In this issue...

Just Because (for 3-6 year-olds) by Mac Barnett (Nori Morganstein)

Catch and Kill: Lies, Spies and a Conspiracy to Protect Predators by Ronan Farrow (Jim Mills)

Impeach; The case against Donald Trump by Neal Katyal with Sam Kappelman (Susan Carr)

The Case Against Impeaching Trump by Alan Dershowitz (Susan Carr)

Stieg Larsson: The real story of the man who played with fire by Jan-Erik Pettersson (Don Boink)

Bagehot: The Life and Times of the Greatest Victorian by James Grant (Doug Wilcock)

On The Plain of Snakes: A Mexican Journey by Paul Theroux (Jim Mills)

With All Due Respect by Nikki R. Haley (Don Boink)

Audience of One: Donald Trump, Television, and the Fracturing of America by James Poniewozik (Jim Mills)

Can’t Is Not An Option by Nikki Haley (Don Boink)

Just Because (Candlewick Press, 2019) Picture Book (for 3-6 year-olds)

by Mac Barnett and illustrated by Isabelle Arsenault

reviewed by: Nori Morganstein, Youth Services Librarian/Assistant Director

This is the book for all the kids with a million and one questions. And this is the book for all the adults with not enough answers. It’s about a child with a lot of questions at bedtime. The story is one many parents will recognize: a child stalling before going to sleep. The child is not asking simple questions either. She asks, “Why is the ocean blue?” and “Why do leaves change color?” and “what happened to the dinosaurs?”

The title for this picture book is ironic because the father in the story always has really great answers for all of the questions the child asks. He never actually says, “Just because.” He also doesn’t give stereotypical answers. His answers are rather fantastical. He explains that the ocean is blue because “every night when you got to sleep, the fish take out guitars. They sing sad songs and cry blue tears.” And the dinosaurs escaped by hot air balloon into space. They aren’t the most factual answers, but they are fun and lead to beautiful illustrations.

There’s a definite Margaret Wise Brown vibe to the book. The characters and setting have a retro, almost Goodnight Moon quality to them. A lot of the pictures are done in black, white and greys, with them some major part of the picture done in one bright color (similar to Margaret Wise Brown’s style). The pages that cover the father’s unique explanations to the questions are always the brightest and most colorful.

The book ends with the child asking 15 or so questions at once and the father finally telling her it’s time for bed, instead of answering them all. She does throw out one last question: “Why do we have to sleep?” and he responds, “Because there are some things we can only see with our eyes closed.” That last page with that last explanation is pure magic, loaded with colors, flying fish, rainbows, volcanoes, bubbles, and happiness. I can see children staring at that last page for a long time, hoping to dream of all these things themselves. All in all, this is a fun going to bed book. Parents will see the humor in it. Kids will appreciate the illustrations and inquisitiveness of it all. And I can see it being a family favorite at bed time.
In recent years some men in power, who have preyed on women in their employ for decades, are starting to be held accountable for their behavior. In *Catch and Kill*, Ronan Farrow, the son of Mia Farrow and Woody Allen, tells of his experience as a media reporter in investigating the practices of some of these men who have made the life of so many of their female employees one of absolute misery and terror.

The bulk of the book has to do with Ronan’s efforts in tracking down one of the prominent sexual predators of our time, Harvey Weinstein. Weinstein for decades has been a prominent movie producer and distributor. He initially headed the Miramax Corp and later The Weinstein Company. In these positions he encountered many attractive women who felt that their careers as actresses and in other positions in the film industry were dependent on his good will. Even those women who had been warned about his behavior felt that they could still advance their careers while keeping him at arms length. Over a period of several years, Farrow, interviewed dozens of these of these women and relates their experiences with Weinstein. Warning, some of their accounts are graphic.

Farrow was working at NBC TV on their morning news show, Today. He was progressively putting together a report on Harvey Weinstein in which a number of his victims had agreed to testify on camera. As his work progressed he kept NBC management informed of his status. As his work advanced and the report neared completion, he encountered increasing resistance from NBC management, going up to the president of the company, hindering his efforts. This resistance progressed to eventually telling him to stop his investigative work and interviews with the victims. NBC management told him that he could contact print media with his story but he could no longer identify himself as a NBC reporter in his investigation. This shutdown of his investigation led to his contacting the New Yorker editor, David Remnick, where he was to receive a much warmer welcome.

