

INTERSECTIONALITY

Progressive activists and their acolytes are bitter and suspicious, always urging people to be wary they're not getting cheated and to ensure they haven't accidentally offended someone and lost their good standing. How can this be healthy? How is it consistent with the American dream? How can it promote prosperity? When you're consumed with paranoia and resentment instead of focusing on bettering yourself, you'll never get past the starting block. It's hard to be constructive when you're always angry. Obsessive victimhood stifles personal growth, and those who foist it on others for political gain or in a personal quest for significance do great harm.

Encouraging people to think of themselves solely as members of identity groups instead of unique human beings promotes the soft bigotry of low expectations and perpetuates the very racism and other "isms" that the left purports to condemn. Today the left exhorts people to dwell on their own race, gender, and sexual orientation along with their group's alleged historical and current oppression. The oppressed are empowered by their identities, and whites, men, and heterosexuals are deemed incapable of understanding their experiences and must be silent and listen. Historically, most studies of identity groups focused on a single topic, such as race, gender, class, disability, or sexual orientation. But the current trend among leftist scholars is to examine how people are marginalized and endure multiple oppressions based on their multiple identities.¹ This concept of "intersectionality," like many of the left's absurd social theories, began in academia. It establishes hierarchies of victimhood based on combinations of the victims' disadvantages—race, gender, sexual orientation, class, and others. It is a matrix to determine where one fits on the hierarchy of victimhood and privilege. Women, for example, are subject to patriarchal oppression; black women are also subject to racial discrimination, and black lesbian women are victims of heterosexual oppression as well.

The more disadvantaged identities you have, the more protection you are afforded. Legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw coined the term "intersectionality" in a 1989 paper examining how black women are marginalized by both anti-racist and feminist advocacy because their concerns transcend the individual groups.² Intersectionality seeks to form social justice coalitions between different identity groups who can unite to resist discrimination.³ As both black men and white women are more privileged than black women, Crenshaw declares, the person who is both female and black has multiple burdens and is marginalized in both feminist theory and anti-racist politics. "Because the intersectional experience is greater than the sum of racism and sexism, any analysis that does not take intersectionality into account cannot sufficiently address the particular manner in which Black women are subordinated," she writes, arrogantly dismissing the relevance of any sort of analysis but her own. Or, as writer Jennifer Kim puts it, "If I'm a black woman, I have some disadvantages because I'm a woman and some disadvantages because I'm black. But I also have some disadvantages specifically because I'm [a] black woman, which neither black men nor white women have to deal with. That's intersectionality; race, gender, and every other way to be disadvantaged interact with each other."

Intersectionality, then, focuses on different types of oppression and how they overlap and are exacerbated if working in combination. Kim says it's important for people to understand this in a time when more companies are paying attention to diversity and inclusion but tend to focus on the specific disadvantages of women or minorities instead of the impact of multiple disadvantages. People are encouraged to advocate for various causes—women's rights, gay rights, racial equity, disability rights, immigration, and more, but they must always do it through the "lens of intersectionality." All oppressed minority factions must see themselves as allies on intersectional issues, which will lead to self-empowerment for all these respective groups. **WOMEN WITHOUT VAGINAS** Crenshaw's concept of intersectionality was embraced on college campuses and weaponized for political effect.

In her book *Introducing Intersectionality*, Mary Romero explains that intersectionality is focused on social inequality. It "provides analytical tools for framing social justice issues in such a way as to expose how social exclusion or privilege occurs differently in various social positions, and it does this by focusing on the interaction of multiple systems of oppression."⁵ "Class alone does not explain all aspects of poverty or housing segregation," writes Romero. "Gender alone cannot account for wage disparities and occupation segregation. Race by itself does not provide a complete understanding of health disparities or college retention rates. Intersectionality, as an intellectual project, delves deeper into the nuances of social equality by pushing researchers to analyze the various manifestations of inequality." Additional "power systems" and their impact on social identity and economic status must also be examined. These power systems include sexuality, ableism, ethnicity, citizenship, and age. The study of intersectionality is mainly in the field of sociology.

One of its political benefits is that the topic is so broad it can be applied to many different situations. For example, Romero uses intersectionality to examine parenting and childhood, social inequality, life experiences on campus, and other issues.⁶ In practice, intersectionality tends to devolve into a hectoring set of rules that must be strictly followed when applied to political issues or when even talking about them. For example, in another piece by Kim, she identifies mistakes people should avoid while celebrating Women's History Month or when discussing women's issues. The first mistake is knowing just part of the history—it's great to know that women got the right to vote in 1920 with passage of the Nineteenth Amendment, but of course you must recognize that female racial minorities got their voting rights much later. Second, it's unacceptable to discuss women's issues without acknowledging the effect of race, ethnicity, ability/disability, national origin, sexual orientation, religion, class, etc.... And third, you must not exclude transgender women and gender nonconforming people when discussing women's issues. That means you must avoid language that is "cisgendered," which is a term the left manufactured to denote the 99 percent of the population that identifies as the sex they were born. Naturally, instructs Kim, we must retire the "pussy hats" popular at women's marches, which exclude transgender people. After all, not all "women" have vaginas.

A DOWNGRADE FOR FEMINISM

Amusingly, intersectionality has created huge problems for progressives, as aggrieved groups jealously compete for the top rung of the victim hierarchy. This has created particular challenges for feminists. Consider Patricia Arquette, who proclaimed during her acceptance speech for the 2015 Academy Award for Best Supporting Actress, “To every woman who gave birth, to every taxpayer and citizen of this nation, we have fought for everybody else’s equal rights. It’s our time to have wage equality once and for all and equal rights for women in the United States of America.” That may sound like boilerplate feminism, but leftists furiously pounced on Arquette for failing to invoke racial minorities—that is, for callously treating women as one homogenous group without acknowledging the hierarchy of disadvantages.⁸ In a piece titled, “Patricia Arquette’s Spectacular Intersectionality Fail,” Andrea Grimes denounced Arquette’s sins against intersectionality.

Grimes says she initially thought Arquette’s statement was “a nice thing to say,” but something about it “didn’t sit right.” On further reflection, she concluded that “Arquette thoroughly erases gay women and women of color and all intersecting iterations of those identities by creating these independent identity groups as if they do not overlap—as if, ahem, ‘all the women are white, all the blacks are men.’” But that wasn’t Arquette’s worst sin, says Grimes. She demanded “that ‘gay people’ and ‘people of color’ fight for ‘us,’ a group that Arquette has specifically identified as non-gay and not of color—as very specifically straight and white and ‘woman.’”⁹ Horrors! Grimes remarks that while white women experience stark wage disparities, the gap between the earnings of white women and white men is smaller than for any other group—except Asian-Americans. “That means white women as a whole do better in terms of wage equality than almost any other group. Got it?”

