

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

Two Resistances: Victor Davis Hanson, *National Review*, Sept. 6, 2017 — The quiet resistance — the one without black masks and clubs — is the more revolutionary force, and it transcends race, class, and gender.

Leftism Is Not Liberalism. Here Are the Differences: Dennis Prager, *Daily Signal*, Sept. 12, 2017— What is the difference between a leftist and a liberal?

Liberals' Addiction to Identity Politics Bad for Parties, *Political Life*: Robert Fulford, *National Post*, Aug. 25, 2017— Since the ignominious failure of the 2016 election, the Democrats have been searching their souls.

Israeli “Occupation”: The BIG LIE: Sally F. Zerker, *CIJR*, Sept. 15, 2017— The time has come to tell the world’s “liars”, boldly and forthrightly, that Israeli “occupation” is the BIG LIE of our age.

[On Topic Links](#)

9/11 Sixteen Years Later: Lessons Put Into Practice?: John Bolton, *Algemeiner*, Sept. 11, 2017

Cultural Approbation: *Weekly Standard*, Sept. 04, 2017

The New Manichaeans: Michael Knox Beran, *National Review*, Aug. 28, 2017

The Coming Terror: Mark Steyn, *Jewish World Review*, Sept. 5, 2017

TWO RESISTANCES

Victor Davis Hanson

[National Review](#), Sept. 6, 2017

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

The quiet resistance — the one without black masks and clubs — is the more revolutionary force, and it transcends race, class, and gender. After the election of Donald Trump, there arose a self-described “Resistance.” It apparently posed as a decentralized network of progressive activist groups dedicated to derailing the newly elected Trump administration.

Democrats and progressives borrowed their brand name from World War II French partisans. In rather psychodramatic fashion, they envisioned their heroic role over the next four years as that of virtual French insurgents — coming down from the Maquis hills, perhaps to waylay Trump’s White House, as if the president were an *SS Obergruppenführer und General der Police* running occupied Paris. *Vanity Fair* and *Rolling Stone* wrote admiringly about the furious Resistance’s pushback against Trump, with extravagant claims that his agenda was already derailed thanks to a zillion grass-roots and modern-day insurgents. Hillary Clinton belatedly announced that she too had joined up with the Resistance (“I’m now back to being an activist citizen and part of the Resistance”), apparently in approbation of both its methods and agendas.

Appropriating the name of heroic World War II fighters to characterize a loosely formed alliance of Trump resisters has since proven a mockery of history — and creepy as well. Powered by Resisters of various sorts have made use of repugnant assassination pornography: a Shakespearean troupe ritually stabbing Trump-Caesar every night, a widely viewed Trump decapitation video, loud boasts by Hollywood’s stars such as Robert De Niro and Johnny Depp of their desires either to beat Trump to a bloody pulp or to do a John Wilkes Booth hit on him, street demonstrations where the likes of multimillionaire exhibitionist Madonna dream out loud off blowing up the White House, while various state legislators, professors, and activists talk of presidential assassination. Is there a new division at the Secret Service whose sole task is solemnly informing the media that it is “investigating” the latest celebrity’s threat?

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

In more mainstream fashion, Democrats in Congress have often stalled Trump’s — appointees, blocked Obamacare reform, and talked of removing Trump through impeachment or the 25th Amendment or the Emoluments Clause. The Resistance has gone from melodramatic charges of Trump’s collusion with the Russians, to amateur diagnoses of his mental incapacity, to fear-mongering about his supposed wild desire for a Strangelovian nuclear war with North Korea, to castigating him for his apparently callous and uncaring reactions to Hurricane Harvey victims.

The Democratic National Committee leaders in their speeches resort to scatology to reflect their furor at Trump’s victory. The media, led by CNN in its visceral hatred of Trump, has given up past pretenses of disinterested reporting. Indeed, a number of journalists have sought to ratify their prejudices by claiming that Trump is so toxic that old-style protocols of fairness can no longer apply. Street brownshirts such as those of Antifa (too rarely and belatedly disowned by a few mainstream Resistance leaders) justify their anti-democratic and anti-constitutional violence on the grounds that Trump is found guilty of being a Nazi — and therefore those alleged to be Nazis have to be resisted by any anti-Nazi means necessary.