*Catch and Kill* reads like a spy novel with the intrigue happening right here, mostly in New York City. Early on he sensed that his movements were being surreptitiously followed. In many instances he would take evasive actions to shake any pursuers off his tail. Eventually he found out that virtually every aspect of his investigation was passed on to the Weinstein organization and, Weinstein was using every weapon at his disposal to kill the story. This intimidation of NBC, similar to the experience of other news outlets, led the network to drop the story. Many devices had been employed by Weinstein including non-disclosure agreements with employees and victims of sexual predation, threatened legal action against reporters and media and the use of some borderline press outlets, such as the National Enquirer, to buy up the rights to a damaging story and then kill it. Hence the title of Farrow’s book, *Catch and Kill*. Farrow showed great courage and persistence in doggedly pursuing his goal in spite of the threatening environment and the negative responses from his superiors.

Farrow’s contact with the New Yorker was fruitful. The magazine went through its usual exhaustive fact checking routine, delaying the publication of the report. The use of a print outlet meant that Farrow could not make use of personal video testimonials. In the October 23, 2017 New Yorker issue, Farrow’s report, “From Aggressive Overtures to Sexual Assault: Harvey Weinstein’s Accusers Tell Their Stories”, reached the new-stands. This event triggered an avalanche of events leading to Weinstein’s firing from his company and, as this review is being written, his sexual assault trial in New York with further indictment for rape taking place in Los Angeles. Farrow documents the extensive web of Weinstein contacts who had protected him for decades from any adverse publicity or legal actions against him. As the author points out Weinstein is only one of many who have made their position of power a device for extracting sexual favor from vulnerable women. Another individual, covered in the book, who had had close contact with Farrow, was NBC Today anchor, Matt Lauer. The many charges of his sexual exploits also led to his losing his position at NBC on November 29, 2017. This pattern has been repeating itself in recent years across the business and entertainment worlds.

In reading about the brazen behavior of these individuals, one is struck by the aggressive sense of entitlement displayed and the complete disregard of the impact of that behavior on the women involved. These predators go to great lengths to set up the setting for the assaults and the cost to their organizations to cover up the activity is staggering. These costs range from multi-million dollar payoffs to ensure silence and the extensive legal and surveillance efforts to prevent the truth from emerging. The efforts of Farrow and others has triggered the burgeoning Me Too movement which holds promise that in the future women can pursue a career without the threat of intimidation from their male superiors. A new world may be upon us.
Impeach; the case against Donald Trump
by Neal Katyal with Sam Koppelman
reviewed by Susan Carr

For starters…who said?

“This business of high crimes and misdemeanors goes to the question of whether or not the person serving as President of the United States put their own interests, their personal interests, ahead of public service.”

Choose one:

1) Nancy Pelosi
2) George Washington
3) Michael Pence
4) AOC

If you chose #3, you nailed it! July 25, 2008.

On December 18, 2019 Donald John Trump, President of the United States, was impeached by the House of Representatives. Now, in January we are all familiar with the House’s Articles of Impeachment:

I - Abuse of Power and, II – Obstruction of Congress.

The first accuses Trump of soliciting assistance from the President of Ukraine to implicate a potential opponent in the 2020 election of corruption; the second amounts to a cover-up of this action.

*Impeach*…Neal Katyal recently served as Acting Solicitor General, he has presented 41 cases before the Supreme Court and is a professor of law at Georgetown University. His purpose is to illustrate why Donald Trump should be removed from office. Obviously, it is a one-sided presentation, yet it is objective and apolitical. He applies his “yardstick rule” to all of his assertions, ie he adheres to the same standards of judgment for both sides of any question. He begins with the Declaration of Independence…in itself, an impeachment…of King George. After the initial “We hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal,” the declaration goes on to state that King George has “refused his assent of Laws” and has obstructed the “Administration of Justice.” The signers of the Declaration of Independence are accusing him of these actions, indicting him, ie, impeaching him.

After the Founders’ experience with King George, it is understandable that they included in the Constitution the means to prevent the president’s being able to act above the law and obstruct justice…they included checks and balances, notably the establishment of Congress. Congress was given the authority to oversee the president and if necessary, impeach and remove him from office. The grounds for removal appear in Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution…“(The President) shall be removed from office if convicted in an impeachment trial of ‘Treason, Bribery or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.”’