Grimes ends by admonishing feminists not to protest against intersectionality as being too divisive, which is a favorite ploy of those who pretend that “doors don’t close behind straight white women after they’ve walked through them.” In other words, straight white women have made strides in overcoming discrimination, and they must assist other disadvantaged groups in overcoming oppression. Making people hyperconscious of their various “identities” inevitably stirs resentment among groups and encourages people to keep score along identity lines, rather than to view other people as individuals and unique human beings. Indeed, intersectionality has created a host of troubling contradictions, especially for traditional feminists. In fact, the current leftist notion of gender ideology largely abolishes the entire concept of gender, recognizing only negligible differences between the sexes and insisting that gender is not biologically determined but is a matter of personal identification. If you’re a man who really feels you’re a woman, then as far as the left is concerned, you are a woman, and all of society must recognize that fact. This leaves no basis for women’s pride or women’s rights, since there is no objective criterion anymore for defining what a woman is.

This problem is starkly illustrated in the growing phenomenon of transgender athletes who are biologically male competing in women’s sports. When traditional feminists

protest the unfairness of biological women having to compete against biological men, they are denounced by the left for disrespecting the transgender experience. Fortunately conservatives reject intersectionality, so we don't have to exhaust ourselves worrying that our every utterance or action may infuriate the Intersectionality Police. But this is a real problem for traditional feminists. This tension is reflected in a Washington Post column by Christine Emba, in which she acknowledges that the feminist movement has delivered gains but questions whether it is for all women or just those in the middle class. She notes that feminism's intersectionality critics use social media hashtags such as #SolidarityIsForWhiteWomen to shame feminists who seek the advancement of only one, relatively privileged group—middle-class white women. Emba cites the Arquette dustup as an example of mainstream feminism's heresy of being insufficiently inclusive.

OUT OF ONE, MANY

Emba observes that despite the rise of intersectionality, some argue that it reinforces identity politics, which she claims the progressive movement was supposed to break down. She also writes that it's leading to infighting within the feminist movement and "encouraging 'privilege-checking' as a form of bullying and silencing." Others contend that intersectionality is spawning academic studies but isn't producing fruit in real life—in law, policy, or day-to-day action.¹⁰ Whether the progressive movement ever meant to reject identity politics as Emba claims, today identity politics permeates the left's advocacy of almost every policy issue. Race, gender, sexual orientation, and class are the left's driving obsessions. But it's undeniable that intersectionality is causing infighting and "privilege checking." How can constant intramural competition among aggrieved activists not be divisive? Will this friction not impact various causes? Take slavery reparations. If we're going to make reparation payments to all black Americans, wouldn't it be insensitive not to provide greater compensation for black women, the victims of double oppression? Beyond that, why limit reparations to blacks? Yes, slavery was uniquely horrendous, but intersectionality emphasizes that all women (and men, except for white men, unless they're gay or transgender men) have been oppressed in American society. So why not just cut through all the noise and demand that straight, white men write checks to all non-white groups in varying amounts, as determined by the social justice gods? Here's another recent example of the absurd contradictions created by intersectionality: the cancellation of the Eureka Women's March in Humboldt County, California, scheduled for January 19, 2019. The organizers released a statement explaining they scrapped the event because "[u]p to this point, the participants have been overwhelmingly white, lacking representation from several perspectives in our community."¹¹ This would be funny if it weren't so pathetic and destructive. It shows the deep-rooted distrust among these groups—that the fight against oppression and discrimination cannot be advanced by sympathetic surrogates alone. A diversity-identity purity test must be imposed. Unless there is proportional representation among the participants from all identity groups, the cause is compromised. For intersectionality's true believers, it's not just a matter of sufficient diversity among the body of protesters. It's that the causes of oppression of one identity group cannot be properly understood by others, so all must be directly involved or their grievances cannot be adequately presented. In this sense, intersectionality is self-defeating. It claims to champion

inclusiveness but fosters rank exclusiveness by encouraging groups to regard their own experiences as unique and incomprehensible by other groups. It's like saying, "We demand you acknowledge society's sins against us, but don't think you will ever understand what we've been through. We demand your help, but you're incapable of helping us, so just shut up and listen." This impulse is increasingly seen in the ridiculous, growing tendency of leftists to denounce Hollywood actors for playing minority characters if they don't belong to that minority group in real life. Thus, an amputee criticized actor Dwayne Johnson, a.k.a. "The Rock," for portraying an amputee in the movie *Skyscraper* because amputees should be "given the agency to tell our own stories."¹² How can there ever be closure when true believers are manifestly unforgiving—when they regard historical wrongs as irremediable? How can reconciliation occur when intersectionality encourages various groups to regard one another with suspicion, jealousy, and rivalry? The groveling statement by the organizers of the Eureka Women's March reinforces this mind-set, as they apologize for the event's unforgivable whiteness: Our intention with this march is to affect real social change by raising the voices of all women within our community. We recognize the majority of our current leadership team is white, and planning for this event has been centered around our experiences. In recognizing our failure to put enough effort into being more inclusive, we are attempting to make things right by taking this time to create a more balanced leadership team. Our goal moving forward is to ensure the voices of women of color are heard and centered when we come together for the furtherance of the rights and protection of women. Throughout history, women of color have been proven over and over again to be some of the most vulnerable populations. From the suffering of enslaved Black women in early gynecological experiments, to the current epidemic of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women across the nation and beyond. Having their voices go unheard can be a matter of life and death, and it is imperative that a safe community is created for everyone.¹³ Note that these mostly white organizers sheepishly acknowledge they can't possibly understand the experiences of minority women and can't adequately promote their cause without ample participation by non-whites. Are we expected to believe they truly feel remorse for having organized what they obviously believed was an empowering event? Or are they merely genuflecting to the gods of intersectionality to avoid race-bullying? This is not normal thinking. It's as if they've been reeducated into a real-life 1984-style groupthink in which dissent is forbidden. Imagine the level of anxiety in that environment—knowing that at any second you might utter the wrong words and be shunned or banished. Thus, another contradiction of this philosophy is exposed—it uses oppression to try to rectify oppression. This glaring contradiction is also evident in the rabid anti-Semitism of some leaders of the Women's March, a feminist group created to protest the election of President Trump. Intersectionality holds itself out as a champion of all oppressed groups, and who could dispute that Jews have been among the most oppressed people in history? But as they are regarded as members and beneficiaries of the white race, their persecution doesn't count as much as that of other minorities. "On the extreme left, Jews are seen as part of a white-majority establishment that seeks to dominate people of color," writes Emma Green in *The Atlantic*.¹⁴ They are seen as heirs of "white supremacy," which mitigates any suffering they've endured.¹⁵ This is surely what Women's March co-organizer Tamika Mallory had in mind when she reportedly instructed her Jewish colleague Vanessa Wruble that "Jews needed to confront their own

