not reduced to identity. We experience emotional reactions, but we are not required to obey them. We possess biases, but we can become aware of them.

This is where science and spirituality arrive at an unexpectedly similar destination.

Science helps us understand the machinery. Spiritual practice asks us not to become completely identified with machinery. Within Science & Soul, consciousness becomes the bridge between the two. Biology gives us impulses. Experience gives us conditioning. Culture gives us identities. Relationships give us belonging. Political tribes give us stories about who belongs and who does not.

Consciousness gives us the possibility of observing all of it.

The Mask We Mistake for Ourselves

From the Science & Soul perspective, human beings gradually construct identities around themselves. We develop stories about who we are and what we represent. We become the successful person, the intelligent person, the spiritual person, the victim, the rebel, the healer, the conservative, the progressive, the Christian, the atheist, the patriot, the entrepreneur, the

academic, or the person who sees through what everyone else supposedly misses.

These identities are not inherently harmful. They help us organize our experience and participate in society. The problem begins when identity becomes a mask that must constantly be defended.

At that point, disagreement is no longer merely disagreement. It becomes threat.

If my political identity has fused with my sense of self, criticism of my political movement can feel like criticism of me. If my religion has become part of my ego rather than a pathway beyond my ego, questioning my religious interpretation can feel like an attack on my worth. If I define myself as highly conscious, encountering someone who challenges my worldview may produce exactly the defensive behavior I claim to have transcended.

The nervous system responds accordingly. The body tightens. Attention narrows. Emotion rises. We begin preparing arguments before the other person has finished speaking. Curiosity disappears, certainty increases, and the human being in front of us gradually becomes a category.

Once we have converted a human being into a label, we no longer need to understand them.

The mask has taken over.

Consciousness Is the Space Between Trigger and Response

Consciousness, as I use the word, is not simply intelligence, education, spirituality, or being awake. It is the increasing capacity to observe what is happening within us without automatically becoming it.

I can notice anger without allowing anger to determine my behavior. I can experience fear while recognizing that fear is influencing my interpretation. I can notice the urge to retaliate without retaliating. I can recognize pride without obeying it. I can observe my political identity without allowing that identity to dictate which facts I am permitted to acknowledge.

This creates a small but extraordinarily important space between stimulus and response. Within that space lies choice.

Instead of saying that another person makes me furious, I can observe that something within me becomes furious when I encounter that person. Instead of dismissing millions of people as stupid or evil, I can notice that I am reducing human beings whom I have never met to a contemptuous category.

Instead of immediately asking how I can prove someone wrong, I can ask why being right feels so important to me at this moment.

That does not weaken conviction. It can strengthen it because our principles become less dependent upon emotional reactivity.

I Am You, and You Are Me

At the deepest level of this discussion lies a spiritual principle that appears in different forms across religious, philosophical, and contemplative traditions: beneath the identities that separate us, human beings participate in the same fundamental human condition.

I express that principle simply as **I am you, and you are me.**

This does not mean that everyone behaves identically or that every action is morally equivalent. It does not erase accountability, law, justice, boundaries, or consequences. Some actions cause far more suffering than others and should be treated accordingly.

The principle is about something deeper. Every human being contains capacities for courage and cowardice, compassion and selfishness, honesty and deception, humility and pride, generosity and greed, love and hatred. Different biology, childhood experiences, wounds, cultures, opportunities, reinforcement, fear, education, relationships, and choices shape how those capacities eventually manifest.

Recognizing our shared humanity therefore does not require abandoning moral judgment about actions. It requires abandoning the illusion that people who commit actions we condemn belong to an entirely different category of human beings.

We can believe that someone's behavior was wrong without concluding that the person is fundamentally less human than we are.

Forgiveness Without Moral Blindness

This brings us to one of the most misunderstood spiritual concepts: forgiveness.

Forgiveness does not mean pretending that something harmful was harmless. It does not mean abandoning accountability, removing consequences, forgetting history, trusting someone who remains dangerous, or allowing another person to continue violating our boundaries.

Forgiveness and accountability can exist simultaneously. We can acknowledge that something was wrong and should not happen again while also deciding that we will not allow hatred of another person to occupy our inner world indefinitely.

That distinction matters because hatred rarely remains contained to its intended target. We carry it physiologically and psychologically. We rehearse arguments, revisit injuries, imagine retaliation, and repeatedly activate similar emotional states. The person we hate may be thousands of miles away while our own nervous system continues experiencing conflict.

Forgiveness therefore does not necessarily release another person from consequences. It can release us from the requirement to continue carrying that person within ourselves.

Christianity approaches this territory through grace and forgiveness. A secular psychological framework might speak about acceptance, emotional processing, compassion, cognitive flexibility, or releasing rumination. Science & Soul approaches the same territory through consciousness and nervous-system regulation.

Different languages can point toward a remarkably similar human possibility.

The Mirror Eventually Reaches Self-Love

If we follow this path far enough, we eventually encounter ourselves, and that may be the hardest encounter of all.

Most of us have lied at some point. We have judged unfairly. We have hurt someone. We have behaved defensively. We have wanted recognition. We have acted from insecurity. We have projected our wounds onto other people. We wore masks because we feared that who we actually were would not be enough.

Self-love does not require denying these things. In fact, genuine self-love may be impossible without acknowledging them.