Katyal writes,

“Since the (Constitutional) convention, scholars, lawyers, and legislators have debated the meaning of the phrase ‘high crimes and misdemeanors.’ And we still don’t have a specific definition written into our laws. But from notes taken during the Constitutional Convention and from the Federalist Papers, we do know what kind of president Congress was meant to remove – one who wielded the powers of the office for their personal benefit instead of for the benefit of the people.”

*Impeach* is brief, spot on, and outlines an excellent defense of a case for impeachment of Donald Trump. Although written before the House presented the Articles of Impeachment on Dec 18th, Katyal’s are similar. The sections on history provide informative background to illustrate his assertions about the current case.

Neal Katyal
As impeachment events are developing rapidly, making comparisons of books on the subject is like trying to hit a moving target. As I write this review, Adam Schiff is presenting the House Articles of Impeachment to the Senate.

The Case Against Impeaching Trump… Alan Dershowitz is well known, in legal circles and beyond. Two of his highly publicized cases were the defense of Claus von Bulow and O. J. Simpson… there were many others. He was a professor at Harvard Law School for many years and has written more than two dozen books about cases and legal theories. Dershowitz presents his case in opposition to the impeachment on the basis of Trump’s deeds not rising to the level of “high crimes and misdemeanors.” He disagrees with Laurence Tribe and Joshua Matz, (To End a Presidency.) who talk about a “living constitution” that “adapts to changing times”. He feels the Constitution cannot be modified without being amended, ie we must adhere to “high crimes and misdemeanors”, not “offenses and misdeeds.” Like Katyal, he claims to adhere to the same standards as the opposition when judging a situation, referring to his, “the shoe on the other foot” rule.

In an article in the NYT (1/20/20) Steven Harper reported on an interview with Larry King in 1998 where Mr. Dershowitz said:

“It certainly doesn’t have to be a crime if you have somebody who completely corrupts the office of president and who abuses trust and who poses great danger to our liberty. You don’t need a technical crime. We look at their acts of state. We look at how they conduct the foreign policy. We look at whether they try to subvert the Constitution.”

“But on January 19, 2020, Mr. Dershowitz was acting as one of Mr. Trump’s lawyers when he said to George Stephanopoulos that abusive or obstructive conduct is not impeachable and that an “actual crime” is required. And although the evidence demonstrates that Mr. Trump has committed crimes, Mr. Dershowitz asserted that, unless those crimes are explicitly stated in articles of impeachment, they cannot lead to Mr. Trump’s removal from office.

Which does Dershowitz believe? His statements in 2020, belie what he said in 1998…but as he says, that with additional research, theories change.

Publication dates of each of these two books are important:

July 9, 2018 – The Case Against Impeaching Trump, Dershowitz
Nov 25, 2019 – Impeach, Katyal.

Dec 18, 2019 - The House Articles of Impeachment of President Trump were presented.

In other words, Dershowitz wrote his book a year before the world learned of Trump’s call to the President of the Ukraine on July 25, 2019. He states in the book, “There is simply no evidence in the public record that he (Trump) has committed any of the crimes enumerated in the Constitution as a prerequisite for impeachment and removal.” Would he write that today? He has agreed to serve on Trump’s impeachment defense team. However, his statement regarding this was: “I’m there to try to defend the integrity of the constitution” – that benefits Trump in this case.

Both books are short, approximately 150 pg each (plus notes) and each comes quickly to the point. Dershowitz style is sometimes dense; Katyal’s is much easier to interpret. And the men? both are legal scholars. They each present their case in a similar fashion: the defense and then shorter answers or statements on specifics. And they both adhere to a similar modus operandi in judging – Katyal, the “yardstick measurement” and Dershowitz, the “shoe on the other foot” test. Although I agree with only one of the authors, I found both books enlightening.