role in racism.” Wruble believes she was pushed out of the organization partially because of her Jewish ancestry. Though the Women’s March and another co-organizer with a history of anti-Semitic statements, Linda Sarsour, eventually issued separate statements condemning anti-Semitism, their declarations don’t square with their association with notorious anti-Semite Louis Farrakhan—Mallory called him the GOAT (greatest of all time) and was notably reluctant to distance herself from him during an appearance on *The View*.¹⁶ Anti-Semitism among Women’s March leaders eventually became so acute that Women’s March founder Teresa Shook called for four leaders, including Mallory and Sarsour, to leave the organization, while other members launched a petition with a similar goal.¹⁷ Progressive activism, being rooted in negativity, suspicion, jealousy, and rage, invariably leads advocacy groups to turn on one another. Intersectional ideology demands that everyone constantly keep score and flay himself over past discrimination and its lingering effects on present generations. Assuming nearly every group is being treated unfairly, it engenders perpetual anxiety over who’s being treated more unfairly, instead of encouraging people to focus on the uplifting aspects of life. Regardless of inequalities among various identity groups, is it healthy for people to endlessly navel gaze, dwelling on their own plight? Will grievance merchants ever be satisfied with progress they’ve made? The Civil War, Reconstruction, constitutional amendments, and civil rights legislation were obviously not enough on slavery. But what about the lasting damage caused by salting this wound in perpetuity? Even if you could eradicate all human prejudice and bigotry, what would be next? Would the next generation of malcontent activists demand equal outcomes in every aspect of life to compensate for the different talents and abilities individuals have? If group identity politics could ever reach its logical conclusion, would activists next switch to disparities among individuals? Progressives essentially reject the notion that every human being is made in God’s image and therefore entitled to equal dignity, rights, and protection of the laws. For them, equal opportunity is an unachievable myth, so central planners and social justice warriors must continually interfere in society to “level the playing field.” “WHITE MEN AREN’T PART OF THE PROBLEM; THEY ARE THE PROBLEM” Leftists believe they serve a higher moral cause and owe no one an explanation. Once they’ve undertaken a new mission, sundry activists rush to glom on it like flies on dung. In the Star Wars bar scene of the Democratic presidential primary field, former candidate Kirsten Gillibrand showed just how quickly and uncritically Democratic leaders attach themselves to the latest cause to ingratiate themselves to their rabid base. On December 4, 2018, Gillibrand tweeted, “The Future is Female... Intersectional... Powered in our belief in one another... And we’re just getting started.” Unwittingly, she committed the cardinal sin of championing old-school feminism (the notion of a “female future” was apparently a rallying cry of lesbian separatists in the 1970s) and intersectionality at the same time.¹⁸ She obviously had no clue what intersectionality is but figured she would mouth the popular leftist slogans to boost her campaign. Unsurprisingly, she received a firestorm of criticism in response. Gillibrand tried to walk it back in an interview with CNN’s Van Jones, saying her intended message was, “Please include the ladies in the future, because they’re not really included today.” Once again, this sentiment, and even her original tweet, may strike conservatives as commonplace left-wing sloganeering. But thanks to intersectionality, yesterday’s cliché is today’s heresy. In a biting piece denouncing Gillibrand in *The Atlantic*, Caitlin Flanagan proclaimed, “[A]s something that a middle-

aged, hyper-successful white woman such as Gillibrand can play around with, [intersectionality is] a hand grenade that's going to explode in her mittens." For example, says Flanagan, when Gillibrand told Jones, "It's worrying that the top three presidential front-runners are white men," she assumed she could leverage just one piece of intersectional theory to wedge her way to the top of the pack. "She's used to feminism being a jet pack that she can fire up any time she needs a boost. Not this time." Gillibrand clearly didn't understand that white women are a bit of a problem for intersectionalists because they may be oppressed as women, but they're still white, which means they're part oppressor, or at least a partial beneficiary of oppression. Flanagan cites Brittney Cooper, an African American professor and author of *Eloquent Rage*, who argues that intersectionality allows people to confront white women on their notion of feminism if they are using it to have access to the power that white men have. That is not what the fight is about. "White women don't want to change the fundamental paradigm of race and gender in this country," argues Cooper; "they want to exploit it so that they can gain access to the power that white men have." Concerning Gillibrand's worries over white men's dominance in the Democratic Party, Flanagan writes, "If there's anything intersectional feminism has no time for, it's white men—which must have seemed politically useful to her in the moment. According to the intersectional framework, white men aren't part of the problem—they are the problem." The fanatical intolerance of intersectionality can be seen in the bitterness Flanagan expresses toward Gillibrand—and toward men in general. In her view, Gillibrand can't possibly understand intersectional feminism when she admits to having deferred to her husband and sons as to whether she would ultimately run for president. In the end, Gillibrand's transgression was apparently unforgivable to Flanagan, who suggested she refrain from running altogether and support a "deeply accomplished potential candidate who really would help make the future intersectional: Kamala Harris."¹⁹ As for white men, they play the role of arch-villain in the intersectionality drama. As Flanagan remarked, they are "the problem." Many leftists will go much further in describing the threat they pose. In an August 2019 CNN appearance, left-wing commentator Angela Rye became offended when Republican strategist Patrick Griffin observed that Reps. Ilhan Omar and Rshida Tlaib were hijacking the Democratic Party from Nancy Pelosi. After berating Griffin for using the word "hijack" in connection with two Muslims, Rye proclaimed, "[T]he greatest terrorist threat in this country is white men, white men who think like you."²⁰ "ANOTHER UNPASSABLE PURITY TEST" Intersectionality, then, requires that only the most identity-disadvantaged can lead the cause. White women, no matter how much they profess their faith in the concept, are disqualified on racial grounds. It is profoundly divisive and alienating to restrict the leadership of a cause to those directly affected by it. Such thinking would have disqualified William Wilberforce and Abraham Lincoln from their abolition advocacy. It violates the biblical principle that we should all serve one another. Ultimately, this paranoid philosophy might hoist itself on its own petard. CNN's Don Lemon questioned whether Flanagan's favorite presidential candidate, Kamala Harris, is black enough, as Harris descends from an Indian mother and Jamaican father. In an interview with White House correspondent April Ryan, who asked why the "blackness" of mixed-race candidates is relevant, Lemon said it wasn't about being black but whether she was an African-American black—a descendant of slaves. When Ryan noted that some slaves from Africa were taken to the Caribbean, Lemon responded,

