

**DANGEROUS**

**Milo Yiannopoulos**

*To John*  
*For the moments*

## CONTENTS

**Preamble:** On Freedom of Speech and Political Correctness

**Prologue:** The Art of the Troll

1. Why the Progressive Left Hates Me
2. Why the Alt-Right Hates Me
3. Why Twitter Hates Me
4. Why Feminists Hate Me
5. Why Black Lives Matter Hates Me
6. Why the Media Hates Me
7. Why ~~Other Gay People~~ Establishment Gays Hate Me
8. Why Establishment Republicans Hate Me
9. Why Muslims Hate Me
10. ~~Why Ugly People Hate Me~~
140. Why Gamers DON'T Hate Me
121. Why My College Tour Is So Awesome

**Epilogue:** How to Be a Dangerous Faggot (Even If You're Not Gay)

PREAMBLE

ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

**Comment [A1]:** Add a short and serious statement here that sets out why you do what you do, without trolling, without bombast, without name-calling, and without ego. This will make for a stronger opening than playing to your core audience.

Make the point that in each and every chapter of this book, what you intend to show is the stifling of speech.

Acknowledge that you use bombast and over-the-top messaging in an attempt to break the strictures on free expression in the same way that comedians like Lenny Bruce once did.

And make the point that liberals used to defend free speech but that since the advent of political correctness, the illiberal left has become the oppressive censors in American society.

Cite Beatrice Evelyn Hall, the 1906 biographer of Voltaire, who described his attitude as "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it," a quote usually misattributed to him.

Then tie each chapter to this preamble.

**PROLOGUE**  
**THE ART OF THE TROLL**

The year 2016 was in more ways than one, the year of the troll. And, as one of the world's most famous trolls, that means it was the year of me.

**Comment [A2]:** Careful that the egotistical boasting that your young audience finds humorous doesn't make you seem juvenile to other readers—especially here.

What does it mean to be a troll? If you stray too far into whiny crybaby leftist circles, (especially feminism circa 2013-14), trolling and political disagreement were one and the same. Others see no distinction between trolls and those who send poorly-worded death threats to public figures.

**Comment [A3]:** Avoid parenthetical insults—they just diminish your authority. Throughout the book, your best points seem to be lost in a sea of self-aggrandizement and scattershot thinking.

Trolling is far more complicated and joyous than that. It is an art, beyond the grasp of most mere mortals. It is one part trickery and one part viciousness -- the ideal troll baits his target into a trap, from which there is no escape without public embarrassment.

The young memester faction of the alt-right accomplished this flawlessly by getting a popular cartoon internet frog called Pepe branded a "hate symbol." Now, left-wing activists, journalists, and "anti-hate" organizations will descend in a firestorm of fury on anyone who shares the frog picture, no matter how innocent the context, invariably making themselves look ridiculous in the process.

The best part of it is, most left-wingers still refuse to accept that they're being trolled.

Trolling has many elements. It's often about telling truths that others don't want to hear. It's about tricking, pranking, and generally riling up your targets. And it's about creating a hilarious, entertaining public spectacle.

**Comment [A4]:** Expand on the idea of trolling as truth-telling—that's something your critics have never considered.

Is it any wonder that a fabulous faggot like me is so good at it?

(Even calling myself a faggot is trolling you. Calling myself a "fabulous faggot" is trolling you fabulously.)

**Comment [A5]:** Add something like this.

Picking deserving targets, and making them hopping mad is essential to trolling. The left-wing media thinks I'm a "misogynist racist white nationalist alt-right leader." The Neo-Nazis, meanwhile, call me a "degenerate kike faggot" and declared a "holy crusade" against me.

One of the two is clearly wrong, but their confusion-but hurt is so glorious that I almost don't want to correct either one of them.

That is trolling them

In my trollery, I am surpassed only by one man, or, rather one God-Emperor: Donald Trump, a man who essentially trolled his way to the presidency. Like me, Daddy, as I like to call him (in itself another troll), only went after deserving targets: the media, Hillary and Bill Clinton, political correctness.

A master showman, Donald J. Trump can command the media's attention despite the fact that most of their leading lights despise him.

Forcing people who hate you and everything you stand for to point cameras at you for over a year? That's a level of trolling I can only hope to achieve one day.

However...

We should never mistake cruelty for trolling. It's true that to be a good troll, one must have a certain level of disregard for other peoples' feelings. But trolling must have a purpose; the difference between trolling and cruelty is that cruelty has no purpose except to hurt someone.

Trolls should troll only in the name of debunking some untruth. In the age of the campus safe space, what could be more valuable?

**Comment [A6]:** Add something like this since most accusations against you point to harm they claim you've done

It's one of the reasons why trolls are winning: hate us, yell, stamp your feet, yes, yes -- but we're the only ones telling the truth these days.

So beware, lefties: so long as facts remain offensive, the age of the trolls will never end

\*\*\*

I am an icon.

A messiah.

A bleached-blond creature of the night who keeps the nannies, pearl-clutchers, cultural scolds, third-wave feminists, progressive bloggers, Black Lives Matter activists, gender studies professors, “fat acceptance” advocates, transgender lobbyists and Islamophobia watchdogs up at night.

My name is Milo, and this book will tell you how I became what America now knows and hates as “the dangerous faggot.”