Alan Dershowitz
Stieg Larsson: the real story of the man who played with fire
by Jan-Erik Pettersson
reviewed by Don Boink

Stieg Larsson is now famous as the author of the Millennium Series. Based in Stockholm, Sweden, he wrote exhaustively about the political ideology of the ultra right in all its forms in Sweden. To begin with his family were Communists, a popular ideology at the time following WW II. Also rife were neo-Nazi and Fascist groups. The latter groups were quite violent. Especially the skin heads. Larsson became an authority on these groups and collected a huge file that he committed to his encyclopedic mind. He began writing at an early age and in his family the topic was usually political.

Most of his writing was sent to liberal outlets such as the British bulletin called Searchlight. In Stockholm he worked with a group named Expo. Their aim was to counter the propaganda of the rightists. It was risky business as the rightist resorted to violence including murder. This required as much secrecy as possible and also delayed his marriage to Eva Gabriellson because of it being necessary to register and give addresses. They attempted to prevent being located that way. Their relationship went on for thirty years. She was a very helpful companion.

Although the book covered a lot of information about Larsson it was heavily loaded with details about the book industry and especially the evolution of the mystery story and the principle Swedish writers of that style. It turned out that Larsson was actually writing stories at the same time, he was consumed with writing exposes of various practices he found deplorable. He was a staunch supporter of women’s rights. When asked how he found time to do so much he simply said he didn’t require much sleep. Oft time though they found him asleep at his desk.

I have been a great fan of his books and his main characters, Lisbeth Solander and Michel Bloomquist. The author, who was also one of Larson’s publishers, does a nice job of describing those characters and relating how Larsson wove into his narratives the evils he fought against by incorporating them in the character’s background. The Millennial Series was conceived to be ten volumes. The first two books were already written before Larsson concerned himself with finding a publisher. It wasn’t difficult to find one. The books were nearly instant successes. They soon went international as well as movie rights being involved. Unfortunately before publication had begun Larsson died of a heart attach. This complicated matters somewhat, but only momentarily because evidence of their success was already known. As time proved, the sales were in the same stratosphere with Harry Potter and Agatha Christie.

In my estimation the saddest outcome of Larsson’s passing was the result of Stieg and Eva never having married. Swedish law does not recognize common law marriage. As a result Stieg’s father and brother were the only legatees. It left Eva out in the cold. According to the book the final resolution of who gets control of what is under negotiation. For those interested in Stieg Larsson this book is a source of much background information and commentary on how he developed his characters.
P.S. Gabriellson wrote her own book stating her case.

Steig Larsson
James Grant, in writing a biography of Walter Bagehot (pronounced Badge-It), describes Bagehot's writing about the foreign government bond craze that lasted from the late 1860s to the mid-1870s as "his signal journalistic achievement." But where the book really sings is not at that moment but when Grant writes about Bagehot's 1873 publication of *Lombard Street*, his most influential work about the English banking system in the heyday of the gold standard. *Lombard Street* is the work that recently achieved notoriety when Ben Bernanke cited it as an influence for his actions as Federal Reserve chair during the Great Recession of 2008, specifically for the use of quantitative easing (QE and QE II) to stem the financial panic. Bernanke's and the Fed's actions would seem to draw directly from Bagehot's admonition that, when faced with a panic, act early to lend freely at a high rate of interest against good banking collateral. Grant, the founder of Grant's Interest Rate Observer and a skeptic of what he calls the "modern machinery of socialized financial risk", has much to say about that, noting especially that in the modern case the phrase "high rate of interest" was ignored. The thirty pages at the end of the book that detail the writing of *Lombard Street* is Grant's best writing as he makes the case for Bagehot as the greatest Victorian.

Walter Bagehot developed his ideas early. He and his father supported free trade and opposed the Corn Laws, the tariff on imported grain. As a Unitarian, the universities at Oxford and Cambridge were off limits to him. He instead went to the newly founded University College, London where he was a student of the famous mathematician Augustus DeMorgan. Following graduation he entered Stuckey's Bank where his father worked and where he met James Wilson, founder of The Economist. Bagehot would marry Wilson's eldest daughter and would, in time, become the third editor of The Economist. It was this combination of being a banker and having an outlet for his writing talents that propelled Bagehot to such an influential role in British economic thinking and policy commentary.