“Jamaica’s not America. Jamaica did not come out of Jim Crow.”²¹ African-American columnist Renee Graham comments on the absurdity of debating who is black enough. “There is no monolithic way to be black,” writes Graham. “Such attacks on Harris are idiotic when there are real and serious policy issues to be discussed... It’s yet another unpassable purity test, not unlike the so-called birthers who sought to undermine Obama’s citizenship.”²² Another columnist, Morgan Jenkins, questions Harris’s bona fides from another perspective. Jenkins believes Harris was strong on many issues but had a poor record on criminal justice reform. This causes Jenkins to agonize whether she could possibly be justified in withholding support from a female black candidate. “No candidate is perfect, and the idea that I might not support a black woman who is qualified for the job is excruciating,” writes Jenkins. “My life’s work is centered on black women and their stories, no matter how complicated those narratives might be. Was my hesitation premature and unfair? But the alternative is almost as painful—giving someone who looks like me a pass on actions that have hurt our communities. I want a black female president. But I want an end to mass incarceration for all black women, for all black families, even more. Who can deliver that? Could it be Harris? Maybe, but I need her to make that case.”²³ Democratic presidential candidate Tulsi Gabbard picked up on this theme, brutally attacking Harris’s criminal justice record during one of the presidential debates, prompting columnist Jeff Yang to ask, “Why did a key focal point of a two-hour-long, 10-person debate end up being a confrontation between the only two women of color, despite frontrunner Joe Biden standing at center stage, and a cackling Trump watching the sparks fly from the White House?”²⁴ Fundamentally, intersectionality is intellectually dishonest. The ideology purports to be based on one’s identity alone—race, gender, class. So shouldn’t intersectionality proponents defend Justice Clarence Thomas when he’s attacked by white liberal men? Shouldn’t everyone be outraged at the abuse heaped on Condoleezza Rice including racist caricatures of her? Shouldn’t the opinions of black conservative Thomas Sowell carry more weight than those of white liberal Paul Krugman? Intersectionality peddlers, like other leftists, want it both ways. If they were consistent, they wouldn’t treat black conservatives—men and women—white conservative women, and gay Republicans so contemptuously. Virginia Democrats displayed their hypocrisy as the clashing hierarchies of privilege illustrated that intersectionality is only useful when it serves progressive and Democratic Party causes; otherwise it must yield. In early 2019, wearing blackface became one of the deadly sins. A photo emerged from a yearbook page of Virginia Democratic governor Ralph Northam, depicting someone in blackface standing next to someone in a Ku Klux Klan outfit. Northam offered nonsensical, conflicting explanations, but it was widely understood he was one of the two men. Meanwhile, Virginia attorney general Mark R. Herring admitted to having worn blackface as a young man. Around the same time two black women accused the state’s Democratic lieutenant governor, Justin Fairfax, of sexual assault. Most Virginia Democratic leaders and legislators called on Fairfax, an African American, to resign, even though the two white Democrats were resolutely remaining in office. But how could Democrats impeach Fairfax while the white male race-sinners refused to resign? President Trump succinctly summarized the dilemma. “African Americans are very angry at the double standard on full display in Virginia,” he tweeted. The New York Times was also exercised over this potential insult to intersectionality. Don’t whites have to defer to blacks? Which is worse, sexual assault or

racism? Doesn't intersectionality require that female allegations trump male denials? Or must these celebrated causes yield to crass calculations of political power? What should the Democratic Party—the self-proclaimed guardian of all disadvantaged groups—do in the face of these competing interests? How do you mollify the women's movement without alienating blacks, and vice versa? Former DNC chairwoman Donna Brazile expressed the Democrats' quandary well, observing, "There's no playbook for this."²⁵ Fairfax defied the new rules of intersectionality, opting instead to fall back on the old norms of race alone. "As a matter of general principle, no one should challenge the fact that African American women have been marginalized regarding sexual assault claims," said Fairfax. "Nor should anyone challenge the fact that African American men have been the targets of false allegations of sexual assault, whoever the accuser. We need a justice system that treats both accusers and the accused fairly and affords both due process."²⁶ He had a point, though his appeal to fairness, justice, and due process wasn't in line with intersectionality's hierarchical rules. And we certainly didn't hear any Democrats arguing for due process and the presumption of innocence when Judge Brett Kavanaugh was falsely accused of sexual assault. "YOU DON'T MAKE PROGRESS ON HALF THE RACE" One convenient aspect of intersectionality is that it can shield victimizers as victims and serve as a perverse type of identity immunity. This is exactly what happened when Representative Ilhan Omar faced allegations of anti-Semitism. As minorities like Omar are among the historically oppressed, they have free rein to dump on historically oppressed whites, to wit: Jews. When Omar was under siege, fellow leftist Linda Sarsour defended her, saying she was "triggered by the constant defensive posture women of color leaders find themselves in... We are put to higher standards than everyone else." People, said Sarsour, "want to destroy us and liberals always play into it... liberals talk about smashing the patriarchy and standing with people of color and often times are the first people to throw women of color leaders under the bus to show how self-righteous they are and to appease angry white men... this is upholding white supremacy."²⁷ If you reject meritocracy, why not reject accountability as well? It's all part of the same logic. Identity trumps behavior. Omar can't be culpable because of her disadvantaged identity. Sarsour's Women's March colleague Tamika Mallory made similar arguments, attempting to turn the tables on Omar's oppressor-accusers. Mallory tweeted that "women of color are held to unreachable standards and scrutinized in a way no one else is." She added that "we are also not given benefit of the doubt. Just based on who we are, people assume ill will. This is NOT okay. There's racism at play."²⁸ So people are NOT allowed to call out Omar's racist statements lest they be accused of racism themselves. Similarly, when Representative Rashida Tlaib came under fire for a column she had written in 2006 for Farrakhan's anti-Semitic Nation of Islam, she invoked her identity as a woman of color to portray herself as a victim rather than a victimizer. Tlaib tweeted, "The hardest part of serving in Congress as a WOC [woman of color] & as a 'first' is how people hear you differently. No matter how much we take on the hate & stay true to who we are through our experiences, our voices are shushed and reduced. We aren't perfect, but neither is this institution."²⁹ Yes, when someone calls you out for your racism, they must be trying to shut you up because of their own racism.