I'm a firestarter and troublemaker who started out as an obscure British tech blogger and rose to infamy as one of America's most well-known polemicists and media personalities. I've created absolute mayhem in half a dozen industries: ~~m~~Media, by being ~~a~~ the most notorious, ~~was~~pish and ~~love~~able columnist, ~~in~~ America; ~~T~~tech, by being banned from Twitter; for falling out with the wrong celebrity, ~~spark~~ing the biggest tech scandal of 2016; ~~e~~Education, by becoming ~~an~~ the most in-demand speaker on American college campuses; ~~with~~ my sellout Dangerous Faggot Tour; ~~g~~Gaming, by almost single-handedly ~~coming~~ to the defense ~~defending~~ of an entire generation of young video gamers; ~~enthusiasts~~ from the forces of finger-wagging feminism; ~~P~~ and publishing, merely by ~~dint~~ of ~~announcing~~ this book.

~~I tour this vast country on a custom bus I'm told is longer than Barry Diller's yacht. I say what no one wants to hear—yet my audiences keep growing. There's nothing therapeutic or reassuring about my speeches. The entertainment value resides solely in my God-like good looks, charismatic aura and legendary wit. I would drop my present causes if they resonated with me as vindicating or motivating. I have guiding principles, but if I had a single "cause" David Remnick would have tried to profile me for the *New Yorker*. I am an engine of chaos.~~

**Comment [A7]:** Off the point.

A certain section of America's political class utterly hates me. They find my existence downright apocalyptic. The appearance of my expensive shoes and frosted tips and the sound of my laughter are horrifying to close-minded people because they force the professors, journalists, directors, activists and musicians to do something no one in America has done for a long time: *question their assumptions.*

~~My critics. The bad guys~~ hate me because they can't beat me. They tell all sorts of lies about me, calling me absurd and untrue things like "far-right white supremacist" because they can't wrap their heads around how such a flamboyant, stylish gay man could have the opinions I do. They call me a leader of the "alt-right" no matter how many times I say I'm not affiliated with that movement and don't much care for it.

~~They say I am responsible for the actions of others. They say I have done objectionable things simply because others have told them I have done those things. They believe those lies because I hold unpopular views. And when told I am not those things, that I have not done those things, they choose to believe the lies.~~

**Comment [A8]:** Add something like this—only less self-serving

~~My supporters. The good guys~~ see me for what I am: a critical voice in the pushback against political correctness, and a free-speech fundamentalist defending the public's right to express themselves however they please. Young conservatives and libertarians respond to love



me because I say the things they wish they could—things—about their dreary professors and odious left-wing “comedians.”

Mischief-making musicians, actors and writers love me -- but only in private, because they fear reprisals.

**Comment [A9]:** Can you offer proof?

In my mind, I play the role gays were always meant to in polite society: I test the absolute limits of acceptability. The social and religious convictions I represent do not map onto the norms of nihilism and self-esteem peddled by social-justice warriors and progressives since the 1960s. But they have set me, and my army of fans, free. Instead of analysing my success, my enemies brand me “leader of the alt-right” or whatever moniker they can reach for that they think will do me the most damage.

I am a threat because I don’t belong to anyone. I’m unaffiliated.

They hate that.

I look and dress and behave as though I should have safe, MTV-friendly feminist opinions. But I don’t.

I am the Ken doll from the underworld.

There are new taboos now, and they all come from the progressive left -- the army of people who want to tell you how to behave. I am here to break apart that consensus.

In the 1960s, the Right was the prevailing culture and the left was the counter-culture. Today, however, it is the left who form the prevailing culture and we, the Right, are the counter-culture.

**Comment [A10]:** You make this point elsewhere. Make it here.

They hate that too.

In modern America’s politicised, identity-policed culture, I cannot be defined or contained. Absurd, moralistic denunciations of me as “ultra-Right” fall hopelessly flat. My life is

~~what liberal editors in New York, trendy professors in Connecticut and entertainment bloggers in LA want: glamorous, effortless, sexually charged and fun. (I'm the world's first alpha bottom.) But they're too provincial, awkward, hideous and irrelevant to ever achieve it.~~

I am a gay man. They call me a homophobe. I'm a sexual libertine and free-speech fundamentalist -- they call me a far-right troll. I date black men but they call me a racist. (They say that even saying that is racist.) I'm a Jew; they call me an anti-semite. I want to keep ~~psychologically damaged~~ men out of women's bathrooms. For all of this, they call me a reactionary bigot.

In the following pages, I'll teach you how to cause the same sort of mayhem I do -- in the media, on campus and in your personal life -- in defense of the most important right you have in America: the right to think, do, say and be whatever the hell you want.

Keep reading and you'll find out how you can become as terrifying to the forces of political correctness and social justice as me I am, ~~and you won't even have to suck a dick to do it!~~

I'll even teach you how, despite my awesome personal qualities and tremendous professional success, I stay so remarkably modest.

## 1

**WHY THE PROGRESSIVE LEFT HATES ME**

“97 per cent of workplace deaths are male.”

“Rates of rape and domestic abuse are far higher in Muslim communities than non-Muslim ones.”

“The black community has a huge problem with crime and drugs.”

All of these statements are ~~facts~~, yet, in today’s America, introducing them to the conversation instantly causes outrage, like telling old people there’s nothing in their mouths and they can stop chewing ~~or informing cab drivers that curry is not a deodorant~~. If you discuss them at all, you are expected to begin with certain caveats. “I’m a feminist, but...” “I’m not an Islamophobe, but...” “The majority of African-Americans are law-abiding citizens, but...”