That Bagehot would catch Grant's eye is no great surprise. There is a banking lineage that connects Bagehot's world to Grant's. Stuckey's Bank where Bagehot worked and became a director sold out in 1909 to Parr's Bank. Parr's was a part of the National Westminster corporate family tree. In 2000 NatWest was acquired by the Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS) and in 2008 RBS — "overextended, mismanaged, illiquid, and caught up in what its management admitted was 'a bull market culture'" — spectacularly failed. The Great Recession of 2008 is in a sense a direct descendant of the Overend, Gurney failure of 1866, which Bagehot wrote so much about in *Lombard Street*. One might make the case that Dodd Frank was written in the spirit of the 1844 Peel Act, the centerpiece of financial legislation in mid-nineteenth century Great Britain.

While Grant saves his best (*Lombard Street*) for last, he does write a solid biography. He effectively provides the reader with the milieu in which Bagehot wrote his other great work, *The English Constitution*, Bagehot's response to John Stuart Mill. Besides focusing on Bagehot, throughout the book Grant gives the larger picture of the era, an era dominated by Gladstone and Disraeli. Grant does admit that Bagehot often got things wrong, especially his political and economic prognostications. Grant acknowledges that it was Thomson Hankey, author of *The Principles of Banking*, who understood the risks and unintended consequences of a lender of last resort better than Bagehot. A century and a half on, we pick up Hankey's theme, employing the term moral hazard to describe actions with no consequences to the perpetrator that can wreak havoc with economies and peoples' lives.

For anyone interested in finance and banking, this is a good book. Since *Lombard Street* figures so prominently at the end of the book, this reviewer would recommend reading it. It is a lively look at the dominant financial institution (Bank of England) and its role as lender of last resort in what was the world's leading economy at the time. It also has the virtue of being a quick read. Digest that and you are ready to enjoy James Grant's biography of Walter Bagehot.
On The Plain of Snakes: A Mexican Journey
by Paul Theroux
reviewed by Jim Mills

In addition to being a prolific fictional author, since 1975 Paul Theroux has written over a dozen accounts of his solo trailblazing travel adventures around the world from China to South America, India to Africa and the South Pacific to the Mediterranean. In a recent book Theroux visited rarely visited parts of our own Deep South. In the last couple of years the author has continued his practice of tempting fate by plunging on his own into exceedingly dangerous regions of our neighbor to the south, Mexico. Through the years his primary means of transportation has been by rail but on his last two journeys Theroux has used his own car. The dangers to be encountered in Mexico are characterized by the book’s title which is taken from the name of one Mexican town which translates as The Plain of Snakes. On all of these trips Theroux has made use of his earlier Peace Corps experiences to mix intimately with the inhabitants at all strata of society and to share their lifestyle and aspirations.

On his most recent trip the author started out by driving the 2,000 mile length of the US-Mexican border. During this time he witnessed the immense flow of goods and people, both legal and illegal, that crosses the border. Much of the illegal flow is directed across the dangerous remote desert areas of the south-west contributing to the large death rate there each year. Private support groups do leave stashes of water at various points in the desert to alleviate the distress of the migrants and help reduce the fatality rate. While some of the flow is related to illegal drugs coming into the US, the vast majority of the migrants consist of individuals driven by poverty and/or violence to seek a better life in the US. Those who have successfully crossed in the past have contributed to the US economy in areas such as agriculture, restaurant work, and other domestic services. In many of these areas it is hard to find domestic workers willing to do the work performed by immigrants. Theroux interviewed many individuals and describes many stories of hardship from those attempting the crossing. In some cases individuals had been working in he US for several decades and returned to Mexico temporarily due to a family death or illness and was then apprehended attempting to return. No matter how long these individuals are American residents they are alway subject to being spontaneous deported. During WW 2 the US Government initiated a new program called the Bracero Program. This legislation allowed Mexicans to cross the border legally for a specified period of time to work here and then return home. In the mid 1960s this program was cancelled. Since then the US has had a continual problem with widespread illegal border crossings.

Theroux then decided to drive his car into Mexico and describes the difficulty in doing so. His route took him through Monterrey, Mexico City, and the two southern states of Oaxaca and Chiapas. He also did a side trip by bus, after returning briefly to the US, to the Mexican Pacific coast stopping in Guadalajara. All along the route he points out the dangers to the solo traveller from the drug cartels and various gangs and not insignificantly the military and the police. Twice in the Mexico City area he was forced at a police stop to pay a bribe in the hundreds of dollars. As far as the author was concerned he had done nothing wrong and his papers were in order. Not having payed would have involved significant delays or worse. The author points out that the average Mexican and particularly the poorer citizens can look for no support or protection from the police and the government. Every years tens of thousands are killed or disappear as a result of random or directed violence.