The mature position is neither self-condemnation nor self-exoneration. It is the ability to recognize unconscious or harmful behavior, accept responsibility, repair what can be repaired, learn from what happened, and refuse to define an entire human life by its worst moment.

Once we genuinely understand that principle for ourselves, something interesting becomes possible: we can begin extending it to others.

The Consciousness Test: Ten Questions Before You Judge the Other Side

Ideas become useful only when they change the way we live. The next political disagreement can therefore become something more than another opportunity to defend our position. It can become an exercise in consciousness.

Before judging another person, political movement, religious group, or opposing tribe, ask yourself these ten questions:

1. Would I judge the same behavior the same way if someone from my own side did it? This may be the simplest test of whether we are applying a principle or protecting a tribe.

2. Can I name something important that my own side gets wrong? If the answer is genuinely no, we should at least consider whether we have moved from independent thought into identity protection.

3. Can I acknowledge something admirable in a person I strongly oppose? Recognizing courage, generosity, intelligence, compassion, or an effective action in an opponent does not require endorsing everything else about that person.

4. Am I looking for truth, or am I looking for ammunition? Reading only to find evidence that defeats the other side is fundamentally different from reading in order to understand reality.

5. What is happening in my body right now? If the jaw tightens, breathing changes, the heart accelerates, or anger rises, noticing that activation before responding can create space between reaction and choice.

6. What exactly is being threatened? Is it a moral principle, someone's safety, or a genuine injustice, or is my identity, status, worldview, political tribe, or need to be right also involved? More than one can be true simultaneously.

7. Can I accurately explain the other person's position in a way they would recognize as fair? If I cannot describe their argument without mocking it, I may not yet understand it well enough to dismiss it.

8. Where does the quality I condemn in them exist in me? If I see arrogance, intolerance, dishonesty, tribalism, judgment, insecurity, or a hunger for recognition, can I find an even smaller version of that tendency within myself?

9. Can I hold someone accountable without needing to hate them? Accountability evaluates behavior and consequences. Hatred can transform the entire human being into the behavior we condemn.

10. What would I choose if my goal were greater consciousness rather than victory? I might still disagree. I might still confront. I might still vote differently, establish a boundary, challenge misinformation, or demand accountability. Consciousness does not require passivity. It asks that my response emerge from principle rather than unconscious reaction.

These questions are not a formula for political centrism, nor do they imply that the truth always lies halfway between opposing positions. Sometimes evidence strongly supports one conclusion over another. Sometimes behavior is clearly harmful. Sometimes moral courage requires taking an uncompromising position.

The purpose of the exercise is not to weaken conviction.

It is to discover **who inside us is holding the conviction**: the conscious observer, or the threatened mask.

Perhaps Trump Is Not the Lesson

Donald Trump may ultimately be far less important to this discussion than he initially appears.

He is the hook because he activates us. He exposes fault lines already present in American culture: political tribalism, religious identity, resentment, fear, moral certainty, distrust, status, belonging, and the desire to defeat an opposing group.

The real danger begins when we become so certain of our own righteousness that we lose the ability to examine ourselves. At that moment, the Christian may have forgotten humility. The spiritual seeker may have forgotten consciousness. The intellectual may have forgotten curiosity. The activist may have forgotten compassion. The patriot may have forgotten shared humanity.

Each may still sincerely believe that the problem exists entirely outside themselves.

Perhaps this is the larger opportunity hidden inside our extraordinary political division.

Donald Trump does not need to become our hero for us to learn from the reactions surrounding him. Nor does he need to become our villain. He can become a mirror.

The Christian might describe what we discover in that mirror as repentance, humility, grace, and forgiveness. The psychologist might speak about metacognition, projection, emotional regulation, identity, and self-awareness. The neuroscientist might examine attention, threat, emotion, and cognitive bias. The spiritual seeker might call it awakening. Within Science & Soul, we can understand it as movement from unconscious reaction toward conscious choice.

The languages differ, but the invitation is remarkably similar.

The world will continue providing people who trigger us. Politics will continue producing conflict. Human beings will continue disagreeing about values, morality, religion, economics, culture, and power. We may not be able to eliminate those differences, nor should we expect to.

What we can change is the consciousness we bring to them.

We can become a little less certain of our own moral perfection and a little more curious about our blind spots. We can notice our masks before defending them. We can regulate ourselves before reacting. We can choose principles over tribes, humility over superiority, forgiveness over hatred, and compassion without abandoning accountability.

Perhaps the most important spiritual question is therefore not whether Donald Trump is sufficiently humble, sufficiently Christian, sufficiently conscious, or sufficiently moral. Those questions concern another man's journey.

The question that can transform our own lives is much closer to home.

When I look into the mirror, what am I willing to see?

References

Ditto, P. H., Celniker, J. B., Siddiqi, S. S., Güngör, M., & Relihan, D. P. (2025). *Partisan Bias in Political Judgment*. Annual Review of Psychology, 76, 717–740.

Kim, J. W. (2025). *Evidence Can Change Partisan Minds but Less So in Hostile Contexts*. British Journal of Political Science, 55.

Pew Research Center. (2026). *Americans have become more likely to say Trump is not too or not at all religious*. Survey conducted April 6–12, 2026.

The White House. (2025). *Establishment of the White House Faith Office*, Executive Order, February 7, 2025.

The White House. (2025). *Establishment of the Religious Liberty Commission*, Executive Order 14291, May 1, 2025.