In the olden days, demonstrators decked out in black, with masks and clubs, would have been deemed sinister by liberals. Now are they the necessary shock troops whose staged violence brings political dividends? Antifa’s dilemma is that its so-called good people wearing black masks can find almost no bad people in white masks to club, so they smash reporters, the disabled, and onlookers alike for sport — revealing that, at base, they perversely enjoy violence for violence’s sake. As the cowardly Klan taught us in the 1920s and 1960s: Put on a mask with a hundred like others, and even the most craven wimp believes he’s now a psychopathic thug.

For the most part, the Resistance leadership is not the modern version of a group of grass-roots idealistic outsiders living hand-to-mouth between missions in the scrub. Their announced leaders, such as Hillary Clinton, are often the embodiment of the status quo rich, influential, and elite America. The Resistance sees nothing

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

[https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-](https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/)

[resistance/](https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/)

~~incompatible in attacking Trump while working out of a townhouse in Georgetown, living in a Malibu compound, flying in a private jet, making a quarter-million a year as a university-endowed professor or a Southern Poverty Law Center grandee, or being a life-time Washington fixture or corporate CEO.~~

Indeed, anti-Trump activism and privilege may be symbiotic. If one were to look at a county map of the United States calibrated by average income, the Resistance leaders could be identified by their homes clustering in the nation’s most affluent enclaves on the two coasts. They are most certainly not resisting the market capitalism, Washington-establishment politics, and old-boy networking that so empowered them.

Nor is it very brave to loudly announce one’s membership in the Resistance, given that the powerful organs of popular culture and the American status quo — both the Republican and Democratic intellectual establishments, the foundations, universities, Silicon Valley, Hollywood, Wall Street — are, in orthodox fashion, anti-Trump. Which of the following is a smarter career move at Google, at an Aspen Institute colloquium, on the set of Disney, in a CNN newsroom, at a Citibank retreat, in the Yale faculty lounge, on the beach at Martha’s Vineyard, while sunning on David Geffen’s yacht, or talking on a panel at the National Press Club: to admit to voting for Donald Trump, or to proudly proclaim you are a member of the Resistance?... *[To Read the Full Article Click the Following [Link—Ed.\]](#)*

[Contents](#)



LEFTISM IS NOT LIBERALISM. HERE ARE THE DIFFERENCES

Dennis Prager

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

Daily Signal, Sept. 12, 2017

What is the difference between a leftist and a liberal? Answering this question is vital to understanding the crisis facing America and the West today. Yet few seem able to do it. I offer the following as a guide. Here’s the first thing to know: The two have almost nothing in common. On the contrary, liberalism has far more in common with conservatism than it does with leftism. The left has appropriated the word “liberal” so effectively that almost everyone—liberals, leftists, and conservatives—thinks they are synonymous. But they aren’t. Let’s look at some important examples.

Race: This is perhaps the most obvious of the many moral differences between liberalism and leftism. The essence of the liberal position on race was that the color of one’s skin is insignificant. To liberals of a generation ago, only racists believed that race is intrinsically significant. However, to the left, the notion that race is insignificant is itself racist. Thus, the University of California officially regards the statement, “There is only one race, the human race,” as racist. For that reason, liberals were passionately committed to racial integration. Liberals should be sickened by the existence of black dormitories and separate black graduations on university campuses.

Capitalism: Liberals have always been pro-capitalism, recognizing it for what it is: the only economic means of lifting great numbers out of poverty. Liberals did often view government as able to play a bigger role in lifting people out of poverty than conservatives, but they were never opposed to capitalism, and they were never for socialism. Opposition to capitalism and advocacy of socialism are leftist values.

Nationalism: Liberals deeply believed in the nation-state, whether their nation was the United States, Great Britain, or France. The left has always opposed nationalism because leftism is rooted in class solidarity, not national solidarity.

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

resistance/

The left has contempt for nationalism, seeing in it intellectual and moral primitivism at best, and the road to fascism at worst. Liberals always wanted to protect American sovereignty and borders. The notion of open borders would have struck a liberal as just as objectionable as it does a conservative.