**Comment [A11]:** Citations needed

**Comment [A12]:** Delete irrelevant and superfluous ethnic joke

I rarely, if ever, use caveats, because they’re irrelevant. I prefer to discuss the facts directly, and I use ~~exaggeration and bombast~~, often outrageously. When Black Lives Matter activist Edward Ward stormed the stage during my otherwise-peaceful speech at DePaul, my response was to quip that, with all the security present, the black incarceration rate was likely to ~~rise~~ ~~go up even higher~~ if he wasn’t careful. (I ~~then~~ ~~also~~ told the line of ~~young black women~~ ~~girls~~ roping off the stage that the reason they were so angry was that I’d ~~had sex with~~ ~~fucked~~ all their brothers -- ~~but I digress~~.)

**Comment [A13]:** Inappropriate humor only works sometimes. Other times it undermines your credibility

I refuse to preface any discussions of Islam, for instance, with the usual fake niceties about radical extremists. As for feminists, ~~they’re so easy to wind up~~, ~~they turn everyday people~~ ~~into trolls~~. A mini Milo born every minute!

**Comment [A14]:** This is unclear

Challenging the myths of the Left causes them to lose their mind like nothing else. The ~~fact that I puncture their fantasies with attention-grabbing wit and style doesn't hurt either.~~ I'm also hot, which I'll cover in excruciating detail later, ~~in the book.~~ ~~[I actually wanted to make this entire book about how hot I am, but my publisher talked me down to a single chapter, the *Assisted*.]~~

**Comment [A15]:** Don't refer to publishing process. It makes us the story

But what really drives left-wingers up the wall is who I am. I should be one of them, you see. I'm urbane and metropolitan -- I'm at home at big-city cocktail parties, more so than normal people. But I'm also at home at the shooting range. I'm on top of the latest pop culture and tech trends and, unlike doddering old conservative think-tank heads and ~~rotund~~, bespectacled *National Review* columnists, I know how to dress. I'm also, of course, gay, ~~—strikingly so.~~ Being gay and British, which Americans think are basically the same thing, I have a flawless sense of style.

People like me are supposed to be good little metropolitan homos and vote Democrat (or Labour, in England). We're supposed to pretend we watch *Girls* and that we thought it was totally believable that the female lead in *Star Wars: The Force Awakens* could pilot the Millennium Falcon with greater skill than Han Solo. Yet even before the left descended into safe-space silliness and identity-politics lunacy, I wanted nothing to do with them. People like me were supposed to go to anti-war protests in Trafalgar Square and experiment with quinoa and hummus diets in their youth. But I was doing something different.

Yes, I was in drug-saturated nightclubs in London, losing my virginity in interracial fivesomes involving drag queens, seducing my English teacher and parish priest and experimenting with every depraved form of escapism I could find. And I listened to a lot of Mariah Carey, Marilyn Manson and Wagner and thought about ~~cutting myself~~ to all three.

**Comment [A16]:** Expand? Two-word phrase is too superficial for this act. (Add something like "...like too many troubled teenagers...")

Obviously I never did it, because I always knew I was ~~I'm~~ too beautiful to spoil like that.

Here's where it gets complicated, though: I also ~~read~~studied music theory, Schopenhauer, and Wittgenstein, and I read Margaret Thatcher biographies, shot my dad's guns, and dreamt of meeting George W. Bush. (I did later in life, but by then he wasn't right-wing enough for me.)

Little did I know that I was breaking all the left's rules by reading Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged* and daydreaming that I was **Dagny Taggart**.

**Comment [A17]:** Idnetifu

To understand precisely why the left hates people like me so much, it's necessary to understand how and why the left has~~has~~<sup>'ve</sup> changed. Once concerned with great, era-defining questions, the left today is instead obsessed with petty-identity politics. To highlight just how small their priorities have become, let me tell you a story from the recent past.

### **The Ghostbusters leftStory**

**Comment [A18]:** If you're going to tell the Ghostbusters story here, you have to tell the whole story here, including the fact that people doxed her and sent her Harambe pictures. Move material from page 49 here

In the summer of 2016, I involved myself in a controversy that shouldn't have been a controversy: Paul Feig's feminist-friendly, all-female *Ghostbusters* reboot. I published a catty review of the abominable flick, tarring it with my trademark reserve as a crime against comedy. I castigated the abysmal performances from the lead actresses, including the widely-praised Leslie Jones, as well as the movie's mean-spirited attitude to the male gender.

A few hours later, I would<sup>d</sup> be banned from one of the web's biggest social networks, leading to weeks of headlines in national newspapers.

**Comment [A19]:** Was the banning really that swift?

I was somewhat late to the *Ghostbusters* party. The film had been attracting controversy for months before its release. It started when the film's trailer debuted on YouTube, where it was immediately assailed by peeved fans of the first, classic Bill Murray movie. They had read reports about director Paul Feig's plans to reinvent the franchise from the ground up, as well as

the creators' seemingly sparse knowledge of the *Ghostbusters* universe, and like many die-hard pop culture fans, they were annoyed. This, coupled with the fact that the trailer was boring rather than a frat boy's penis at a fat acceptance rally, led to it becoming the most-disliked movie trailer in YouTube's history.

**Comment [A20]:** In a book that will be read by people who don't share your POV, avoid gratuitous insults. They detract from the overall point you're making. In a lecture or a Breitbart column, the audience already shares your POV and sense of humor.

Under normal circumstances, this would not be hugely controversial. Cult franchises like *Ghostbusters* can be treacherous territory: upset the fans and you may be in for a lifetime of loathing. Just think of what fans did to George Lucas after *The Phantom Menace* hit theaters.