THE SINS OF THE FATHER The left also uses intersectionality as a lens for examining religious discrimination. Since the American left sees Muslims as non-white and

victimized, it overlooks gross violations of civil rights in Muslim countries. Intersectionality is not as forgiving of Christians, who are perceived to represent the top spot on the religious privilege hierarchy. Despite rampant persecution against them, Christians are not seen as victims. Open Doors USA reports that 215 million Christians—about 1 in 12 Christians worldwide—experience high levels of persecution by communist, Islamic, or other nationalist-religious regimes.³⁰ Yet most of these incidents receive little media attention, much less political condemnation.³¹ Like affirmative action, intersectionality is self-contradictory because it applies racist, sexist, and class solutions to address supposed problems rooted in racism, sexism, and classism. It's one thing to be conscious of wrongs perpetrated against particular groups in history, but it's another to demonize descendants of the identity groups believed responsible for such wrongs based solely on their identities. In effect you are discriminating against people based on their identities, not their behavior, which is as wrong in this case as in any other. Leftists make these classifications based on identity categories and ignore the actions and characters of individuals in the "privileged" groups. Our sense of justice can't help but rebel against condemnation for things we had nothing to do with. Intersectionality encourages us to objectify human beings rather than view them as individuals. It's immoral and destructive to the human spirit to exempt people from personal responsibility for their individual actions because they are a member of a disadvantaged identity group. Intersectionality's proponents will doubtless claim that they are not demonizing white people or white men in particular but merely seeking redress for the historically disadvantaged. But you can't witness their allegations of privilege and miss the ethos of resentment and blame. This sick thinking dominates the left. For example, the Library Journal, founded by Melvil Dewey, who originated the Dewey decimal system, tweeted, "Library collections continue to promote and proliferate whiteness with their very existence and the fact that they are physically taking up space in our libraries."³² There you go—whiteness is evil. Actress Rosanna Arquette, sister of Patricia Arquette, expressed the same idea when she tweeted, "I'm sorry I was born white and privileged. It disgusts me." In case her feelings weren't clear she added, "And I feel so much shame." Ironically, her self-denunciation provoked criticism from social justice warriors who accused her of taking full advantage of her privilege.³³ Even pointing out that whites are being categorically maligned can inspire charges of white supremacy. Those who demand an "honest" conversation about race should understand that many people feel they can't speak freely without being wrongly accused of prejudice. As if to prove my point, race-baiting leftists have added another loony term to our dictionaries—"white fragility," defined as "the tendency among members of the dominant white cultural group to have a defensive, wounded, angry, or dismissive response to evidence of racism."³⁴ "WHITE WOMEN UPHOLD WHITE SUPREMACY THROUGH THEIR VOTE" "I don't know if you've heard, but white people are awful," writes RedState's Alex Parker. "They're just the worst. We have a relatively new term for all the people who aren't the worst: people of color. Therefore, there are people who are of color, and there are people who are the worst. Those are the two races in America today." Parker cites an example of how this thinking plays out. Actor Herve Villechaize, a dwarf, played Tattoo in the popular seventies show Fantasy Island Game of Thrones actor Peter Dinklage, also a dwarf, portrayed Villechaize in the HBO movie My Dinner with Herve. When social justice warriors heard that Villechaize was a minority and Dinklage was not,

they pounced. One person tweeted, “Umm Herve Villechaize is FILIPINO!!!! NOT WHITE!” Another said, “Love Peter Dinklage, but are folks just gonna ignore the fact that Herve Villechaize was Filipino?” He added the hashtag #whitewashedOUT. Yet another went further, tweeting, “No. No. NO. Shame on you, HBO. Herve Villechaize was French-born Filipino and British. Casting Dinklage in a wig and with a fake accent erases his real identity and tragic story and is a crushing blow to APA actors who could’ve owned this role.”³⁵ There you have it. One’s identity is based on his race, not his common humanity, a buzzword that liberals used to use, ironically, when virtue signaling harmony and solidarity was their thing. But harmony went the way of other liberal pet causes such as global cooling. As it turns out, with regard to Villechaize, the social justice warriors jumped the gun. Villechaize was actually of German, French, and English descent—pretty solidly white, in other words. This entire episode is silly and pathetic. It’s wrong for people to obsess over race. It is wretchedly dehumanizing to all concerned, and people who agree should express revulsion toward such thinking rather than standing fearfully silent or pretending to endorse it. It is the height of racism, in the name of purging racism. Other examples of such divisive nonsense abound. Although Democrats and Never Trumpers hailed the 2018 congressional elections as a repudiation of Trump, some disgruntled leftists were outraged that the white vote trended Republican. Progressive activist Marisa Kabas tweeted, “deleted a couple tweets because I don’t think they accurately expressed what I was trying to say. White women uphold white supremacy through their vote. They have no qualms about hurting women of color, and that’s an objective truth.” If this was her preferred tweet, one wonders what the originals contained. Travon Free tweeted, “Black women voted 95% for [Democrat] Beto [O’Rourke]. White women did what white women do. #ElectionNight.” Leftist celebrity Chelsea Handler tweeted, “59% of white women voted for Ted Cruz. I don’t know what it is going to take for us to be sisters to other women, but we have to do better than this. We need to vote for the best interests of others, and stop thinking only about ourselves.” Handler was similarly agitated a few weeks before, when she denounced Fox for unveiling its new streaming platform, Fox Nation. She tweeted, “Fox News’ new paid streaming service ‘Fox Nation’ will launch later this year with daily programming from Laura Ingraham and Sean Hannity. It’s for when you need a break from watching racists on your TV, so you can watch them on your computer.”³⁶ These tweets illuminate another problem with intersectionality and leftist politics in general. Leftists like Handler get a pass in our culture and from the liberal media for such despicable remarks. They are immune from criticism when falsely alleging that conservatives, by virtue of their conservatism alone, are racist. On election night, another person tweeted, “Really, truly embarrassed that 76% of white women in Georgia voted for [Republican gubernatorial candidate Brian] Kemp. It’s shameful. Humiliating. Thinking about driving my ass down there next election and personally talking to as many of these fools as possible.” Another said, “White women: foot soldiers of the patriarchy.” There are countless other examples.³⁷ The message is that white women can’t possibly promote their own interests if they vote Republican. Apparently, a robust economy, strong defense, and social conservatism only matter to white male patriarchs. The election defeats of African-American gubernatorial candidates Stacey Abrams (Georgia) and Andrew Gillum (Florida) triggered socialist icon Bernie Sanders. He told the Daily Beast following the election, “I think you know there are a lot of white folks out there who are not necessarily