It is emblematic of our time that the left-wing writers of Superman comics had Superman announce a few years ago, “I intend to speak before the United Nations tomorrow and inform them that I am renouncing my American citizenship.” When the writers of Superman were liberal, Superman was not only an American but one who fought for “truth, justice, and the American way.” But in his announcement, he explained that motto is “not enough anymore.”

View of America: Liberals venerated America. Watch American films from the 1930s through the 1950s and you will be watching overtly patriotic, America-celebrating films—virtually all produced, directed, and acted in by liberals. Liberals well understand that America is imperfect, but they agree with a liberal icon named Abraham Lincoln that America is “the last best hope of earth.”

To the left, America is essentially a racist, sexist, violent, homophobic, xenophobic, and Islamophobic country. The left around the world loathe America, and it is hard to imagine why the American left would differ in this one way from fellow leftists around the world. Leftists often take offense at having their love of America doubted. But those left-wing descriptions of America are not the only reason to assume that the left has more contempt than love for America. The left’s view of America was encapsulated in then-presidential candidate Barack Obama’s statement in 2008. “We are five days away from fundamentally transforming the United States of America,” he said. Now, if you were to meet a man who said that he wanted to fundamentally transform his wife, or a woman who said that about her husband, would you assume that either loved their spouse? Of course not.

Free speech: The difference between the left and liberals regarding free speech is

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

as dramatic as the difference regarding race. No one was more committed than American liberals to the famous statement, “I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.” Liberals still are. But the left is leading the first nationwide suppression of free speech in American history—from the universities to Google to almost every other institution and place of work. It claims to only oppose hate speech. But protecting the right of person A to say what person B deems objectionable is the entire point of free speech.

Western civilization: Liberals have a deep love of Western civilization. They taught it at virtually every university and celebrated its unique moral, ethical, philosophical, artistic, musical, and literary achievements. No liberal would have joined the leftist Rev. Jesse Jackson in chanting at Stanford University: “Hey, hey. Ho, ho. Western civ has got to go.” The most revered liberal in American history is probably former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who frequently cited the need to protect not just Western civilization but Christian civilization. Yet leftists unanimously denounced President Donald Trump for his speech in Warsaw, Poland, in which he spoke of protecting Western civilization. They argued not only that Western civilization is not superior to any other civilization but also that it is no more than a euphemism for white supremacy.

Judaism and Christianity: Liberals knew and appreciated the Judeo-Christian roots of American civilization. They themselves went to church or synagogue, or at the very least appreciated that most of their fellow Americans did. The contempt that the left has—and has always had—for religion (except for Islam today) is not something with which a liberal would ever have identified. If the left is not defeated, American and Western civilization will not survive. But the left will not be defeated until good liberals understand this and join the fight. Dear liberals: Conservatives are not your enemy. The left is.

[Contents](#)

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>



LIBERALS' ADDICTION TO IDENTITY POLITICS

BAD FOR PARTIES, POLITICAL LIFE

Robert Fulford

[*National Post*](#), Aug. 25, 2017

Since the ignominious failure of the 2016 election, the Democrats have been searching their souls. How could a once-great party have fallen so low? Was it the lacklustre campaign of their presidential candidate, Hillary Clinton? Was it the failure of the Democrats to grasp Donald Trump’s vote-getting power? Was it a complete breakdown of the party’s national machine? Mark Lilla, a widely praised social critic and Columbia professor, believes he has the answer. He delivers it in *The Once and Future Liberal: After Identity Politics* (Harper/Collins), a sharply intelligent and highly persuasive book.

He deals with American politics, but his perceptions also apply to Canada. A large part of our public life is conducted through identity politics. Canadians anxious to better the lives of Indigenous people, for example, increasingly tend to express themselves in issue-specific organizations rather than through political parties. A long-time leftist, Lilla claims that the Democrats have become addicted to pressure groups that slice the public into ethnic, national and sexual elements. These slices have together overwhelmed the Democratic Party itself and rendered it irrelevant. The left has now balkanized the electorate and invested its energies in social movements rather than party politics.

