

# To understand the incomprehensible Iowa Trump voter, Mr. Remnick should look in the mirror



David Remnick

by Lev Tsitrin

My enjoyment of a breakfast was much enhanced by the anguish coming out of the radio as I ate: the *New Yorker* editor [David Remnick was discussing](#) the upcoming Iowa caucus on NPR's WNYC – and expressed his distress and his incomprehension at how it was possible to even think of voting for a person with ninety-one different charges (if not yet ninety-one convictions)

against him? And yet, Trump's lead among Iowa republicans is unassailable. What's the matter with these people?

I am not overly sadistic, yet what a pleasure it is to see the shoe being placed on the other foot – given that my distress and my incomprehension of Mr. Remnick and his MSM cohorts' (including the so-called "public radio" on which I heard his broadcast) perversion of values is just as profound, and my disgust at their willful blindness to reality is every bit as acute as Mr. Remnick's. Misery loves company. Hearing Mr. Remnick – who along with other MSMers is responsible for my distress squirm, was fun.

Unlike Mr. Remnick, I am not distressed about Trump (who represents the executive branch) – but about the coequal branch – federal judiciary. Having discovered in my litigation that federal judges feel free to falsify in their decisions the parties' argument by replacing it with the argument of judges' own concoction tailored to give the victory to the side they want to win (and that outrageously, they defended this practice when I sued them for fraud by a self-given in *Pierson v Ray* right to act from the bench "maliciously and corruptly") I contacted the press (Mr. Remnick including) thinking that I had on my hands a huge sensation – yet to my uncomprehending amazement, MSM was determined to stay mum (in the case of Mr. Remnick, after repeatedly emailing him, I got a polite but terse "bug off" – "I appreciate your interest and take on board what you've said in your notes." Huh?)

The same was the case with WNYC. Wishing to understand what is it that blinds the media to judicial "corruption and malice" even as journalists are eager to trumpet Trump's alleged sins, and learning that the chief expert on the subject, Brooke Gladstone of WNYC – a journalist who runs "On the Media," an NPR show which investigates journalism, was to talk at a Manhattan library, I headed there to talk to her in-person. That was on October 6. Most constructively, Brooke suggested I drop off my material at the office of WNYC – but, unwilling to

head to Manhattan again, I mailed it in the next day. There was no response from Brooke. Finding myself in Manhattan on October 19, I printed out another set to drop it off as she suggested – but WNYC refused to take the package. I e-mailed Brooke about the snafu, asking her whether she got the package I mailed. Politely, she replied that she hadn't been to her office since our conversation, and suggested I email this material – which I immediately did. There was another period of silence, and on November 13 – more than three weeks later – I emailed a reminder. She replied that she would read it over the Thanksgiving weekend. Another long weeks of silence ensued, and on December 4, I sent another reminder. There was another encouraging reply – “I will read it this week.” Another weeks-long silence followed. Getting worried that something must have happened to her, I sent her my New Year's wishes for health and happiness, asking again whether she read what I sent her. In response, she wished me a great New Year too – but there was not a word on the material I sent her. I sent another reminder January 5 – suggesting this time that may be, her New Years' resolution should be “keeping promises.” To that suggestion, I got no response.

Such would not be a reaction if I promised a tape on which Trump says he has the right to be “corrupt and malicious.” Journalists would have instantly jumped on the story (and would have paid for the privilege too, I suspect) – as not a few of acknowledged to me directly. (Paradoxically, since the branches of government are coequal, presidents do have this very right. I wish Trump would assert it!)

Are journalists stupid? Are they dishonest? Are they opposed to democracy? These are the same questions that journalists address to the Iowa's Republicans. Are they incomprehensibly stupid? Are they opposed to democracy and wish for a dictator, as Mr. Remnick and his ilk seems to suggest? Are they blind to the reality?

I'd say it's none of the above – but they see judicial

prosecution of Trump as political, and dismiss it as Democrat/"never-Trumpers politicking. So why wouldn't they turn a blind eye to it – exactly as the MSM turns the blind eye to judicial fraud, seeing illegal, fraudulent judging as mere tool of politics – and therefore doing nothing to oppose it? So paradoxically, all that Mr. Remnick has to do to understand the Iowa Republicans, is to look in the mirror and ask themselves, "why do I oppose covering judicial swindles on the pages of the *New Yorker* even though they are clearly illegal, violating the democracy about which I care so much?"

I think the Iowa Republicans are far more honest in their answer, and their answer is much easier to understand – for anyone who wants to understand, of course. But the likes of Mr. Remnick do not want to, preferring to see Iowans as fools who do not care about democracy and are willing to be deceived by a demagogue. This is so much easier than facing the facts. Besides, if you do care about democracy, you should also look into how judging is done (for clearly, judiciary is part of the machinery of democracy) – and acknowledge that doing it "maliciously and corruptly" violates the norms of the beloved democracy (and is, for that matter, illegal).

Yet MSM does not want to do this. Democracy be damned – they are all for oligarchy (as long, of course, as they are the oligarchs – or at least, the "elites"!) )

So I wish Mr. Trump every success – if only of the sake of seeing the likes of Mr. Remnick squirm at seeing Trump back in the oval office. MSM's hypocrisy must be punished. There is plenty: when it comes to Mr. Trump's alleged crimes, journalists see both what's there, and what's isn't, trumpeting both at MSM's max volume – but when it comes to "corrupt and malicious" swindler-judges, journalists would rather see nothing, and not a murmur is heard from MSM.

This double-standard drives me crazy – and I hope Trump will drive crazy the MSM hypocrites like Mr. Remnick. The revenge

would be sweet.

Lev Tsitirin is the author of "[Why Do Judges Act as Lawyers?: A Guide to What's Wrong with American Law](#)"