But this wasn't normal circumstances, and the fans' reaction to *Ghostbusters* quickly became a media and political controversy. Partly as a means to market the movie, Feig and the *Ghostbusters* cast began attacking their detractors as misogynists and sexists who only hated the movie because of its all-female cast.

The media, amazingly, swallowed this obvious attempt to delegitimize criticism and ran with it. Not just the film media, you understand, but also the political, mainstream and even alternative media. The film started to generate more headlines than a Kardashian wedding. The frantic pro-*Ghostbusters* campaign reached peak absurdity when, after disappointing box office returns, politicians from the California Legislative Women's Caucus gathered at a private screening to watch the movie. After the viewing, their leading members gave a series of obviously pre-prepared statements to journalists, each one of them celebrating the movie as a work of high art and a progressive leap forward.

**Comment [A21]:** Do you have proof of this?

Feig transformed a movie about four out of shape, middle-aged men, three of them white and one black to a chick flick with four out of shape, middle-aged women, three of them white and one black.

Groundbreaking!

This is the story of how the left, one of western civilization's most historically significant ideological traditions, found itself at a point where defending a commercially unsuccessful, fourth-rate reboot of a 1980s movie about spooky ghosts became a matter of high political importance.

It's also a story of how I came to represent the left's greatest fear:— their opponents becoming cooler than them.

Here's Why All This Stuff Matters:

(I promise we'll get back to the jokes soon.)

In the past, the leftist coalition was based on economic class. The left were the champions of blue-collar workers against the managerial, big-business classes. Their priorities were jobs, pay, and decent living standards for ordinary citizens. A few leftists -- Bernie Sanders in the United States, and Jeremy Corbyn in Britain -- continue this tradition. They are, notably, significantly older than many other left-wing politicians. They are also loathed by much of the establishment in their respective parties.

Why? Because the mainstream left, today, has very different priorities.

There was no reason why the left had to abandon its old blue-collar base. The industries that kept them in work may have largely disappeared, but the voters themselves didn't go anywhere. Indeed, as voters in old working-class heartlands entered a crisis, with insecure economic prospects, the left should have been more attentive to their concerns.

But that didn't happen.

**Comment [A22]:** This section is very well argued but dry. Mixing in humorous quips only works when the quip is genuinely funny to all readers—and not when it diminishes your authority.

**Comment [A23]:** The reason was partly that the base abandoned the Democrats during the 1960s because the Democrats voted for civil rights legislation.

Instead, the left chose to abandon their old voters and seek out new prospects. Slowly, they began to ignore the former working class, and turn to a very different electoral coalition: latte-sipping metropolitan voters, women, and minorities. The fact that minorities were only a small section of the electorate didn't bother the left -- they could just import new ones! ~~And import them they did~~, regardless of how the rapid influx of cheap labour and new welfare recipients added pressure to their already-beleaguered former base.

**Comment [A24]:** Unsupportable charge

After such a betrayal, it's remarkable that millions of former working-class families still remain loyal to parties of the left.

As their electoral coalition changed, so too did the left's politics. They became less concerned with pay, more contemptuous of efforts to protect old industries, and practically venomous towards the cultural values of their old voters. Barack Obama's infamous 2008 quip that former working-class communities "cling to guns or religion or antipathy toward people who aren't like them or anti-immigrant sentiment or anti-trade sentiment" epitomized the new attitude of the left.

**Comment [A25]:** Word-for-word?

They no longer cared about the people they used to be expected to protect, abandoning them more brutally fast than Taylor Swift is dumped by her love interests.

What they did care about was their new voters -- the so-called "rainbow coalition" -- and ensuring that they had no illusions about who was on their side.

Thus began the era of identity politics.

(You know, I'm really getting into this! I should consider a professorship somewhere. I'd be the hot lecturer that the football team would consider an easy A -- or maybe just easy. Ewe



joked before that I'd make an excellent men's studies professor,<sup>1</sup> a (And frankly a teaching position is about the only position I haven't tried, if you know what I mean.)

The left has always been well-practiced at turning social classes against one another. As far back as the 19th-century, socialists championed class warfare while conservatives championed the ideal of "One Nation." Yet the working class always proved frustrating to the champagne socialists of the academy. Marxists were particularly perturbed when, during World War One, the European working class (with the exception of Russia) chose to fight for king and country instead of rise up against their masters. And so, in the 1920s, the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci decided that the time had come for a new form of revolution -- one based on culture, not class.

According to Gramsci, the reason why the proletariat had failed to rise up was because old, conservative ideas like loyalty to one's country, family values, and religion held too much sway in working-class communities. If that sounds familiar to Obama's comment about guns and religion, that's because it should. His line of thinking, as we shall see, is directly descended from the ideological tradition of Gramsci.

Gramsci argued that as a precursor to revolution, the old traditions of the west -- or the "cultural hegemony," as he called it -- would have to be systematically broken down. To do so, Gramsci argued that "proletarian" intellectuals should seek to challenge the dominance of traditionalism in education and the media, and create a new revolutionary culture.

Gramsci's ideas would prove phenomenally influential. If you've ever wondered why you're forced to take diversity or gender studies courses at university, or why your professors all seem to hate western civilization ... Well, now you know who to blame Gramsci.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/06/29/ive-just-been-appointed-oberlins-first-mens-studies-professor/>

I can practically hear science-fiction authors currently suffering an incursion of social justice feverishly writing stories about traveling through time to bump off Antonio before he write anything influential.