Lilla yearns for the big-tent appeal of the old Democrats. He looks back in history to Roosevelt’s New Deal as a golden age of liberalism. He wants public life to emphasize “what we all share and owe one another as citizens, not what differentiates us.” He calls for an end to movement politics. “We need no more

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

marchers. We need more mayors. And governors, and state legislators, and members of Congress.” He imagines a healthier form of politics that transcends identity attachments. Organizations claiming to speak for repressed Americans are usually given the benefit of the doubt by the public. Lilla isn’t so generous. A few days after the 2016 election he wrote in a *New York Times* article that “Liberals should bear in mind that the first identity movement in American politics was the Ku Klux Klan. Those who play the identity game should be prepared to lose it.”

Born in 1956, Lilla grounds his account of identity politics in what he knows of the 1960s and its effects. From 1965 or so, war and the rise of feminism together left many of the young dissatisfied with conventional politics. To side with the Democrats was to embrace Lyndon Johnson’s Vietnam policy. That was okay for parents, but the furious young needed something different.

In the early stages of revived, second-generation feminism, women with leftist inclinations wanted a more specific approach. In 1970 a slogan arose, “the personal is political.” It raced through women’s discussions and found a permanent place in the rhetoric of feminism. It was a time when women met in groups for “consciousness-raising,” which meant sharing various forms of dissatisfaction with their condition as women. Encouraged to confess or complain, women turned their meetings into variations of therapy groups or prayer meetings. They expressed themselves (as the literature on the subject demonstrates) in purely personal terms. In trying to research the subject, they turned inward, examining their own feelings. A sense of identity took hold, setting the pattern for scores of later movements, fundamentally altering the structure of liberal politics.

As Lilla says, a young woman of today “may come from a comfortable, middle-class background” but “her identity confers on her the status of one of history’s victims.” Now she has claims to make—not claims for the whole of society but claims for her particular slice. Her politics will be based on this self-definition. If she’s in college she may join a women’s organization. Soon her views on women’s issues become non-negotiable. Her teachers, always ready to identify and endorse

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

popular new ideas, become willing mentors....

[To Read the Full Article Click the Following Link—Ed.]

[Contents](#)



ISRAELI “OCCUPATION”: THE BIG LIE

Sally F. Zerker

[CIJR](#), Sept. 15, 2017

The time has come to tell the world’s “liars”, boldly and forthrightly, that Israeli “occupation” is the BIG LIE of our age. We’ve all seen the propaganda effectiveness of “the big lie” many times before, and this one too is working its indecorous distortion of the truth.

The truth is that Jews cannot be occupiers of the Biblical lands, which include present-day Israel, Judea, Samaria, and some of the country of Jordan. The term occupation is meant to signify larceny, theft of others’ property, abuse of the Other, cheating, immorality, and dreadful deeds. Obviously, this is a very offensive concept. But Jews are not, and cannot be guilty of these crimes, for two reasons. One, Jews are the extant aboriginal people of this land, and two, Jews have international legal rights to this territory. These two concepts, historical and legal, require elucidation.

What defines Jewish indigenoussness is the consistency of modern Jews with their ancestors of thousands of years ago. They live in a country with the same name, Israel, as that which existed in 1312 B.C.E. Today’s Israelis speak the same language that was spoken by Jews in that land more than 3000 years ago. We do

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

not need a Rosetta stone to understand ancient Hebrew scripts because the language and letters are the same as current Hebrew. Israelis chant from the same biblical texts that their ancestors did millennia past. Their Jewish law presently is derived from that found in their Talmud which was originally oral and later written down about twenty-five hundred years ago. Their Temple, which was destroyed by invaders twice, can be archaeologically located in their original site in Jerusalem. And Jerusalem which was founded by their biblical King David, still stands as the centre of Jewish sovereignty, as it did when King David ruled the Jews.

In reality, the Jewish people established a distinct civilization in their ancient homeland approximately 3500 years ago, and the roots of that civilization are still much of the source of Jewish life in Israel right now. And, despite a series of conquests and expulsions over the centuries, (Roman, Muslim, Crusaders), Jews retained and rebuilt communities in Jerusalem, Tiberius, Rafah, Gaza, Ashkelon, Jaffa, Caesarea, Safed and elsewhere. Years before the Zionist migrations began in the 1870s, Jews lived continuously over time throughout the land of Israel.

