

Mamdani's Manhattan: NYC Edges Toward Islamic Socialism

[American Liberty](#), June 25, 2025

On Tuesday, New York Democrats did the unthinkable: they nominated an Islamic extremist and avowed socialist, Zohran Mamdani, to be the party's candidate for Mayor of the largest city in the United States. If the past 50 years of municipal

elections are any indication, this nomination is effectively a coronation. In a city where Democrats outnumber Republicans six to one, the primary is the real contest, and the general election, a mere formality. Which means, barring divine intervention or electoral rebellion, Zohran Mamdani is about to become the Mayor of New York City.



That fact should alarm every New Yorker who still remembers what the city once stood for: energy, enterprise, liberty. Mamdani represents none of those things. He is not merely to the left of the average Democrat, nor even a slightly more flamboyant flavor of Bernie Sanders. He is a man whose entire political identity is anchored in hostility: hostility to capitalism, hostility to the police, hostility to Israel, and, more broadly, to the Western liberal tradition that built the very city he seeks to govern. His ascent is not a fluke. It is a culmination, of decades of ideological drift, institutional rot, and a political machine that increasingly caters to the most radical voices in its base.

Let us not mince words. Mamdani is a radical in both domestic and foreign policy. As a State Assemblyman, he co-sponsored the “Not On Our Dime” Act, a bill aimed at punishing Jewish charities that support Israel. He refused to condemn the October 7th Hamas terror attacks by name, choosing instead to attack Israel’s countermeasures as “genocide.” He chants “globalize the intifada” at rallies, stands shoulder-to-shoulder with groups that explicitly call for the destruction of the Jewish state, and refuses to affirm Israel’s right to exist as a Jewish homeland. That is not simply controversial. It is morally obscene.

His domestic policies are no less extreme. Mamdani promises publicly run grocery stores, free childcare, and universal rent freezes. These are not programs designed to solve problems but to annihilate markets. They are not about helping New Yorkers but about humiliating capitalism. Under his plan, housing construction would slow, landlords would flee, and grocery store shelves would begin to resemble Havana more than Harlem. He believes in public ownership not as a means but as an end, the same way socialists have always treated the economy: as an experiment in control.

To call Mamdani anti-police would be an understatement. He has flirted with “defund” language, proposed replacing police officers with “violence interrupters,” and opposed

law enforcement intervention during illegal campus occupations. He was arrested during a disruptive protest outside a US Senator's home and actively encouraged other demonstrations that snarled traffic and blocked businesses. When asked whether he would call in the NYPD to dismantle violent or antisemitic protests, Mamdani hemmed and hawed. It is not that he lacks a plan for public safety. It is that he sees the current disorder as preferable to order maintained by the wrong agents of authority.

We should pause to consider what it means that the Democratic Party in New York chose this man, not as a marginal councilmember, not as a bombastic backbencher, but as their standard bearer. The answer is chillingly clear. Mamdani did not win despite his radicalism. He won because of it. The Democratic Party has been captured by its most extreme elements. Its donors may still be clustered in the Hamptons and Tribeca, but its base is now anti-cop, anti-Israel, and anti-market. That shift is not just cultural. It is electoral. It is mathematical. It is the reason Andrew Cuomo, a moderate by today's standards, was elbowed aside in favor of a candidate who proudly allies with Linda Sarsour and Hasan Piker, two figures best known for their vitriol toward Jews and law enforcement.

Even the economic press, typically allergic to partisanship, has sounded the alarm. Politico notes that Mamdani's budgetary plans are laughably disconnected from fiscal reality, with revenue projections that ignore basic arithmetic. The Manhattan Institute describes his public-grocery-store plan as "Venezuelan." The Cato Institute likens his housing policies to a manual on how to destroy supply. And Governor DeSantis, never one to mince words, predicted that Mamdani's victory would accelerate the exodus of New Yorkers to lower-tax, law-and-order states.