Comment [A26]: Unclear, unfunny, delete

In the 1950s and 60s, a group of European expatriate academics known as the Frankfurt School married Gramsci's idea of cultural revolution to the idea of a new revolutionary vanguard: one made up of students, feminists, and minorities who felt excluded from mainstream western culture and sought to change it. Their ideas would provide much of the intellectual ballast for the cultural upheavals of the 1960s, and the subsequent transformation of the left.

That's why Andrew Breitbart wrote about them extensively in his bestselling book, *Righteous Indignation*.

The New Left, as they came to be called, were responsible for the early stages of the left's pivot away from traditional class politics and towards the divisive, politically correct world of gender, racial, and sexual politics we know today. They were the ones responsible for making issues like abortion, the reversal of gender roles, racial justice, pacifism, and multiculturalism into major platforms of the left.

The students who joined the New Left in the 1960s became the professors who are teaching you today.

The New Left also enjoyed phenomenal success in the realm of culture. For the youth of the 1960s, rebelling against the over-protective, military-minded, and somewhat austere World War Two generation, the ideas of cultural Marxism struck a chord -- even though, for the most part, these young baby boomer didn't realise where these ideas were coming from. Rock musicians, the standard-bearers of young boomer culture, became fierce advocates for pacifism,

feminism, gay rights, and all the other causes of the New Left -- a tradition that continues to this day.

The other reason ~~that why~~ the New Left ~~was~~ were so successful is that in the 1960s, their arguments made sense. There was real racism to be fought, ~~racism that was institutionalized and legal~~. Gays were oppressed, by conservatives and liberals alike. Sexism in the workplace did exist—~~even worse than on *Mad Men*~~.

**Comment [A27]:** This point about institutionalized racism is very important—it is a distinction that conservatives and liberals can agree on. Racism still exists, but it was legal then.

The tragedy is that instead of granting life to the inherently divisive doctrines of Cultural Marxism, these problems could easily have been solved with the milder tradition of Classical Liberalism. Indeed, ~~in 1950s Britain~~, it was classical liberal politicians of the Wolfenden Committee who, ~~in 1950s Britain~~, began the process of decriminalizing homosexuality. ~~Marxists played little, if any role in it.~~

The ~~Marxists~~ were as useful as Victoria Beckham at a pie eating contest.

~~These days, it often seems as though the Left is little more than a lawless band of professional victims and troublemakers. Just look at their attitude to elections and the ostentatious amount of voter fraud on the Democrat side.<sup>2</sup> Each group of ineligible voters has their own motivations to break the law. In the case of dead voters, I believe they are the only people that can get a decent deal on Obamacare coverage.~~

**Comment [A28]:** This paragraph is off the point.

For better or worse (what am I saying?— ~~D~~definitely for worse!), the New Left became the defining youth movement of the 60s and 70s, and although initially perceived as radical, its ideas would eventually come to dominate the mainstream movement.

~~The counter-culture of the 1960s became the prevailing culture of the 1980s.~~

**Comment [A29]:** You make this point on the bottom of page 44. It would be helpful to make it here.

This ~~rise~~ of the New Left coincided with the decline of the unionized working class and the rise of non-unionized workers, who in the 1980s were increasingly attracted by Ronald

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/10/25/full-text-the-election-is-rigged-by-milo/>

Reagan and Margaret Thatcher's promises of economic freedom and upward mobility. As the left looked to fill the gap, they increasingly turned to the New Left, and its coalition of women, social minorities, and immigrants.

**Comment [A30]:** Point out that the working class were attracted to Thatcher and Reagan despite their tough stances against unions?

The consequences of this pivot are plain to see today. While it's a stretch to say that modern leftist politicians want to overthrow capitalism (they're actually quite happy to get rich on the proceeds of globalization), the intellectual legacy of Cultural Marxism can clearly be seen in their viewpoints: The metropolitan elites of today's leftist political class have Gramsci's condescension and contempt for working-class culture -- which is still resolutely traditionalist, despite their efforts, of Gramsci's heirs -- maps extraordinarily well onto the metropolitan elitism of today's leftist political class.

The knee-jerk endorsements of feminism, Black Lives Matter, and gay identity politics is also in no small part related to this Marxist tendency to back the "revolutionary class" against the "oppressors," regardless of the facts. Another by-product of 1960s leftism is the quiet contempt -- sometimes hatred -- of white males, is also a by-product of the 1960s leftists, who are (correctly) identified them as the architects of western culture.

You can spot these people a mile away if you know what to look for. They are the type who will be disappointed by a DNA test that shows they are of 99% European ancestry because they thought "I might be something interesting". They are the type to point out at great pains that true communism has never been tried. They will write articles hinting at the acceptability of political violence from the safety of their gated community.

**Comment [A31]:** Cite examples

For the New Left, white males are the cultural counterpart to the economic bourgeoisie class in classical Marxist theory -- a class of oppressors that must be overthrown by the oppressed. The influence of the New Left is seen most clearly in universities,

where efforts to “deconstruct” the pillars of western civilization, from classical liberal humanism to the mythical “patriarchy” proceed apace -- just as Gramsci would have wanted.

By the early 2000s, in firm control of the baby boomers’ cultural consciousness, the New Left was on course to become the new cultural hegemony. Conservatives, preoccupied with defeating the Soviet Union and reviving the ideal of the free market, had failed to grasp the gravity of the left’s cultural revolution. On the right, the culture wars were left to social conservatives, who obsessed over unwinnable fights like gay marriage, and alienated young people with hare-brained censorship campaigns against rock music, comic books and video games.