racist who felt uncomfortable for the first time in their lives about whether or not they wanted to vote for an African American. I think next time around, by the way, it will be a lot easier for them to do that.” Apparently Bernie was unaware of any whites in either state having voted when Obama was on the ballot. But in the end, Bernie just couldn’t resist contradicting himself and blaming racism full-on. “I think [Gillum is] a fantastic politician in the best sense of the word,” said Sanders. “He stuck to his guns in terms of a progressive agenda. I think he ran a great campaign. And he had to take on some of the most blatant and ugly racism that we have seen in many, many years. And yet he came within a whisker of winning.”³⁸ It’s not about race, but it is.

CHILLING PRIVATE SECTOR SPEECH Many white progressives revel in attacking conservative whites for their alleged racism and yes, for simply being white. Senator Lindsey Graham became an immediate villain when he staunchly defended Supreme Court Justice nominee Bret Kavanaugh. Protestors accosted Graham when he exited the Senate office building and headed for his car. They called him “despicable” and promised to vote him out of office. They screamed at him, “You old, white, privileged patriarchy!”³⁹ Race-shaming is rampant in our culture. Fashion retailer Forever 21 stepped in it when its website showed a white male model wearing a sweater with the words “Wakanda Forever,” a reference to the movie Black Panther. One critic tweeted, “Hey @Forever21, in what universe did you think it was OK to feature a white model in Wakanda gear? Granted, chances are you knew it wasn’t OK, but still. As a Former #21 men brand specialist for the company, I’m highly offended.” Being offended is a badge of honor these days, especially if it’s for the right reasons and you have the proper pedigree. Another person tweeted, “Wow Forever 21 is tone deaf af. Colonizers aren’t praised in Wakanda. Try again.” Do you see how deep this goes? The hapless white model with a sweater promoting a black superhero movie is instantly demonized as a colonizer. This is too twisted for words. Naturally, Forever 21 didn’t dare object. The store instantly hit the ground groveling and apologized for offending the left. It deleted a tweet with the photo and deleted pictures of the evil youngster from its website. It tweeted, “Forever 21 takes feedback on our products and marketing extremely seriously. We celebrate all superheroes with many different models of various ethnicities and apologize if the photo in question was offensive in any way.”⁴⁰ But in what sane world would the photo be offensive? What is offensive is this entire charade. It’s not just the leftist cultural insanity that is so alarming but the widespread capitulation by people who are bullied and intimidated into conforming. Arguably, private sector intimidation is becoming as great a threat to free thought and expression as government encroachments. Similarly, Columbia University student Julian von Abele ruffled feathers when he filmed a video praising Europeans for building the modern world and expressing his love for white men. The university got wind of the incident and emailed undergraduates, condemning the “racially charged” incident and announcing they had begun an investigation. Von Abele responded on Twitter, denying charges of racism and hatred. “Nobody has explained what I said that was actually negative or racist, or insulting towards anybody else,” he said. “I was theatrically and sarcastically demonstrating that whites are not allowed to embrace their cultural achievements.” He added, “As everyone who has known me my whole life knows, I am a kind person and I don’t hate anyone, certainly not for their race or ethnicity.” The school newspaper, the Columbia Daily Spectator, charged von Abele with harassing students of color and “spewing racist, white supremacist rhetoric.” Student senate member Alfredo Dominguez

attributed the incident to allowing free speech on campus. “You can have arguments all you want about free speech and people being entitled to say what they want,” said Dominguez. “But when that bubbles [into] assaulting black or brown people with that and then stalking them... you’re getting into levels of hate crime and your speech being directly related to violence.” The article reported on a video supposedly showing von Abele berating a group of mainly black underclassmen with racist and white supremacist comments. The Black Student Organization and the Student Organization of Latinxs accused von Abele of physically grabbing another student and asking him if black women like to date white men. The video doesn’t corroborate any of these smears, but it does show one student touching von Abele’s chest and face.⁴¹ Abele explained that he made the video because he was tired of people using the term “white privilege” and other divisive rhetoric to dismiss others’ views. “Every single person should love themselves and their culture, and we should all be allowed to be proud of our heritage,” he said. He related that other students told him he had no right to express his views because he was male and white. But he said he was tired of being held personally responsible for others’ historical actions and of the divisive rhetoric that blames all society’s ills on white men. He added, “At no time did I shove, grab, or physically or verbally assault anyone, nor did I denigrate anyone’s race.”⁴² The alarming attitude of the Columbia Daily Spectator vindicates Abele’s concerns about his free expression rights. The incident shows that people are frustrated and weary of being blamed for things they had nothing to do with, which violates any reasonable person’s innate sense of justice. Nevertheless, intersectionality has continued to spread from academia to the Democratic Party. Democrat Stacey Abrams, the failed gubernatorial candidate in Georgia, penned an essay in Foreign Affairs endorsing intersectionality as a vision for America. She’s convinced that white racism is rampant today, mainly among conservatives, and that it must be countered by identity politics, which she laughably denies is divisive. “When the groups most affected by these issues insist on acknowledgment of their intrinsic difference, it should not be viewed as divisive,” she wrote. “Embracing the distinct history and identities of groups in a democracy enhances the complexity and capacity of the whole.”⁴³ In her view, all existing inequities are due to bigotry, and identity groups must be empowered to defeat them—which is a formula for a balkanized, bitter, and joyless nation. “UNEARNED SKIN PRIVILEGE” The notion of white privilege is fundamental to the ideology of intersectionality. But for allegations of white privilege, intersectionality would have no juice at all. In 1989 sociologist Peggy McIntosh revolutionized the idea in her piece, “White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack.”⁴⁴ She observed that while men might admit that women are disadvantaged, they won’t concede that men are overprivileged. They might be willing to improve women’s status but won’t agree to lessen their own. She equated men’s refusal to reduce their own “privilege” as de facto obstruction of women’s progress. In thinking through these issues, she realized there are interlocking hierarchies in our society. White privilege must exist, just as male privilege does, though its existence is denied and protected, as is the existence of male privilege. “As a white person, I realized I had been taught about racism as something which puts others at a disadvantage, but had been taught not to see one of its corollary aspects, white privilege, which puts me at an advantage.”⁴⁵ Betraying a conspiracy mind-set, she opines that whites are “carefully taught” not to recognize white privilege, just as males are taught not to recognize male privilege. “I have come to

