

Ironbound Films
Attn: Jeremy Newberger, CEO
35 Garrison Landing
Garrison, NY 10524-3658

And my friends, in this story you have the history of this entire movement. First they ignore you. Then they ridicule you. And then they attack you and want to burn you. And then they build monuments to you.

- [Nicholas Klein](#) (1884-1951), an American labor union advocate and attorney. A variant of this quote is often [misattributed](#) to [Mahatma Gandhi](#) (1869-1948).

Never argue with stupid people, they will drag you down to their level and then beat you with experience.

- Attributed to both [Mark Twain](#) (1835-1910), American author & [George Carlin](#) (1937-2008), humorist and social critic.

Sometimes people don't want to hear the truth because they don't want their illusions destroyed.

- [Friedrich Nietzsche](#) (1844-1900), Philosopher, essayist, and cultural critic.

<><><>

[A New Video for Jeremy Newberger](#)

<><><>

01– December - 2024

Dear Mr. Newberger,

I want to work for you in a UNPAID capacity.

Working 100% gratis, I would be emailed assignments that I would then complete.

I want to prove myself.

Should the quality of my work prove to be acceptable, it is my hope that then a salaried arrangement could be discussed.

I present my both my website [John Eisenhower's Writing Project](#) and my essay page [John's Substack | John Eisenhower | Substack](#) as a portfolio of my growing body of work.

While I am at it, I invite you to check out my 3 most recent essays: [The godless God, the Devil and Honor](#), [The godless God & the Rise of Fascism in the United States](#) & [The godless God, the Devil and the Philosopher's Stone](#)

On October 13, 2024, I sent you a request regarding me doing an unpaid assignment for you to your Threads. In the post, I included a brief video:

[Newberger Appeal Oct 13.mp4 - Google Drive](#)

[I'm a 64-year old guy](#). I work a s--- job and my past is marred by drugs and alcohol. I want to work in the entertainment industry...something with an activist edge. That is...um...unrealistic

An unrealistic goal means unrealistic methods.

I'm going to write editorials – and philosophical digressions – and email them to companies that I want to work for on a UNPAID basis.

That's because I'm plucky or crazy. Ah, I'm both.

Mr. Newberger: With the election of Trump (and the extremist GOP taking the majorities of both Houses of Congress), human decency has been dealt a fundamental blow. I fear that our democracy might not survive.

I put some thoughts together about this specifically for you. The analysis/opinion that follows was created explicitly for this email.

I'm going to start by voting breakdown of two recent presidential elections.

In the 2016 Presidential election, [the voter turnout](#) was approximately 55.7% of the voting-age population (an approximate 44.3% not voting).

- ♦ Democratic: Hillary Clinton [received about 48.2%](#) of the popular vote.
- ♦ Republican: Donald Trump [received about 46.1%](#) of the popular vote.
- ♦ Third-party candidates: Combined, third-party candidates [received about 5.7%](#) of the popular vote.

Despite Clinton winning the popular vote, Trump received the presidency due to succeeding in the Electoral College.

While it is debatable if it should exist, [the Electoral College ultimately elects](#) the President of the United States.

Each state is allocated a certain number of electoral votes based on its representation in Congress (total number of Senators and Representatives). When voters cast their ballots in a presidential election, they are actually voting for a slate of electors: these electors are chosen by their party (who then vote for the President).

To win, a candidate must secure a majority of electoral votes (at least 270 out of 538).

This system means that a candidate can lose the national popular vote but win the presidency by securing a majority of electoral votes from key states. If the loser of the popular vote wins several states by narrow margins – while winner of the actual vote wins other states by large margins – the loser can realize an overall electoral vote victory and win the contest.

Trump [received](#) 304 electoral votes: Clinton [received](#) 227 electoral votes.

Three key states [determined the outcome](#) (Trump's margin of victory in these states was very narrow):

- ♦ Michigan: Trump won by approximately 10,704 votes.
- ♦ Pennsylvania: Trump won by about 44,292 votes.
- ♦ Wisconsin: Trump won by around 22,748 votes.

In the 2020 Presidential election, the [voter turnout was approximately 66.6%](#) of the voting-age population (33.4% not voting).

- ♦ Democratic: Joe Biden [received about 51.3%](#) of the popular vote.
- ♦ Republican: Donald Trump [received about 46.8%](#) of the popular vote.
- ♦ Third-party candidates: Combined, third-party candidates [received about 1.9%](#) of the popular vote.

I am speculating that a significant numbers of people who did not vote in the 2016 election did so in 2020 because of a deep seated fear over Trump being re-elected. Similarly, a much smaller percentage of voters went third-party in 2020 because many of these votes went for Biden (same fear).

There appears to be perception that non-voters are simply are a block with monolithic disinterest in politics. I disagree. While a portion of non-voters are grossly disinterested in the process, I feel that non-voters are a more complex group. In fact, this is not a block of non-voters at all.

Instead of a block of nonvoters, there is a very fluid pool of people who participate more or less sporadically. While there are those who think that politics is BS – as it is composed of vainglorious actors who are using, manipulating and grifting – many of the less active care but simply need to be appealed to directly.