When social conservatives started going after *Harry Potter* for “promoting witchcraft,” it became embarrassingly clear what side had won the culture wars.

~~Speaking of witchcraft, the Clintons have turned into such villains that the demons summoned through their “spirit cooking” sessions take notes on *them*. It’s like a masterclass in demonic behavior. The demons wonder how she has done it all in one human lifetime. If you want a great example of media bias, imagine if the Trump campaign was participating in satanic rituals involving blood and semen. The closest thing Donald Trump has to an occult ritual is his infamous habit of eating KFC with a knife and fork. But even that I think is one of Daddy’s elaborate trolls.~~

**Comment [A32]:** This entire paragraph is just repeating Fake News. There was NO blood, NO semen and there was NO Satanism. Delete.

~~You have to feel for poor Bill. Every time he hears ‘gender’ and ‘gap’ in the same sentence he gets hard, then he sees Hillary’s crossed eyes and evil smile and he’s booking another flight on the Lolita Express.~~

Ironically, the cultural left achieved dominance just at the point when they were no longer needed. By the end of the 1960s, when the New Left were still on the fringe, their milder

allies in the social liberal movement were already well on their way to winning the really important cultural battles. Jim Crow was dismantled, gays were allowed out of the closet, and anti-discrimination laws were put in the statute books. By the 1990s, it was difficult to argue that any social group in the west lacked equality—under the law.

Indeed, thanks to the persistence of government redistribution plans and the early growth of affirmative action, some groups were already getting favoured treatment -- a foreboding sign of things to come.

By 2010, the argument that racism, sexism, and homophobia were still rampant in western society was starting to look absurd. Indeed, I suspect the reason that a previously ignored relatively trivial issue like gay marriage became such a cause célèbre for the left during this period is because it was, for them, the last clear-cut legislative battle that could be easily fought and won.

**Comment [A33]:** Don't call it "trivial"

**Comment [A34]:** Actually, it was NOT. The left came very slowly to gay marriage

Of course, the reason the left loves pelvic issues so much is that if you give people freedom over wine, women and song they tend to acquire the illusion that they are free in other aspects of life, too. That's why so many people think they're libertarians. So it was fine all the while the left was telling people they could put anything into their bodies they wanted, because that permissiveness appealed to readers, listeners, consumers and voters who didn't notice that they were being taxed oppressively, regulated minutely and manipulated in countless other ways.

**Comment [A35]:** Unclear

**Comment [A36]:** Baseless charge

It was a conservative thinker, Robert Nisbet, who figured this out. He says it goes back to the French Revolution. If you can live like the Marquis de Sade, who cares if Robespierre's in charge?

**Comment [A37]:** Citation needed

Anyway, starting sometime around the 1990s~~back then~~, the cultural left began to be was unquestionably in power -- not just in terms of their dominance of mainstream politics, but also

in their dominance of the media, academia, and entertainment. ~~Once on the fringes, the New Left~~

**Comment [A38]:** See suggestion on page 41

~~had become the establishment. They now possessed that most dangerous of combinations—a great deal of power, and nothing obvious to use it on.~~

~~That's not for lack of effort.~~ Seriously, you have to hand it to them. These guys put the work in. I do admire leftists' energy levels. If I had to spend all day screaming and crying, blaming made-up concepts like the "patriarchy" for my failure and defending Barack Obama, I'd be exhausted. Modern American liberals took ~~Orwell's "two minutes hate" from 1984~~ and turned it into 24 hours.

**Comment [A39]:** Expand to refresh the memories of readers who don't remember the book well

How do they do it? Is it the corn syrup in their Kellogg's breakfast obesity bowl?

Maybe I've stumbled onto the real reason they love Starbucks so much.

### ~~Rebel Artists~~

**Comment [A40]:** This section is superfluous. After the long dry explanation of Gramsci, it would be better to go to the next section, which is "Why the Left Hates YOU."

~~In addition to bullying the public for not liking the right movies, books, and video games, the left also started to bully artists for creating them. You can always tell that an ideology has accumulated too much power when artists are afraid of it. And you can always tell that an ideology has not only accumulated too much power, but also gone loopy, barmy, wacky, and just round the bend insane when people are afraid of wearing sombreros at parties. Social justice warriors have become so unhinged that even Amanda Bynes would advise them to seek help.~~

~~"Cultural appropriation" is the buzzword that the left currently uses to torment people it accuses of disrespecting other cultures. White girls wearing dreadlocks are a particularly popular target, as are college fancy dress parties, where ponchos mean peril and heads will roll if you roll in a headdress. Wearing the garb, or dancing the dances, or even writing from the perspective of another culture is a grave act of neo-colonial oppression, we are told.~~

Strangely, we never hear much outrage over Asians wearing business suits, Santa being black, or the Gulf States building skyscrapers and McDonalds restaurants—oh wait, that’s cultural *imperialism*, isn’t it? It’s so easy to get confused with all these social justice concepts. Why, if I didn’t know better, I might conclude that they’re just an excuse to paint white men as history’s eternal villains.

One particularly amusing example of a “cultural appropriation” panic occurred in July 2015, when Boston’s Museum of Fine Arts announced “Kimono Wednesdays,” in which visitors were encouraged to pose in Kimonos next to Claude Monet’s painting 1876 “La Japonaise,” which depicts the artist’s wife in a similar outfit. Local leftists found the prospect of whiteys dressing up in oriental outfits outrageous, and promptly conducted a sit-in at the museum.

