

# **‘Big Lie?’ How am I to know?**



It started on the eve of January 6, and continued on that day, too – the flood of fiery denunciations of the storming of the Capitol a year ago as an “attack on our democracy,” all complete with recollections, editorials, and a presidential speech.

Day in and day out, we are told by those who, by implication, know the truth – that Trump’s claims of the stolen election that triggered it, is a lie, a “Big Lie” at that.

I’m all for the truth, but I cannot possibly know whether everyone’s vote was counted, and whether every vote that was counted was legit. I am only one person, and I cannot personally verify each vote among some hundred fifty million that were cast in the 2020 election either in person, or by absentee ballot. I can only rely on the integrity of the “system” – the states’ system of voter verification, and of

vote counts. It boils down, in the end, to reliance on the assurances given to me that the election was fair.

But to do that, I have to assume that those who say so are themselves trustworthy.

And I know from my personal experience that it is simply not true. The message may be right or wrong – but the messenger is not exactly a truth-seeker. That much I know for a fact.

How do we know that Trump's is a "big lie"? Politicians tell us that – but are they disinterested, objective parties; are they mere impartial truth-seekers? Or do they have some skin in the game, and say it to protect their seats, and their majorities? There is a clear conflict of interests here. Politicians are notoriously shifty, guided by expedience, not facts, their self-preservation and political advancement their main priority, trumping all else. Should I take the word of those cynical opportunists? (As an example, consider this, from the President Biden's speech on the first anniversary of the January 6 events – I cannot find the transcript, and quote from memory: "One hundred fifty million people went to the polls to vote, risking their lives because of Covid." That simply isn't true – much of voting was done by absentee ballot – and it was precisely what caused Trump to declare the election "stolen." The nutshell of his logic, if I get it aright, is that he won the in-person vote, and lost the absentee vote; yet the absentee vote is much easier to manipulate than the in-person vote. That is a critical detail that President Biden – whose speech was densely sprinkled with the word "truth" – forgot to mention. How is that "truth-speaking"?)

Then, there are press outlets who tell us that in disputed states the ballots have been counted and recounted over and over again, yet no fraud was discovered (as if, once the extra ballots are injected, the mere recounting will detect them). Moreover, the press tells us, the nation's courts were asked

to look into the matter, and confirm that all is hunky dory, and there is no need to worry – there was no voter fraud.

Now, I know a great deal both about uprightness of the courts, and the honesty of the mainstream press. I had to sue judges for fraud, and was told that in *Pierson v Ray* judges gave themselves the right to act from the bench “maliciously and corruptly.”

So can I rely on judges’ word that all was fine and good during the election – even if they indeed heard the cases challenging the vote count? No. And they didn’t hear those challenges to vote counts either – they used jurisdictional gimmickry to say “we won’t take your case, because we can’t” – and this counts, for the purposes of the legal system and the press as “considering the case.” How does this not examining the claims of voter fraud equate to debunking the claims of voter fraud (as we are lead to believe by the press), I cannot fathom. Yet, that’s what we are told the courts did – President Biden mentioning it his speech, too. So how am I to trust the word of judges that there was no fraud, given that they are not only self-admittedly “corrupt and malicious,” but that they did not even look into the allegations?

And as to the mainstream press press itself – I lost the count of my attempts to make them cover the fact that “due process” does not exist in judicial decision-making process, that judges openly gave themselves the right to act from the bench “maliciously and corruptly” – but the likes of the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* adamantly refuse to cover this scandalously sensational fact. So how am I to believe papers’ protestations that they are telling me the truth that Trump engaged in “big lie” when I know that they are not the champions of honesty in government?

So my dilemma is this: is it possible that Trump’s claim of “stolen election of 2020” is a “big lie”? There is a distinct

possibility. But can I trust people who froth at the mouth, telling me that it is was a “big lie”? I can’t, for I know for a fact that they are not truthful.

“Doctor, heal yourself first” is an age-long refrain. “Liars, mend your ways first” is what I would tell those who tell me that Trump’s claims of stolen election are a “big lie.” It may be, or it may not be – and that’s all I know, given the lack of trustworthiness of our “elites” – the politicians, the judiciary, the press who want to convince me.

Much has been said about the “threat to democracy” posed by Trump. Since democracy implies the public’s control over the government, and that control that is very uncertain at the present given the deviousness and absence of accountability of the mainstream press and of the judiciary, I’d suggest that the real “threat to democracy” are these two utterly disingenuous entities, Trump’s “big lie” – even if it was a lie (of which I am not at all sure) being a very distant second. .

Lev Tsitrin is the founder of the Coalition Against Judicial Fraud, [www.cajfr.org](http://www.cajfr.org)