"The recent verdict is predictably causing waves on the pseudo-"Left" with its identity politics. But there is a problem with all the public opinionating, which really has no bearing on the disposition of the legal case.”

“We will never know what happened that night in Florida. There was definitely a physical altercation between the two men. Whether that means self-defense as justification or not is a very specific issue. It is a legal issue, not a common-sense morality issue, whether Zimmerman was guilty of a crime in the purview of the state… it’s also not a political issue.”

“It is not the case that the law in the U.S. today is stacked against people racially. Not really.”

“Was this a case of "racial profiling?" Well, this is a not the same matter for civilians as it is for police. One cannot prosecute someone for having racist opinions. The question is whether racist attitudes is a political issue.”

“What if Zimmerman had been black? Would this have made it any less a crime? For most killing of black people by civilians justified by self-defense is by other black people. And many if not most black people have the same assumptions about young black men as potentially being criminals as anyone else does.”

“This case would only have been potentially political if Zimmerman had not been prosecuted by the state. That would have potentially (but not necessarily!) shown some racial discrimination. But a not guilty verdict doesn't mean this. Especially because the jury was racially mixed. (We've long since passed the time of all-white juries!)”

“What the "Left" can't abide is that we no longer live under Jim Crow. There are no more lynch mobs. At the same time, there are real issues of self-defense -- not "vigilante justice" -- in this case. As I wrote below, most (nearly all) cases of black people deemed legally to have been killed in self-defense are by other black people. So, the idea that Trayvon Martin's killing and George Zimmerman's acquittal means "open season on black youth" is demagogical, to put it politely.”
Aug 18, 2014

“What is remarkable now is that the police haven't killed anyone further in the rioting… If Antisemitism is the socialism of fools and antizionism is the anti-imperialism of fools, then this rioting -- not the protesting! -- is the anti-racism of fools.”

“About Michael Brown's shooting,, it turns out that Brown was shot while police searched an area immediately after the strong-arm robbery of a store in which Brown is suspected. Racial profiling is a different sort of problem if there is a specific lookout for someone in particular. Especially if the person shot is an actual suspect and likely guilty of a crime. This is not to say that Brown deserved to be shot or that the police are excused in their actions, but it does change the political issues involved and the question of the role of the police. I recall that in the wealthy Glen Ellyn suburb of Chicago while I was living in nearby Wheaton, the police shot and killed a naked man in a call to a domestic dispute. He was white. No charges were filed against police. It was not in the national news.”

“We need to see however distorted the expression of deeper and broader discontents and not only or even primarily among blacks in these protests, while recognizing that as mere protests they remain unpolitical.”

Aug 13th, 2014:

“As my brother who is a cop put it, if he needs using his bare fingers to gouge someone’s eyes out to stop them, this is all legal. If might not be according to departmental code, but it is legal. And not only when on paid shift duty, but at all times 24/7 a police officer is deputized by the state to exercise the monopoly of violence. And violence may legally be used to prevent a crime -- any crime, including robbery -- and not only in self-defense. It is only civilians not police who are required to meet the threat of violence with "proportionate force." The bottom line is that any police officer will defend themselves against any bodily harm whatsoever and are
legally sanctioned as well as equipped by the state to do so.”

“But if you need someone to be armed, then that's the police only. Like it is commonly said, everyone hates the police until they need them! …The point is not to be surprised when rioters are shot down on the streets by the police. And for the police to protect themselves while doing so. It’s not pretty, but it’s reality. And it’s legal.”

Dec 6, 2014:

“there is a recipe for a no-win situation here acknowledged by the article -- that police will feel unfairly blamed for doing their (miserable, mean, as well as very dangerous) jobs, while people will feel unjustly targeted for harrassment.”

“The problem is that the attempt to alibi the resulting popular "rage" ends up justifying what will inevitably happen: that people will resist police harassment and get killed (or just beat up) for it. And they will not be prosecuted for any crime in doing so because they will not have committed any crime! …The fact that 6 cops killed Eric Garner on video is precisely what made it impossible to prosecute them for any crime -- they did what they did collectively in full public view. So they knew that they were not committing a crime. No "men rea" hence no crime.”