But, hilariously, the (mostly white, college-age) protesters soon found themselves joined by counter-protesters who, by contrast, were actually Japanese. According to the *Boston Globe*, the counter-protesters carried signs welcoming others to share in Japanese culture. Among the counter-protesters was Etsuko Yashiro, a 53-year-old Japanese emigrant who helps organize Boston’s Japan Festival. Yashiro told the *Globe* that she was “disappointed with the other side,” and reportedly blamed the incident on the protesters’ youth. Other local Japanese residents were similarly befuddled. The Deputy Consul General of Japan in Boston, Jiro Usui, told the *Globe* “We actually do not quite understand what their point of protest is.”<sup>3</sup> You and me both, Jiro.

Few things betray the short-sighted, joyless, anti-human stupidity of the left as much as cultural appropriation. Virtually every book, film, play, video game, and work of art is the result of a long history of cultural appropriation. The *Final Fantasy* series borrows from George Lucas, who borrowed from Akira Kurosawa, who borrowed from Dostoyevsky and Shakespeare.

**Comment [A41]:** This is a good point—maybe include in at a later point in the book

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.bostonglobe.com/arts/2015/07/18/counter-protesters-join-kimono-fray-mfa/ZgVWIT3yiZSIQgxCghAOFM/story.html>



Without appropriation, culture as we know it would not exist. Civilization would resemble a Nickelback album—a barren wasteland, odious, asinine, anodyne and void of greatness.

The attempt to stifle cultural expression gotten so bad that even leftists are getting sick of it. Lionel Shriver, author of *We Need To Talk About Kevin*, is one of the most accomplished leftist authors in the world. In 2010, she authored *So Much For That*, a book about a man who has to sell his business and give up his dreams to pay for his sick wife's healthcare costs, is essentially a critique of the pre-Obamacare, American model of privatized healthcare in fictionalized form.

Yet even Shriver has figured out that something has gone terribly, disastrously wrong with the left's embrace of identity politics. Her keynote speech at the Brisbane Writers' Festival in September 2016, which she delivered wearing a sombrero, was an evisceration of the left's new obsessions—identity, cultural appropriation, and feelings. She went as far as to call the identitarian left the “culture police” and announced a sincere desire for them to go away soon.

I am hopeful that the concept of “cultural appropriation” is a passing fad: people with different backgrounds rubbing up against each other and exchanging ideas and practices is self-evidently one of the most productive, fascinating aspects of modern urban life.

Shriver also committed what is, for a leftist, an unforgivable sin: she explained the actual reason for the rise of Donald Trump.

[T]he left's embrace of gotcha hypersensitivity inevitably invites backlash. Donald Trump appeals to people who have had it up to their eyeballs with being told what they can and cannot say. Pushing back against a mainstream culture of speak-no-evil suppression, they lash out in defiance, and then what they say is pretty appalling.<sup>4</sup>

In doing so, Shriver also figured out why *I'm* so popular. Do you think anyone would put up with me if it wasn't for the left? I'm unbearable!

Shriver's speech was an important moment, due to her stature in the world of left-wing literature. But she was just the first of many liberal-leaning creators who, as they begin to feel its culturally suffocating grip, have begun to speak out against the regressive left. Other renowned authors, like my literary hero Bret Easton Ellis, have also spoken up.<sup>5</sup> They've been joined by movie directors like Eli Roth, music stars like Phil Labonte, and a host of nominally left-leaning comedians like Chris Rock, Jerry Seinfeld, and Ricky Gervais.<sup>6</sup>

The imagination cannot help but rebel against the shackles that the regressive left would seek to put on it. The cultural libertarian revolution is only just beginning. We will see many more Lionel Shriviers speaking out in the years to come.

### **Why the Left Hates You**

So what does this mean for you?

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/sep/13/lionel-shriviers-full-speech-i-hope-the-concept-of-cultural-appropriation-is-a-passing-fad>

<sup>5</sup> <http://reason.com/blog/2016/08/04/brett-easton-ellis-unloads-on-social-just>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-hollywood/2015/07/20/enough-entire-entertainment-industry-says-no-more-to-social-justice-warriors/>

The priorities of the modern left are very different to those of the old. Because of their intellectual pedigree in the angry, victim-centric doctrine of Cultural Marxism, the left is committed to defending a worldview which arranges women, minorities, and gays in a pyramid of oppression, with straight white males (as the least oppressed) at the bottom! It's a transformation so stark, not even Rachel Dolezal or Caitlyn Jenner would dare attempt it. If you know anything about classical Marxism, it's pretty easy to understand -- straight white males are the "bourgeoisie," the group oppressing everyone else.

**Comment [A42]:** See pyramid reference on page 51. You construct this metaphor very badly, especially when you reverse the pyramid on page 29.

This means that, despite facing their own unique problems, men, and especially white working-class men, are routinely ignored by the leftist political class. Any attempts to address their issues are usually met with outrage. Only this year, when the British conservative MP Philip Davies gave a speech at a conference on men's issues, the reaction of feminists in the left-wing labour party was to demand he be suspended from his party. As for whites, any attempt to organize is usually received by the mainstream as the very revival of Nazism, despite the fact that much of such organizing activity today comes as a response to a culture that appears to hate them.

**Comment [A43]:** Unclear

Popular culture, dominated by the left, is instructive. Movies are filled with petty, mean-spirited jabs at straight white males. There's a huge trend of movies that seek to channel white guilt over slavery, with movies like, *Django Unchained*, *10 Years A Slave* and *MLK*. The villains in these movies - always white males - get progressively more sadistic and irredeemable.

