Where Have The Liberals Gone?

November 25, 2018

The world has been going through its most severe intellectual crisis; proven bases and platforms like remaining dry surface on a sinking ship are getting consistently smaller and smaller. And the tide –staying with the metaphor- is drifting the ship further and further from the shore line. It had begun around the first part of the '80s; Europe and America –choosing different pathways- started to go down the road taking them further from those fundamentals that resulted in the thriving of both. The transformation of liberalism had begun.

John Locke (1632-1704) is regarded the father of liberalism. In his thesis, the basis of liberalism is the person's natural rights to life, freedom, and personal gain without the interference of the reigning government. The individual person's liberalism equal to the freedom from government's oppression. We can regard the first wave of liberalism from the beginning of the twentieth century; the movement's objectives were the constitutional rights of economic individualism, personal freedom, and freedom of speech; all under a duly elected parliament and government supervision. In this contexts, the "parliament" could be the most important point; parliament is consisted of elected representatives, whom were chosen by the people. This is the very basis of the European Democracy and the American Representative Democracy.

The election of Donald Trump, BREXIT, the advancement of the conservative ideology and movement in Italy, Austria and Brazil; also the demonstrations in France in December, 2018 show: there is something wrong with the Obama, Merkel, Macron, Trudeau, Cameron celebrated Great Liberal Dream. At the same time and in the same countries (plus elsewhere) left wing politicians started to tag the advancement of conservatism as "populism"; in such a pejorative tone that placed populism between a heroin dealer and the child pornography wholesale distributor. While European and American liberal politicians along with these nations' "liberal brain washing facilities" (a.k.a. "national media") completely forgot that according to Britannica, "Populism: political program or movement that champions the <u>common person</u>, usually by favorable contrast with an elite. Populism usually combines elements of the left and the right, opposing large business and financial interests but also frequently being hostile to established socialist and labor parties." Also: "Populism is typically critical of political representation and anything that mediates the relation between the people and their leader or government. In its most democratic form, populism seeks to defend the interest and maximize the power of <u>ordinary citizens</u>, through reform rather than revolution." It is crucial to notice that in both definitions the true representation of the "common person" is paramount.

So then what happened to liberalism? How has "new liberalism" that European and American liberals have worked on so hard between 1980-2016 become the polar opposite of "populism?" Because comparing Locke's views with the definition of Britannica, the two should be nearly identical. Where the difference is coming from? The conflict is immediately solved once we understood: the definition of "liberalism" has not changed; the definition of "populism" has not changed; the "liberals" have gone. Disappeared.

Those who lived through the time between 1945-1989 know, the younger ones –hopefully- were thought somewhere that the diagonal opposite of "capitalism" is "socialism"; at its core, socialism is a system where a government and/or a party dictates everyone what to do, what to say, how far to go, while provides a –low level- security and comfort. The basis of "capitalism" that everyone participates in life and economy based on one's invested efforts and hard work. As Winston Churchill ably quipped: "The inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of blessings; the inherent virtue of socialism is the equal sharing of miseries."

Beside progressives, their media, governments and many "intellectuals" would love to make everyone believe the opposite, if in a system –such as the capitalist- there is no one who dictates to people or groups, then that system by definition is individual-based; and also by definition, the system's degree of freedom is high. While the opposite –the socialist- (also by definition) is based on forced conformism.

There are several question to be raised: should we use John Lock's definition of "liberalism", -then why liberals hate capitalism and populism? If we don't have an answer, here is another one: why liberals over the last decade has positioned themselves against everything John Locke thought? There is only one logical and rational answer; it is because over the last quarter century, the liberal movement has pushed itself so much to the far left, that there is a significant overlapping between them and the far-left socialists. This is why – beginning of the 21st century- they started to re-Christen "liberalism" to "progressivism" (roughly on the same basis how "global warming" had become "climate change").

November 25, 2018

This shift manifested itself differently in Europe and in the US. The difference is equal to the difference between the two systems; to the advantage of Europe. In the US, several legacy nationwide broadcasting stations (CNN, ABC, NBC, MSNBC, etc.), many federal laws and creations have been fertile ground for the – let's call the spade a spade- "progressive socialist" thesis. One of the leading federal creations is Jimmy Carter's Department of Education; the up until then perfectly functioning state based education system (beside destroying the US education quality) quickly became a progressive socialist brainwashing Laundromat "educating" roughly 85 million students today. This is a self-amplifying (in a downward spiral) system; students who graduate from the progressive-socialist education will take their progressive-socialist mindset with them back to academia and to life. Google, Twitter, Facebook, the three largest communication platforms are the best examples how three decade long advancement of progressive-socialism corrupted everything; stacks of recently unearthed documents have proven how far these companies' leaderships, culture, moral and philosophy traveled to the far left.

