

In the world of politics, there is a tendency to claim that "The only reason politicians win is for doing all the things I want them to do - and the only reason politicians lose is for not doing *all* the things I want them to do." One could consider this to be a type of confirmation bias particularly apparent in political analysis. As such, I want to make one thing clear - I am under no illusions that the majority of Americans think in the way that I do. Clearly not, as my preferred policies or candidates of the socialist and progressive types rarely get their time in the sun.

I must admit, on the night of the Democratic primary election for NYC mayor, I felt hope the likes of which I usually can't expect to experience as an activist. I had already prepared myself emotionally for disappointment: told myself that the best case scenario would be for Mamdani to barely get the majority of votes in the later stages of counting. Of course, there was a wildly different turn of events: Zohran Mamdani was leading so much throughout the entire night even as most of the votes were counted, to the extent that the *possibility* of him losing had started to look statistically very slim. So slim, as a matter of fact, that the runner up, sex pest Andrew Cuomo, decided to drop out that very night.

Excuse my language, but let me explain why I, as a writer covering the events, feel not only justified, but compelled by responsibility, to address Mr. Cuomo with the title of "sex pest". This is also one of the reasons I believe Mamdani was able to overtake Cuomo. Not because Cuomo *is* a sex pest, but because Mamdani did not shy away from acknowledging the facts which make him one. There was one moment in particular, during the primary debates, which took the internet by storm. After being asked about his "lack of experience" over and over, and having his name repeatedly mispronounced, Mr. Mamdani finally responded with a little more attitude. To quote the viral audio:

"To Mr. Cuomo, I've never had to resign in disgrace. I have never cut Medicaid. I have never stolen hundreds of millions of dollars from the MTA. I have never hounded the thirteen women who credibly accused me of sexual harassment. I have never sued for their gynecological records. And I have not done those things because I am not you, Mr. Cuomo. And furthermore, the name is Mamdani. M-A-M-D-A-N-I. You should learn how to say it."

The virality shows me, at the very least, that there is an audience for naming sexual predators and corrupt individuals. This should hardly be surprising, as there have been entire niches created, in different corners of the internet, around the content of people "getting what they deserve." Some examples include popular subreddits such as r/Justiceserved and r/JusticePorn (which for clarification, has no actual porn) while other platforms have less defined "spaces" created mainly by the algorithm. I have no intention of praising or crediting the communities themselves for effective

political change due to their tendency to focus on pettiness and excessive punishment towards even minor inconveniences, especially the deeper one goes down the rabbit hole. However, the popularity of the content even among regular internet users reveals that there is a general distaste towards people like Cuomo.

In the current political climate of the right's persistent accusations of pedophilia against the LGBT community and LGBT individuals, why are we seeing less vocal support than ever for our community? Meanwhile, the long-term associate and (as quoted by Trump) "good friend" of Epstein sits in the White House, so why aren't more alarms being rung by the Democratic opposition? Why not throw back some (actually credible) accusations towards a man who has been convicted of sexual harassment and notably accused by multiple women?

The Republicans who defend predators like Trump and oppose the release of the Epstein files are right about one thing: the Democrats have predators, too. And they're protecting them like one would protect some disgraced member of the royal family in Ancient China - parading around the old men who are nearly decomposed for what? Honor? Loyalty? Bullshit.

In 1994, former president Bill Clinton, and another good friend of Epstein, was accused by Monica Lewinsky of gross abuse of power. Of course, she wasn't the only one. There have been at least four notable sexual harassment accusations about Bill Clinton, lest we forget. It's hard to imagine now, but it was such a huge scandal that anyone would have expected the Clinton name to have been permanently disgraced from the Democratic party. Fast forward to 2016, his wife Hillary Clinton, who stayed with him throughout the entire scandal and for decades after, is the Democratic candidate for president. Fast forward to 2024, the same Bill Clinton is visiting Western Pennsylvania to campaign for Harris.

Barbara Bush, daughter of George W. Bush, who dragged the United States into the near-unanimously unpopular Iraq war, is also invited to the Harris campaign! How nice!

"They go low, we go high."

Perhaps one of the most iconic lines to come from the Obama Presidency, said by Michelle Obama, truly captures the spirit of the party: compliance. In February of 2016, former Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia passed away, leaving an open seat for the President to fill. Of course, this seat would remain open until the start of Trump's first presidency nearly a year later, handing him the opportunity to appoint Neil Gorsuch. Former president Obama nominated several different individuals for the seat before the end of his term, at which point the Senate is *supposed* to hold a vote to approve or disapprove of the decision. The (at the time Majority Republican) Senate simply

refused to vote on it - it was clear that it didn't matter who the candidate was. They didn't want Obama to get a pick. *They were refusing to do their jobs.* There have been arguments made that when one branch of the government simply refuses to do their jobs, the President may be allowed, constitutionally speaking, to override them. Of course, the former president didn't want to override them. The Obamas got to "go high" and keep their moral victory. Now what?

Is it "going high" when women lose their constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy? Is it "going high" when families are torn apart because of a lack of legal protections for immigrants? Is it "going high" when the stakes are people's lives? Is it "going high" when you refuse to condemn sex criminals? Or better yet, when you condemn sex pest Cuomo for being disgraced but then turn around in just a few years and support him in his campaign against an *actual* candidate like Mamdani, is that going high? Is that professionalism?

Of course not. It was never about going high or being better than the opposition. They don't see themselves as the opposition. The Democratic party is still stuck in a time when they could be on the same team as their predator Republican friends - when they could be a part of the club. They were kicked out a long time ago and they're still pretending because standing with the people was never an option. That's why they still treat people like Mamdani as outsiders.

Mamdani is undeniably a good candidate. He speaks with charisma and fire in his words. His policies are realistic and almost revolutionary at the same time. When he pushes for something as mayor, it will be felt in the daily lives of New Yorkers. Don't let it distract you, however, from the reality that we could've had this the entire time.

Mamdani is winning in spite of the Democratic establishment. He is a sign that the old ways have to go. No more treating politics like a social club where everyone in government is invited. It's time to get serious about the lives of our constituents - because they're not as stupid as their party seems to treat them - they can tell the difference between a politician who is "part of the club" and a politician who actually wants to do their job. That's why he will win.