see white privilege as an invisible package of unearned assets which I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I was ‘meant’ to remain oblivious,” she wrote. One wonders who “meant” her—and other whites—to remain oblivious. Adam Smith, perhaps? Ronald Reagan? “White privilege is like an invisible weightless backpack of special provisions, maps, passports, codebooks, visas, clothes, tools and blank checks.... I began to count the ways in which I enjoy unearned skin privilege and have been conditioned into oblivion about its existence.” So she decided to “work on” herself by listing the daily effects of white privilege in her life, which included such items as, “I can if I wish arrange to be in the company of people of my race most of the time.... If I should need to move, I can be pretty sure of renting or purchasing housing in an area which I can afford and in which I would want to live.... I can be pretty sure that my neighbors in such a location will be neutral or pleasant to me.... I can go shopping alone most of the time, pretty well assured that I will not be followed or harassed.... I can turn on the television or open to the front page of the paper and see people of my race widely represented.”⁴⁶ This is a small sampling of her “privileges,” which she wrote down to force herself to “give up the myth of meritocracy. If these things are true, this is not such a free country; one’s life is not what one makes it; many doors open for certain people through no virtues of their own.” Here again we see a devaluation of the principles of merit, freedom, and equal opportunity. If leftists succeed in convincing people that a merit-based society is unattainable, they will have destroyed a central pillar of the American idea. The oppressor–oppressed worldview of white privilege and intersectionality is aligned with neo-Marxism and “privilege theory.”⁴⁷ It’s natural, then, that the neo-Marxist notion of “white privilege” evolved into social doctrine among progressive activists.⁴⁸ Karl Marx divided the world into categories of the oppressors and the oppressed with his zero-sum class ideology, which pitted the bourgeoisie against the proletariat and saw capitalism as the systemic oppressor. In modern times, leftists have repackaged Marx’s divisive framework and furtively adapted it to forms of oppression beyond the economic class struggle, such as race and gender, pitting identity groups against one another with the ultimate goal of instituting socialism out of the chaos.⁴⁹ Each category has different sets of oppressors and oppressed. With race it’s whites versus minorities; with gender it’s males versus females and heterosexuals versus gays and transgenders. Philosophy professor Jason Barker, in a New York Times op-ed idolatrously titled “Happy Birthday, Karl Marx. You Were Right!,” giddily boasts that “racial and sexual oppression have been added to the dynamic of class exploitation. Social justice movements like Black Lives Matter and #MeToo owe something of an unspoken debt to Marx through their unapologetic targeting of the ‘eternal truths’ of our age. Such movements recognize, as did Marx, that the ideas that rule every society are those of its ruling class and that overturning those ideas is fundamental to true revolutionary progress.”⁵⁰ Neo-Marxist philosophy is inherently defeatist and at war with the American idea because it rejects equality of opportunity even as a goal. Because of different privileges enjoyed and disadvantages suffered by various identity groups, meritocracy and opportunity are unattainable. People succeed not because of their efforts or abilities but because of their privilege. The only solution is to replace capitalism with socialism. Only government can remedy the privileges that capitalism confers. MIDDLE-CLASS FOOT SOLDIERS Capitalism, according to many neo-Marxists, doesn’t just cause class oppression but racial oppression as well. “Capitalism is a system that breeds

class oppression and national/racial conquest,” writes Edna Bonacich. “The two forms of exploitation operate in tandem. They are part of the same system that creates inequality, impoverishment, and all the other host of social ills that result. I believe you cannot attack capitalism without attacking racism. The two are Siamese twins, joined together from top to bottom.”⁵¹ Bonacich regards capitalism as innately flawed and incapable of eliminating poverty—it “depends on exploitation.” Private property owners become wealthy on the backs of “propertyless” laborers, who work for them and rent their buildings. But for the have-nots, there could be no “haves.” Capitalism can’t rid itself of poverty. “It requires poverty. Poverty is the basis of wealth.... To repeat, the wealthy depend on poverty for their riches. They are committed to it, wedded to it. They cannot do without it.... Capital accumulation depends on exploitation, and exploitation both requires and reproduces poverty.”⁵² Once again, we see the socialist notion of finite wealth, a mind-set that is impervious to the concept of economic growth and wealth creation. With a fixed amount of wealth and no way to expand it, it follows that the social planners must step in and fairly redistribute it. Here we also see the regrettable philosophical basis for the left’s contempt for the wealthy. Bonacich bastardizes the term “racism” to support her theory that capitalism and racism are joined at the hip. For her, “racism is a system of exploitation.” It is a mechanism to control and oppress people to extract maximum profits from them. By redefining racism she’s able to explain away the rise of the black middle class that was occurring when she wrote her article in 1989. The upward mobility of blacks didn’t mitigate racism because the black middle class, “like the white middle class, are part of the structure of oppression of the black poor and working class.” She maintains that “the United States continues to be a deeply racist society” in at least two central respects. “First, it consists in the continued exploitation of people of color for profit. Second, it is demonstrated in the demand that people of color must accommodate to the white man’s system, rather than vice versa.” Capitalism, she insists, “is based on vicious inequality.” The ruling class pays lip service to racial equality but openly opposes social equality. It pretends to open the doors of opportunity to blacks, but the system demands that people of color adapt to the white man’s culture. “They have to play by the white man’s rules.” But what evidence exists that “the system” demands that minorities adapt to “the white man’s culture?” If that’s the case, why is black culture so popular? Why do politicians like Elizabeth Warren and Beto O’Rourke strain to co-opt minority identities? As Victor Davis Hanson asks, “Why did California congressional candidate Kevin Leon rather abruptly become Kevin de León, emphasizing an ethnic cachet—if ‘whiteness’ equaled unearned advantage and non-whiteness earned lifelong discrimination?” Other examples include Professor Ward Churchill, who masqueraded as a Native American for career advancement,⁵³ and Rachel Dolezal, who became Spokane NAACP chapter president while pretending she was black.⁵⁴ Elaborating on her conspiratorial view of capitalism as an innately exploitive system, Bonacich says it’s not just the wealthy who exploit the poor but the foot soldiers in the middle class who “are paid out of the profits squeezed from the poor in order to keep the poor under control.” The middle class helps to manage the poor. They are the guardians of this pernicious inequality, ensuring that capitalism extends through the generations, and they are paid “handsomely” for their efforts. The education system, whose competitive nature is modeled on capitalism, is a feeder of the middle class and its values. “The schools are a great sorting machine for the unequal hierarchy of wealth and

