

## **Is Violence a characteristic inherent to the Left?**

Yesterday's violence at the Michigan Legislature showed a prime example of predilection of the political left for the use of violence by their supporters.

This violence frequently erupts when democratically elected governments propose or enact legislation that the left disagrees with. The latest case saw an Democrat politician saying "there will be blood". Later that day, the union goons attacked a tent operated by supporters of the Right to Work legislation being passed by the legislature, resulting in injuries and destruction of the tent. One member of the media was physically assaulted by a union goon. Online, there has been a continuous flow of comments by union supporters justifying the assaults and mocking those assaulted. This is the action and commentary fits the model of tactics long used by trade unionists and other left wing political activists. They tend to act violently when they have overwhelming numbers, and then justify their actions as being a necessary part of dialogue. When that is compared to the mass protests made by more conservative organisations, such as anti-abortion groups, gun owners and such, it can be shown that those right wing protests are most notable for their civility and orderliness. Is it an age difference? The unionists tend to be middle-aged, and so to the gun owners and pro-lifers. So it is unlikely that age alone is not causal factor in differing behaviours. What it appears to be is that the right tends to be more civil, open to dialogue and orderly, whereas the leftist response tends to be more immature, close-minded and thus they act out in an uncivil, violent manner. Perhaps it is a difference in the ability to express ideas? The right seems to be able to form cogent ideas and express them in coherent sentences, whereas the left, all too often, seems unable to form a coherent logical train of thought and appears to be frustrated at their inability to communicate and lashes out in a childlike manner in their frustration.

Yesterday, I was reminded of what I had written back in the 1990s on the issue of left wing violence and their use of mob tactics to bully and intimidate.

Back in 1995, I wrote of the violence used by the left through their union goon squads, and social activist organisations to attack political decisions that the left disagreed with and noted that while many of these organisations have a history of opposing the use of force and supporting the various peace movements throughout history, they seem to be the first to engage in violence if they dislike the results of democratic elections and the legislation of governments elected that they oppose.

From 1995, I wrote, Who are the Violent?

*Trade unions...who rail against oppression and the use of force, yet have had a history of using violence and the threat of violence to achieve their goals.*

*Student groups... who are the first to jump on the bandwagon of world peace and oppose the use of force by the police and other groups. They too have had a long record of using force and violence to achieve their goals( dating back to the late sixties.)*

*Anti-poverty groups and social welfare activists, who also have traditionally cried out against violence.*

The protests then were against the conservative government of Mike Harris, Premier of Ontario, who initiated large scale cutbacks in government spending in order to bring some fiscal sanity to the budget, deficit and debt of the province.

At that time, the mainstream media was chock full of stories of impending right wing violence with quotes from various law enforcement agencies and academics pointing to the growing militia movement in the US.

After the unions, both private and public sector, began their reign of violence in Ontario, aided and abetted by anti-poverty groups such as OCAP(Ontario Coalition against Poverty) and various student groups, the mainstream media still was focused on the **possible** dangers of right-wing violence, while bending over backwards to excuse the **reality** of the violent tactics of the left.

I noted then that during the socialist NDP's time in power, that despite the attacks on businesses and the pressure by government on civil liberties, that there was no violence by the right. There were protests, but they were peaceful.

I also note that in 1993, I wrote about the violence at the Summit of Americas conference in Quebec, where thousands took to the streets in what the rioters called "spontaneous" outbreaks of violence. From the article, *A "spontaneous" riot broke out as a mob of bandanna wearing cowards broke down the security fence surrounding the Summit of the Americas. Since it was a "spontaneous" riot, apparently hockey pucks, gas masks and chunks of concrete litter the streets of Quebec, as masks were donned and pucks and concrete were hurled at police.*

That summit was centred on the NAFTA free trade agreements. Some of the spokesmen for the left justified their use of violence by arguing "severe "economic violence" that free trade inflicts on the worker"

One of the chief organising groups at that event was CLAC (the Anti-Capitalist Convergence) and powerful trade unions such as the Canadian Labour Congress and the Canadian Auto Workers. The CLC is provided funding, office space, and other resources to the vandals disrupted the summit. The Canadian Auto Workers said that it had "15

buses filled with activists preparing to go to Quebec City."

An organization called Common Frontiers was described as "one of the organizers" of the People's Summit, the counter to the government's Summit of the Americas. The steering committee for Common Frontiers consisted of representatives from the Canadian Auto Workers, the Canadian Labour Congress, United Steelworkers of America and the Canadian, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada, which counts most of Canada's journalists as members.

Common Frontiers resided in an office building owned by the Ontario Federation of Labour. The building held a variety of union offices, including farmworkers, a hospital union and the Canadian Labour Congress. In fact, Suite 305, Common Frontiers' address, was listed as a CLC office.

Other listed backers of "Common Frontiers" were Oxfam, the Sierra Club and some church groups and student unions.

Interesting quotes taken from the Mainstream media at the time included OCAP leader John Clarke saying, in response to being asked if his definition of political action included violence, said "whatever it takes" as a response.

Maude Barlow of the Council of Canadians, stated that "the breaking of windows, while regrettable, is sometimes necessary to exercise the right of free speech".

A statement that causes the reader to realise that violence and the left are as inseparable as are Catholicism and the trinity.

This past summer, a cross-Canada bus trip was organised by a group of Pro-life advocates in order to hold quiet vigils and street education on abortion. Immediately, the Canadian Auto Workers union funded a group dedicated to protest the advocates, and disrupt their vigils. Not content with waving signs and shouting obscenities at the Pro-Life group, this Union funded protest group resorted to unprovoked physical confrontation.

[See Video here](#)

There are many other examples that could be used to show that, not only does the left use violence, but that they are proud to use it and encouraged to use it with very little criticism from the mainstream media.

The methodology of the left wing activist movement has proven over the years to be *"there will be peace as long as you do as you are told or else we will use violence to enforce our terms"*