The Republican Party, unfortunately, is ill-equipped to stop him. Their nominee, Curtis Sliwa, is a 71-year-old gadfly with a flair for performance and a deep disdain for Donald Trump. A self-described Never Trumper, Sliwa lacks both the voter base and the policy heft to be anything more than a protest vote. That leaves only one man standing in the way of Mamdani's ascendancy: Eric Adams. Recently departed from the Democratic Party and now an independent, Adams may be flawed, but he is no revolutionary. His record is mixed, his rhetoric cautious, but he at least subscribes to the core premises of American governance. Police matter. Markets work. The West is worth defending.

Re-electing Adams is not an ideal outcome. It is a triage decision. New York needs a reckoning, but it first needs to survive. A Mamdani mayoralty would be a cultural and economic catastrophe. The city would become a laboratory for anti-Semitism cloaked in anti-Zionism, for failed Soviet-style economic policies dressed up as urban equity, for public disorder rationalized as community expression. It would turn New York into America's Mecca, not in the spiritual sense, but as a pilgrimage site for every extremist hoping to watch the West implode.

Ranked Choice Voting Could Install An Islamic Extremist In New York City Hall

[American Liberty](#), June 24, 2025

Ranked choice voting is a seductive idea. It promises moderation, civility, and consensus. But as the 2025 New York City mayoral race illustrates with brutal clarity, its actual function is something closer to electoral alchemy, capable of transforming ideological second-raters into frontrunners through procedural sleight of hand. The system does not amplify the popular will. It distorts it. And in this year's Democratic primary, that distortion may elevate Zohran Mamdani, a self-declared democratic socialist with a documented record of antisemitism and lawless activism, into the most powerful municipal office in America, not because he earned the most votes, but because he engineered the smartest alliance.

Let us be blunt. Under a traditional voting system, Mamdani's campaign would be dead on arrival. His record reads like a fever dream of progressive radicalism: anti-Israel agitation, sympathy for and even participation in violent protest, proposals that promise fiscal ruin, and a contemptuous indifference bordering on hate toward the city's largest Jewish population outside Israel. No rational electorate, surveyed in good faith and counted cleanly, would reward such a man with power. But ranked choice voting has created a loophole, one that Mamdani and his ally, Comptroller Brad Lander, are exploiting through a cross-endorsement strategy designed to bypass the democratic majority. It is a scheme with all the procedural legitimacy of a three-card monte table and the same level of respect for the intelligence of the mark.

Here is how it works. In New York's ranked choice system, voters select up to five candidates in order of preference. If no one gets over 50 percent of the vote in the first round, the candidate with the fewest first-choice votes is eliminated, and their votes are redistributed to the next preferences on their ballots. This process continues until a candidate crosses the 50 percent threshold. In practice, it means that a candidate who comes in second, or even third, can win, provided they are strategically ranked by enough voters as a fallback option.

Enter the Mamdani-Lander alliance. Each has urged their supporters to rank the other second. Their hope is not to win on the first round. It is to survive long enough to accumulate second-choice votes as other candidates are eliminated. Former Governor Andrew Cuomo, leading in first-choice support, is the clear frontrunner in a traditional race. But under ranked choice, Mamdani may prevail in later rounds through Lander's redirected support. Cuomo has not cross-endorsed any rivals, which leaves him vulnerable. Should Mamdani come in second to Cuomo but inherit enough of Lander's ballots, he could be declared the winner, despite having fewer first-choice votes.

This is not a hypothetical. It is today's threat. Election Day is here, and the future of the city is being negotiated not in the minds of voters, but in the backroom deals of ideologues. The public may still believe they are choosing a mayor. In truth, they are participating in a kind of probabilistic simulation where preferences are weaponized and clarity dies by a thousand algorithmic cuts.

Now consider the man who may benefit from this procedural deception. Zohran Mamdani is not merely progressive. He is militantly anti-Israel, proudly affiliated with groups that have glorified terrorism, and prone to describing Hamas-inspired chants like "globalize the intifada" as peaceful protest. He has aligned with radicals who describe Jews as "bloodthirsty pig dogs," and he has not repudiated them. He boycotted resolutions recognizing the Holocaust. He led rallies in front of the Israeli Consulate while demonstrators called for intifada revolutions. And he wants to be mayor of the city with the largest Jewish population outside of Israel.