Mr. Newberger, I am a huge fan of the AI bits that you have been posting to social media & You Tube. Funny as hell and translates into [GOTV](#).

But what needs to be done is to solidify the base of enlightened voters by talking to the 'doubting Thomases' in a way that...well...speaks to them.

I will circle back to the hesitant voters and how we need to explicitly reach out to them but first...a digression.

Vainglory is an interesting word. It means [excessive or ostentatious pride especially in one's achievements](#).

Of course, a person that takes excessive pride in his accomplishments is not looking at them critically.

During his 2016 Republican National Convention speech, Donald Trump said: [I alone can fix](#).

He was emphasizing his belief that he was uniquely qualified to address and resolve the issues facing the United States. [Pointing to his outsider status](#) combined with his singular understanding of the system's flaws, he maintained that he was the best candidate to bring about the necessary changes and reforms. This statement was part of his broader message that the political establishment had failed the American people, and that he alone had the capability to fix the problems created by career politicians.

Fast forward to 2024.

In a post on Truth Social, Trump [vowed to impose](#) a 25% tariff on all products coming into the United States from Mexico and Canada on his first day in office. He stated that this tariff would

remain in effect until the flow of drugs, particularly fentanyl, and illegal immigrants from these countries stopped.

Apparently gleaned from his singular understanding of the system's flaws as an outsider – he was only an active politician for a decade and only served *one* term as President – he emphasized that both Mexico and Canada had the power to address these issues: since they would not, they would face significant economic consequences.

Maintaining that the proposed 25% tariff on *all* products from Mexico and Canada is unlikely to effectively stem the flow of drugs (particularly fentanyl) and illegal immigration, many experts believe that such tariffs would primarily harm American consumers and businesses by driving up costs and disrupting supply chains.

Critics point out that [both](#) Mexico & Canada are already taking significant measures to combat drug trafficking and illegal immigration.

For instance, Mexico has increased vigilance around rail yards and highway checkpoints: Canada has implemented stricter immigration policies.

These efforts are complex and multifaceted, and critics argue that the threat of economic consequences will do nothing to address the deeply rooted issues that these efforts are attempting to stem. Instead, these efforts will be frustrated and possibly be completely thwarted.

But that Truth Social post was not a surprise. He [campaigned on pledges](#) to implement sweeping tariffs on allies and adversaries alike. Vowing to hike tariffs to 60% for all goods imported from China and to 20% for those brought in from the rest of the world, he argued that these policies would both pressure countries to get serious about immigration and encourage companies to move manufacturing jobs back to the US. This would raise revenue for the federal government.

During the campaign, economists were [largely unimpressed](#) by these ideas. Maintaining that such tariffs would likely lead to higher prices for American consumers and could trigger a global trade war, the experts (who devoted their lives to studying this topic) felt that these were disastrous notions. The proposed 60% tariff on goods imported from China and the 20% tariff on goods from the rest of the world were seen as particularly problematic. Economists warned that these measures would increase costs for businesses and consumers: they would cause inflation and overall economic instability.

And [most economists rejected](#) Trump's assessment that these policies would pressure countries to address immigration issues or encourage companies to move manufacturing jobs back to the U.S. Instead, they believed that the tariffs would harm the U.S. economy rather than achieving the intended goals.

[Over 400 economists](#) and former policymakers endorsed Kamala Harris: this was because of the consensus that her economic policies would provide more stability and opportunity for all Americans. This endorsement highlighted the widespread concern among economists about the potential negative impacts of Trump's tariff plans.

[Kamala Harris secured](#) 47% of the popular vote in the 2024 presidential election, while Donald Trump garnered 51%. Don't bother pulling up your calculator app: the difference is '4'.

44.3% of eligible citizens did not vote in 2016: 33.4% of eligible citizens did not vote in 2020.
The difference? 10.9%.

Any reasonable person who *actually* follows the news – scratch that, any person who does not follow the news is not *reasonable* – knows Trump is a nutjob who is deluded by his *vainglorious* nature.

I believe that we have to keep crazy and stupid people from the levers of power.
And...man...did we f--- up this time. Assuming that these loons don't destroy our democracy, we need to attract the sporadic voter. And these are not reasonable people: most of them probably don't even follow the news.

I believe that a vibrant opposition is needed: a community of smart and articulate people. Up to this point, we have been a disjointed and bickering lot. I feel that a unifying figure – in the mold of Martin Luther King, Jr. – will have to pull us together. In the contentious age of social media that will be difficult.

This means crafting outreach strategies that appeal to that sporadic voter...that unreasonable person who doesn't follow the news.

But how?

Sheesh...I don't know. I'm a 64-year old guy. I work a s--- job and my past is marred by drugs and alcohol: some doofus who is offering to work for you *for free*.

You're the hoity-toity media guy. What do you think?

You should schedule a Zoom meeting with me. We can toss some ideas around. While we're at it, I can talk about how I can help Ironbound Films *for free*.

Namaste & Shalom

John Eisenhauer

[John's Writing \(johnswriting.org\)](http://johnswriting.org)

[John's Substack](#) | [John Eisenhauer](#) | [Substack](#)

CC:

Seth Kramer
Principal

Graham Wright
Associate Producer

Daniel A. Miller
Principal