

The decline of democracy: whose fault is it?



Who is at fault for the decline in popularity of democratic ideals world-wide? The answer – at least the *New York Times*' answer – is obvious from the title of its analysis of the situation: "[U.S. Allies Drive Much of World's Democratic Decline, Data Shows](#)": "much of the world's backsliding is not imposed on democracies by foreign powers, but rather is a rot rising within the world's most powerful network of mostly democratic alliances. ... often, the trend was driven by a shift toward illiberal democracy. ... In that form of government, elected leaders behave more like strongmen and political institutions are eroded, but personal rights mostly remain (except, often, for minorities). U.S. allies often led this trend. Turkey, Hungary, Israel and the Philippines are all examples. A number of more established democracies have taken half-steps in their direction, too, including the United States, where voting rights, the politicization of courts, and other factors are considered cause for concern by many democracy scholars."

Needless to say, to me the mention of “the politicization of courts” by the *New York Times* of all places was a proverbial red rag to a bull – for who is more responsible for “the politicization of courts” than the *New York Times* and the rest of the legacy media who adamantly refuse to investigate and shed the disinfecting light of public scrutiny on the judicial decision-making process, letting it fester instead? So I penned the following, e-mailing it to the *New York Times*’ and the researchers quoted in the article. I don’t hold my breath that any of them will reply – but at least, why not put the mirror in front of the real culprits responsible for the decline of democracy? For what it is worth, here is what I said:

In his “*U.S. Allies Drive Much of World’s Democratic Decline, Data Shows*” NY Times’ Max Fisher laments, among other things, “the politicization of courts.”

Since I am easily America’s top expert on federal judicial procedure, let me explain to Mr. Fisher (and those he quoted in his article) how federal judges routinely operate. Having gathered parties’ argument, they throw it into garbage, replacing it in their decisions with the utterly bogus argument of judges’ own concoction that allows them to decide cases the way they want to, not the way they have to. Simply put, there is no “due process” in federal judicial decision-making process; decision-making is arbitrary. When sued for fraud, those judges defend themselves by a self-given, in *Pierson v Ray*, right to act from the bench “maliciously and corruptly”.

So here you have it – federal judges are so corrupt that they don’t mind openly acknowledging it. And yet, the legacy media – the likes of the *New York Times* – studiously stay mum, as do the academics, lamenting the perceived politicization of courts instead – despite the fact that the perception of courts as political simply reflects reality. After all, judicial decision-making being arbitrary, it can only be

political.

Why does MSM/the academe refuse to cover judicial fraud? They don't want to say – but I have some theories – like the one expressed in this 2-min read: <https://alibi.com/news/61032/Judicial-Fraud-Impacts-Americans.html>

In any event – the media and the academe are huge part of the problem. Instead of acting as democratic institutions investigating and exposing corruption across the board, they do so very selectively. When it comes to Trump's perceived "obstruction of justice," the gloves are off. When, however, it is federal judges who obstruct justice right in the open, right from the bench, by adjudicating judges,' rather than parties' argument in brazen violation of "due process of the law" – the legacy press and the academe studiously look the other way.

So why be surprised that democracy gets a bad rap? US judiciary being arbitrary, do we really have a democracy, or do people judge an oligarchical system that is corrupt by design – its media and academe including?