On “riots”:

“This is precisely the problem, that there is a (entirely false) polarization between peaceful/violent protest in anxiousness to defend the "violence" by pointing to "underlying causes" i.e. "decades of pent-up anger" trumps all political considerations of strategy/tactics. -- As usual, "revolution" is reduced to "violent outburst." But how can *teenagers* have "decades" of anger?! -- Why not just say the usual, that everything wrong in the Americas can be attributed to "500 years of racist sexist patriarchy?"

For as we know the oppressed cannot be expected to act politically rationally with deliberate intention. And that any- and everything the oppressed do is "revolutionary." -- This is what led to cheerleading for the Islamic Revolution in Iran, support for Hezbollah and Hamas, etc., etc., etc. -- all the way back to the vicarious thrill white liberals got from listening to Malcolm X, Stokely Carmichael, Eldridge Cleaver, Amiri Baraka,
et al., and from watching the theatrics of the Black Panthers, etc.

Apolitical.”

— — — — — — — —

Nov 25th, 2014

More on riots:

“Indeed, my family -- my brother's (who's a police officer) wife and my husband -- were more horrified by the riots than by the killing of Michael Brown.

We need to find the "rational kernel" in that.

It consists in the idea that mass/mob violence -- even if only against property but certainly violence against persons -- or how the media describes it "disorder" is indeed worse than occasional abuses of people by police.

It's understood that that police regularly use force including unjustifiably, but that everyday people are expected to be peaceful. Police are terrifying, but ordinary civilians ought not to be.

What people like my sister-in-law and husband are expressing is their desire not to live in fear -- when they hear protesters chanting "no justice, no peace," they can only hear that now they need to fear black people who are rejecting living peaceably with others.”

— — — — — — — —

On Feminism

— — — — — — — ——

Feb 14, 2014

“Another way of putting it is that Feminism is the adaptation to the *defeat* of gender and sexual emancipation -- the defeat of socialism.

Being a Feminist means being an advocate of the defeat of socialism.
Period.”

“Feminism was a symptom of social-historical regression, and it would have been better if it had been avoided.”

====================
On Sexual Assault
====================

Sep 30, 2014

“I will reiterate: If people always had to explicitly say "yes" to sex, even in relationships (as in Stefan's example), then sex would happen far less than it does -- which seems the objective of laws such as these!

College should be a time of risky experimentation, precisely because it an environment whose relative safety allows for dangerous behavior that is relatively benign (for example college sports).”

“There are in practice many times in which regarding sex "no means yes." To fail to recognize this is to not recognize the psychology of not only sex but emotional as well as physical intimacy.

The evil of this is that it short-circuits the very real anti-sex attitude of society: because people are encouraged to say no and stigmatized for saying yes to sex, this will drive the problem further underground: for there will inevitably be occasions in which "yes means no."”

====================
On Scotland Referendum
====================

“I personally didn’t care one way or the other. But the outcome is good, I think. The U.K. doesn't need to be brought down or broken up -- it’s a sidekick to the U.S. That's why it needs to remain as it is…

The U.S. supports the EU as a stabilizing structure of Pax Americana. The
U.K. in the EU helps ensure that. Thus there will be no European defense force but only NATO as a UN-approved regional security force -- that is authorized to intervene globally as far as Afghanistan!

No, Scotland independent would reinforce lame "anti-imperialism" that equates capitalism with the U.S. and U.K. -- and Israel!

Any defeat -- any discouragement -- for the fake "Left" is good: They need to recognize the dustbin to which they've consigned themselves.”

=================================
On Imperialism
=================================

Obama as a bourgeois revolutionary vis-a-vis Syria:

“It is not barbarians at the gates of civilization from which society is threatened but the dynamic force of change in capitalism which the rulers must however reluctantly obey. The U.S. is called to leadership because no one else can or will take political responsibility for the world changed by capitalism. If Obama doesn't want this war, it is because he doesn't want the revolution that he is nonetheless tasked with leading. The "Left" by contrast are not the more willing revolutionaries but rather the counterrevolutionaries.”