Anthropologist Jose Martinez-Cobo, a Special Rapporteur for the UN who studied the place and condition of indigenous peoples and nations, defined such communities as those that have continuity, with the land, with shared culture in general, such as religion, lifestyle etc., with intrinsic language, with common ancestry, and other relevant factors. By that respected definition of indigenusness, it is irrefutable that Jews are indeed the indigenous people of the land of Israel.

On the other hand, there were no Muslims in existence until almost 2000 years after Jews had already settled in Israel, because Islam was the religion that Mohammed founded. Arabs, who are the ethnic peoples out of the Arabian Peninsula, had not come to the region through their conquests until after Mohammed's death in 632 ACE. It is important to understand that no independent Arab or Palestinian state has ever existed in this region, which came to be called Palaestina, after the Romans so renamed it in the second century. The Romans purpose for this alteration was to break the link of the Jews with their past, after

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

they had crushed the Jewish revolt in ACE 135. Thus, when the Arabs did conquer—and occupy parts of the land, they did so as occupiers of previously settled territories by Jews.

As for more recent Arab settlers, if one looks at the period when Jews began to immigrate to the region in large numbers in 1882, there were fewer than 250,000 Arabs living in the region, and the majority of these had arrived in recent decades. According to many observers and authorities, the vast majority of the Arab population in the early decades of the twentieth century were comparative newcomers, either late immigrants or descendants of persons who had immigrated into the territory in the previous seventy years. BDS supporters, who accept the premise that the Palestinians are indigenous and oppressed by white colonialists have it backward according Barbara Kay, columnist for the *National Post* (Canada). “It is the (non-white) Mizrahi Jews in continuous habitation in Israel from time immemorial who were oppressed under a series of imperial regimes, up to and including the British Mandate.” ...

[To Read the Full Article Click the Following [Link](#)—Ed.]

Dr. Sally F. Zerker is Professor Emerita, York University,

and Academic Co-Chair of CIJR's Toronto Chapter.

CIJR Wishes All Our Friends & Supporters: Shabbat Shalom!

[Contents](#)

On Topic Links

[9/11 Sixteen Years Later: Lessons Put Into Practice?](#) John Bolton, *Algemeiner*, Sept. 11, 2017—Today marks the 16th anniversary of Al Qaeda’s 9/11 attacks. We learned much on that tragic day, at enormous human and material cost. Perilously,

**LEFTISTS—NOT LIBERALS—EMBRACE DIVISIVE IDENTITY
POLITICS, “INTERSECTIONALITY”, AND “RESISTANCE”**

isranet-publications

Isranet Daily Briefing, September 15, 2017

<https://www.isranet.org/daily-briefing/leftists-not-liberals-embrace-divisive-identity-politics-intersectionality-and-resistance/>

however, America has already forgotten many of September 11’s lessons. _____

Cultural Appropriation: *Weekly Standard*, Sept. 04, 2017—The Delta Sigma Phi fraternity chapter at the University of Michigan had what it thought was a delightful theme—antiquity on the Nile—for a party kicking off the school year. They invited guests to come as a “mummy, Cleopatra, or King Tut, it doesn’t matter to us. Get your best ancient Egyptian robe and headdress and be ready to party in the desert.”

The New Manichaeans: Michael Knox Beran, *National Review*, Aug. 28, 2017—In November 2016, Mark Lilla, the humanities scholar, published an essay, “The End of Identity Liberalism,” in the New York Times. “In recent years,” he wrote, “American liberalism has slipped into a kind of moral panic about racial, gender and sexual identity that has distorted liberalism’s message and prevented it from becoming a unifying force capable of governing.”

The Coming Terror: Mark Steyn, *Jewish World Review*, Sept. 5, 2017—Most of the news bulletins I’m exposed to are on the radio, as I’m tootling around hither and yon. So it took me a while to discover that what the media call “peace activists”, “anti-racists” and “anti-Nazis” are, in fact, men and women garbed in black from head to toe, including face masks.