privilege that is American capitalism.” The teachers validate this process, and “help to label the poor as incompetents, as failures, as unworthy, and therefore deserving of dispossession.” Bonacich says the great myth of the educational system is that the pursuit of individual achievement will maximize social benefit—that the greatest good comes from selfishness and that the benefits of competition will trickle down to everyone, which she identifies as “the self-delusion of capitalism in general, and imperialism in particular.” Once again, she implicates the middle class in this sham. They view their own advancement while others are starving as “a mark of their uprightness,” and they claim to be role models to the poor. She also blames capitalism for the ghetto. “It epitomizes the social decay of capitalism. This is what the ‘free market’ produces.” Bonacich further indicts the black middle class. “They are forced to become police for the white man’s system.... They have to participate in supporting capitalist rule. They have to help in the extraction of the surplus from the poor.” Like most leftists, Bonacich has a pat answer for everything. The growth of the black middle class, she says, doesn’t disprove the reality of America’s racial oppression but intensifies it. The existence of a black middle class, you see, impedes the black poor from seeing themselves as victims of racial oppression. Far from showing the decline of racism, it signifies a new chapter in the evolution of American prejudice. Coming close to denouncing the black middle class en masse as Uncle Toms, she claims they are putty in the hands of white elites who “are forever devising new strategies to consolidate their rule.” Bonacich sees wealth redistribution and other welfare policies as commendable but inherently limited. As long as our system features private ownership of productive property, which is used to profit the owners, there will always be an impoverished class, likely consisting largely of minorities. “The class relations of capitalism inevitably involve drainage of wealth from the poor to the rich, and no redistributive programs can ever remotely counter the basic direction of this flow.” Her solution is not to lobby the government for change but to overthrow it. “Just as the private property in slaves was once confiscated, so the owners of the corporations that rule this nation will one day have to be dispossessed.” Bonacich didn’t see revolution on the horizon, however, because all the major institutions—schools, media, etc.—were firmly in capitalist hands—which is odd, since the left had long since ensconced itself in the media and schools when she wrote this piece in 1989. For Bonacich, even large-scale upward mobility among blacks would not improve many black lives. It would just serve to assimilate blacks into the corrupt capitalistic system—“accepting the dominant order and fitting into it.... Jobs in the white man’s system is not the answer.” Instead, blacks need to build alternative economic systems that they control—not capitalist systems but collective ones. Racism, in her view, is forever intertwined with capitalism. It is “one of the major mechanisms by which private capital retains its rule.”⁵⁵ **RADICAL IDEAS HAVE BECOME MAINSTREAM** This is a sick, jealous, and loveless ideology whose legitimacy depends on class and race conflict and can permit no meaningful improvement in social mobility or race relations. Socio-economic classes are fixed, and there can be no real assimilation. As such, any objective evidence of improvement is denied or explained away. This us-against-them mind-set is the core of progressive morality. Christian writer Jayme Metzgar articulates it well. “While adherents of progressivism may sincerely believe they’re working to end oppression, the fact is that their model of morality requires oppression in order to exist,” writes Metzgar. “It requires that someone always be cast in the role of oppressor, whether

he or she deserves to be or not. Any final end to oppression and evil—any real peace, unity, or brotherhood—is impossible.” This explains why Bonacich felt threatened by successful blacks. “Instead, they needed to rebuild their own communities, with Black, not white, needs and interests, as the central, human concern.” In her view, racial harmony and color blindness are not lofty ideals but insidious tricks. Black upward mobility is merely a ruse to entice them to abandon their identity and to be forever relegated to white domination and exploitation. Some apologists dismiss Bonacich’s cohort as radicals who are not representative of leftist or liberal thinking at that time or even now. But if you believe their ideas haven’t matriculated into the culture, you haven’t been paying attention. This is the stuff of mainstream gender studies and critical race theory classes on nearly every college campus today. Their ideas have now insinuated themselves into mainstream Democratic Party thinking. Democrats are deeply invested in perpetual struggles of race, class, and gender, and are pursuing policies so radical as to annihilate our entire existing economic structure. It is naïve to view these ideas as anything but seminal and today’s Democratic initiatives as anything but a logical outworking of this radicalism. Modern leftism is a secular religion, and there are many denominations that often overlap, from the church of environmentalism to socialism, cultural Marxism, identity politics, and intersectionality. Metzgar notes that many religious traditions seek to answer the question, “What is good, true, and beautiful?” In Christianity, God is the answer to all three. But progressivism, without the benefit of moral absolutes, has settled on a simplistic moral standard that refines sin to the single category of oppression. Metzgar argues that progressives see history as the moral force that moves toward progress. There is certainly truth in this. Marx clearly subscribed to this general notion, and the progressive worldview rejects the Christian biblical doctrine of man’s fall, believing instead that man, through science and reason, marches toward enlightenment. Metzgar contends that the progressive moral framework leads to the inescapable conclusion that victimhood is the highest virtue. “Victims and members of oppressed identity groups are elevated to a kind of sainthood in the progressive religion,” writes Metzgar. “Those who are more oppressed have more moral authority and are thus more worthy to speak, set policy, and make demands. This is in fact exactly what intersectionality teaches, complete with a hierarchy of victimhood for comparing everyone’s relative righteousness.”⁵⁶ Indeed, there is no way to explain their stubborn adherence to an ideology so rife with contradictions other than to understand that it’s a matter of faith. This helps to explain why so many Americans are desperately trying to be victims, even to the point of faking their identities or orchestrating hoaxes to validate their victimhood. In the next chapters we’ll see how these radical ideas permeate the left’s entire political agenda today.

Limbaugh, David. *Guilty By Reason of Insanity: Why The Democrats Must Not Win* (pp. 41-55). Regnery Publishing. Kindle Edition.

Limbaugh, David. *Guilty By Reason of Insanity: Why The Democrats Must Not Win* (p. 41). Regnery Publishing. Kindle Edition.

Limbaugh, David. *Guilty By Reason of Insanity: Why The Democrats Must Not Win* (pp. 27-41). Regnery Publishing. Kindle Edition.