While in Mexico City Theroux gave a class on writing and literature. At various stops he connected with many local writers comparing notes on Mexican society. Even though he is fairly fluent in the language he took a class in Spanish in Guadalajara, or more precisely in Mexican which differs in many ways particularly idiomatically. In Oaxaca and Chiapas the author was visiting the poorest part of the country. This region also has the strongest cultural ties to native pre-columbian tribes. Many of the region’s inhabitants speak only the Zapotec language. The villages in the area are exceeding remote and Theroux achieved access only with great difficulty. So many of the inhabitants have been ignored and mistreated for so long by the government that the area has essentially been ruled for decades by an insurgent group called the Zapatistas. The locals had become so confident of Theroux discretion that he was invited to an insurgent meeting where many of the leaders were masked. He even had the opportunity to meet the long time leader of the group, Subcomandante Marcos. (continued on the next page)
Reading about Theroux’s traveling experiences is fascinating since he explores the basic culture of each region and explains the motivation behind many of the behavior patterns that on the surface seem inexplicable. The history of Latin America has been replete with so many rebellious groups and leaders including one of the best known, Che Guevara. Theroux’s penetration of the local cultures goes a long way in explaining this enduring rebellious behavior in Latin America. Through the years going back to the 1970s, this reviewer has found all of Theroux’s travel books to be engrossing reads in view of the risks that he has taken and his view into the nature of the societies that he is visiting. One aside: Paul Theroux, when he is not traveling, lives in Hawaii and in Sandwich on the Cape. Several years ago my wife and I were in Sandwich and decided to look up his house. It was located in a quiet residential area with his home built on a local rise. It was Fall and there was a woman out raking leaves on the edge of her property. I asked her if the writer, Paul Theroux, lived in the house on the hill. She looked at us and said, “Yeah he lives there. He never rakes his leaves and they all end up in my yard.” That’s the local perspective.

With All Due Respect
by Nikki R. Haley
reviewed by Don Boink

I think I have found a new presidential contender. Nikki Haley has come out with this book in a timely fashion while everyone is thinking politics. Although that is not the current contest it could well be the next one. She is now a staunch supporter of Trump and plans to campaign for him. None the less, from reading her book I get a strong impression that she not only has the fire in the belly but the capability to make a strong run for the office.

Born of immigrant parents from India she has experienced (suffered) the sting of discrimination both personally and through her parents who settled in So. Carolina. Her mother had achieved the distinction of getting a law degree and was being considered for a judgeship in India but was rejected for being female. They came to America (legally) to give their children better opportunities. Her father is a professor at a black college. She says they don’t qualify as black or white but settle on brown, which isn’t recognized. She is a graduate of Clemson University and got a law degree. She served six years in the South Carolina Legislature and then became the state’s Governor.

Since then she was named U. S. ambassador to the United Nations serving two years. Although she deplores the rhetoric and crudity of Trump she agrees with many of his policies. Since her parents came into the country legally she agrees that others should also be required to do the same. She however does not refrain from calling Trump out if she feels he’s out of line. An example is the Chancellorsville incident where white supremacists demonstrated violently and Trump equivocated and said he thought there were fine people on both sides. She told him to his face that there was no equivalence there. He had no reluctance to naming her Ambassador.

She felt two difficult years at the U. N. was enough and chose to leave. This sparked rumors that she would run for President. She assured all that she intended to campaign for Trump in 2020 but left the future open. The book impressed me with her way of thinking and the determination to buck the odds and prevail. There is no doubt that she is political and understands how the system works. She has proven that she is good at it. I’ll vote for her.