The progressive-socialists far left positioning cannot be demonstrated better than in the United States of America, the -supposed- center of global capitalism a 77 year old, self-proclaimed socialist (Bernie Sanders), who has been the member of the American socialist movement since 1962, had to be cheated out of his candidacy, otherwise he would have been the presidential candidate of one of the two major political parties in 2016. Once again: in the United States of America, millions cheered and voted for a card-carrying socialist in 2016. Step by step, the progressive-socialist movement in the US has gone so far from the traditional centerleft position of the political spectrum that they have been flirting with Germany's National Socialist Movement style of the 1930s. Occupy Wall Street, Black Lives Matter, Code Pink, Media Matters for America, MoveOn and dozens of other progressive-socialist formations have resulted in the birth of Antifa which has gone as far as beating people up in broad daylight (incl. a case when the person was in a wheelchair) if they wore a Trump hat during the 2016 election. The number of appalling, disgusting examples is practically endless. Emails have been proving how Google changed the search algorithm to disadvantage republican politicians and/or activate groups (Latinos) to vote for democrats; Google has changed search algorithm suppressing conservative organizations when a search criteria was entered; progressive-socialist gangs they broke windows, burned cars, and burned facilities in Berkeley and other universities; in many nationwide department stores (i.e. Macy's) employees were forbidden to greet customers with "Merry Christmas"; Twitter has suspended access for republican senators; Facebook suspends anyone's account for anti-liberal opinion; leading universities disinvite conservative speakers such as Condalisa Rice; Maxine Waters US House Representative from California, a progressive-socialist, openly instigated crowds to harass republican politicians and cabinet members. As a result, people such as Sen. Cruz, McConnell, Secretary Nielsen and many others were harassed by mobs in restaurants and other places while they had dinner with their families and friends; the family of Tucker Carlson a highly respected, middle of the road FOX News program host was harassed while Carlson wasn't even at home; during the Kavanaugh hearings, angry mobs harassed senators inside of the Capitol Building; Sen. Collins, her family and friends received death threats after Sen. Collins voted for Justice Kavanaugh; the "Political Correctness" terminology was born, putting lipstick on the "eliminating freedom of speech" pig: Jason Dominguez a city council member of Santa Barbara, CA said this on the Council's July 31, 2018 meeting: "Unfortunately, common sense is just not common. We have to regulate every aspect of people's lives"; Amazon's system neither allows giving lower than four star rating, nor allows negative comments on Obama's book. I assume all these (and a lot more) have been happening in the name of "freedom of speech in America." Tragically, this trend had exponentially increased during the shameful presidency of one Barack Hussein Obama.

Perhaps the American media has gone through the most significant transformation. While in the 1960s and 70s this media provided "news" (to the degree of they were capable to force President Nixon's resignation), they got into the "providing selective news" business from around the early 1990s (beginning Bill Clinton's Monica Lewinsky case), they have been almost exclusively practicing "news fabricating" since around 2008. It has gone to the point that 97% of all (so called) "liberal" media coverage of President Trump and his government has been negative since January 2017. The obvious result of this "progess" that the only centerright but balanced news organization (FOX) has been enjoying No.1. rating for 26 strait months, while CNN has slid to No.10 (from its leading position in the '90s). CNN slid only to No.10., because they have long time contracts with airports, hospitals and other facilities; those cannot broadcast other channels. Even with this

Where Have The Liberals Gone?

November 25, 2018

advantage, the number of FOX viewers were 2.4 million, while 891,000 viewers were interested in CNN in July, 2018. Yep, something stinks around "liberalism".

Europe was lucky in this regard; Europe is segmented in politics, culture, governmental structure, education, language, and history; all these made it impossible to operate a CNN, ABC, NBC (...) type broadcasting system with numerous progressive-socialist networks bombarding the society. Also, it is impossible for Brussels to create "federal level" changes similar to the US nationalization of its education system during Jimmy Carter. The fact that few people speaks all the three (English, German and French) cardinal languages, in itself prevents a coordinated brainwashing across Europe. This was one of the reasons why "progressivism" has not taken hold as much in Europe as it has in the US. As a result, Europe as a whole has not gone as far to the left as the US has; there are people in Europe still advocating John Locke's liberalism.

At the same time, Europe is wrestling with another kind of danger, that some government leaders call "illiberalism"; by doing so, they are trying to equate illiberalism with conservatism and populism. Illiberalism however cannot be equal to conservatism and populism, because "illiberalism's" main reference is to be "anti-liberal"; the inherent contradiction that conservatism and populism are very close to John Locke's "liberalism, therefore "illiberalism" cannot be equated with "anti-liberalism" therefore cannot be a "form of conservatism and/or populism." Illiberalism is a conveniently created phrase that people can fill with content they like. This is why illiberalism has twice as many interpretations in Europe as number of countries.

One thing however is sure: the John Locke's type "liberalism" is dying if not totally dead in the US and in Europe. The left-center of the political spectrum has been completely, totally vacated by and from liberals. Large segment of them has pushed itself (and pushed each other) to the far left, becoming progressive-socialists; the other side of center-left had become illiberal using the terminology for their own benefits and advancements.

The world's total political spectrum needs liberals. But these ones in the US and in Europe.