Read a fascinating or intriguing book lately?
Write a review (300 – 900 words) and share your experience with the BLL community.
E-Mail to Jim Mills jmlills43@comcast.net and have your review printed in an upcoming BLL Book Review.
If you have any comments on our reviews or if there are any particular books that you would like to see reviewed
Please contact us at: jmlills43@comcast.net
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Also appear on the Brewster Ladies Library Web Site http://www.brewsterladieslibrary.org/
Donald Trump’s life has paralleled the birth and rise of television in the United States. Mr. Trump was born in 1946, the year that television began its grip on the mores and opinions of the American public. Mr. Trump who began his business career as a real estate developer in New York City, through the years has morphed into a major celebrity whose renown had spread across the nation. The author, James Poniewozik, has been the chief television critic for the New York Times since 2015. In *Audience of One*, Poniewozik covers the evolution of television as a major opinion maker in our country, and, as the author points out, that television has been a major factor in channeling Trump’s opinions.

Mr. Trump’s TV career began around 1980 when he was interviewed by Tom Brokaw on NBC’s Today Show. As the decades went by and many of his business enterprises such as his casinos, airline, football franchise, and university began to tank Trump began to sell his name as a source of income. With the advent of reality TV, his television career peaked in the 2000s with a NBC program, *The Apprentice*, with Trump as the central figure who decides the viability of the future careers of two competing groups of apprentices. The entire program is oriented towards the apprentices’ finding ways to curry his favor and succeed on the program. His image as a prominent businessman was tied to a great extent to the persona generated by the program highlighted by his ubiquitous expression, “You’re fired.” As Trump’s celebrity spread the use of the Trump name became a major source of his income. Whether these enterprises were successful or not, Trump would earn a royalty.

The author documents the trends in TV through the years. In the period up to the 1980s, the era of the three major networks, TV news was a unifying factor with most Americans receiving their news from the same sources. The advent of the Cable TV era has greatly multiplied the choices available to viewers resulting in a fragmenting the views presented. During this period three major cable news stations emerged with CNN, MSNBC and Fox News presenting differing versions of the news. Early on Trump established close ties with Fox News, in particular the program *Fox and Friends*. The latter program began a new feature in 2011 called Mondays with Trump. The segment was sold as being, “Bold, brash and never bashful”, a capsule description of its originator. Trump’s contribution to *Fox and Friends* was to continue until 2015 and his entrance into the 2016 presidential race.

As president, Trump is know as an avid TV watcher and he reliably watches *Fox and Friends*. Many of those who want to attract the president’s attention try to find a way to get their viewpoint presented on the program. Since Trump is not known to be a reader, thoughts expressed in written form seem to regularly elude him. Another basic method to influence him, which many foreign leaders have exploited, is flattery. *Fox and Friends*, and for that matter the Fox News network, have employed that technique with great effect and the president regularly returns the high regards. This type of activity between the press and politicians is not new but the current situation is certainly unprecedented. In recent years probably no one in the world has received as much media coverage as has Trump. It is said that he appreciates continual publicity whether positive or negative. He seems to believe in the Oscar Wilde adage: “There is only one thing in the world worse than being talked about, and that is not being talked about.”

![Trump on Fox and Friends](image-url)
This is another book by Haley and covers mostly the same ground her first one covered, namely her heritage as a native of India and her fierce American patriotism. The fact that her family lived in South Carolina is interesting as to its import on her history as a political person and the effect that discrimination had on her family.

Her politics aline with the conservatism of the Tea Party, of which, she speaks very highly. Her strongest criticisms are aimed at Obama and the Affordable Care Act as well as the tremendously costly bail outs associated with Bush as well as Obama. She characterizes herself as an accountant and a numbers person weighing all legislation in terms of cost to the taxpayer. When serving in the South Carolina legislature representing the 87th district she championed a bill requiring that how the members voted be recorded. This drew the wrath of most of her colleges and she lost responsible positions on committees because of it. This was her way of lessening the steady increase of the budget each year. Opposition to her never slowed her down but only stiffened her resolve. Her popularity increased to the point that after six years in the legislature she won the governorship of South Carolina. Her stand on immigration is emphasizing legality. Since her parents came into this country legally she feel strongly that our borders should be protected.

Because she impressed me greatly it causes me to look more closely at the conservative agenda than I have previously because it struck me as severely obstructive. Not being capable of compromise lessens its usefulness in a democratic form of government. Nonetheless Halley’s ethics and principled outlook is in her favor and I would consider her incorruptible. This book stops short of the time she served two years as our Ambassador to the United Nations. I’m sure that despite the Sturm und Drang of our political process she will return to the fray in the near future. She is certainly a remarkable person.