Strangely, there are no movies about Ottoman or Middle Eastern slave-owners!

I suppose we'll have to wait for Muslim guilt to become a thing.

It's feminist movies, though, where you really see the mean-spiritedness. The *Ghostbusters* reboot was perhaps the first movie I've watched that appears to have been written

entirely out of spite. Bill Murray gets chucked out of the window in the first 30 minutes, the villain is an incompetent white male secretary, and the movie seems to take a jab at men every second. The petty identity politics also came out in the movie's marketing, which featured male director Paul Feig getting on his hands and knees on the red carpet before being mock stepped on by the film's all-female cast. Can you imagine a similar stunt, with reversed genders? The press would seethe with outrage for weeks.

One of the reasons die-hard fans hated the new *Ghostbusters* is that its politics were cynically inverted. In the original movie, the bad guys weren't the ghosts. Everybody loves Slimer and the Stay Puft Marshmallow Man. The bad guys were the clueless bureaucrats in the government, who set off a supernatural crisis through bumbling and red tape. The feminist version, the enemy is all mankind. Every man in the movie is malevolent, moronic or both. To add insult to injury, the Ghostbusters end up getting government funding at the end. Like all feminists, they can only survive by clamping themselves to the government teat.

With straight white males having replaced the bourgeoisie as the hated oppressor class of the left, they've become fair game for smug champagne socialists in entertainment and the media. That's why you routinely see movies, stand-up routines, songs and *Guardian* columns about straight white men that would be classified as hate speech if they were directed against any other group in society.

Jokes about white men are currently in vogue. White men can't dance, jump or fuck but if you dare crack a joke that black women are loud, Asian women can't drive, Latinas are maids that steal, sleeping with black man will ruin your credit score, or Asian men make bad porn stars and you'll receive more opprobrium and lawsuits than Michael Jackson after one of his kids-only sleepovers.

**Comment [A44]:** These points are stronger without gratuitous insult and teat reference

**Comment [A45]:** Move this section to the Ghostbusters section on page 35

The new, identity-driven left doesn't just hate only white men. One of the consequences of replacing the old working-class-/bourgeoisie dichotomy with the myriad identities of intersectional theory is that everything has become much more complicated. Yes, straight white males are the most oppressive/worst offenders at the top of the pyramid, but how do you order everyone else? Are Muslims oppressing women or are women oppressing Muslims? Is a disabled black man oppressed more than an able-bodied black woman? And wWhat do we do about white males who are gays?

**Comment [A46]:** Define this phrase earlier

**Comment [A47]:** See "bottom of the pyramid" reference on page 49

The result of dividing their political coalition into a smorgasbord of victim groups is a tragicomic battle for the bottom (also the name given to my warring ex-boyfriends), with each group's advocates fighting to be more oppressed than the other. You see this on social media all the time -- "white feminists" are attacked by intersectionalists for not being ethnic enough, and thus not being oppressed enough. Or, using the illogical luciferian logic of the left, they are criticized for being too ethnic, which of course is cultural appropriation.

**Comment [A48]:** Smorgasbords don't have bottoms—you're not making this point very well

**Comment [A49]:** Superfluous here

**Comment [A50]:** Undefined

Anyone who knows basic social psychology could have seen what was going to happen. Since the 1970s, social psychologists have been aware that emphasising differences between groups leads to mistrust and hostility. In a series of landmark experiments, the psychologist Henri Tajfel found that even wearing different-colored shirts was enough for groups to begin displaying signs of mistrust.

So guess what happens when you tell everyone that their worth, their ability, their right to speak on certain subjects and – shudder – their "privilege" is based on what they were born with, rather than any choices they've made or who they are?

Here's what you get: -is the modern left. -Blacks fighting gays fighting lesbians fighting trans fighting everyone else. It's the iron law of victimhood-driven identity politics: Someone has to win, and everyone else has to lose.

Progressive identity politics ignores basic human realities. Being yourself out there in public, on social media and in culture, is an act of violence towards somebody. If you live authentically as yourself as an adult, there will be repercussions. Not everyone will like you. People will be cruel to you on Twitter. Some people may even want you dead. This is a fact of life and it is not changed by all the "abuse and harassment" policies in all of Silicon Valley.

**Comment [A51]:** Clarify—what is "being yourself out there"? And how is it an "act of violence"?

People will hurt you in unspeakable ways just for being who you are. That is the price you pay for being you out there in public.

**Comment [A52]:** How?

Progressives will never understand this. Or, if they do, they don't care -- and instead simply pick who to protect (transgender sexualities, Muslims and lonely hambeasts in their thirties) and who to throw to the wolves (the rest of us).

**Comment [A53]:** Don't use "frannies" here—it just derails your argument

And, NO, that's NOT the point. Not here.

**Comment [A54]:** Define

Identity politics is universally attractive because it enables failures and weaknesses to be spun as the products of oppression and historical injustice. The primary victims of it are the designated "oppressor class," for whom it can be humiliating and deeply unfair. Take MTV's *White People*, a documentary highlighting a handful of cherry-picked examples aimed to demonstrate "white privilege" in action. It's an hour of television designed to produce discomfort in those with the wrong skin color. (

**Comment [A55]:** This paragraph seems to contradict above grafs on identity politics

Safe to say, it'll be a while before we see *Black People* on our screens.)

But the great tragedy is that this also pits minority group against minority group. If the last ten years in the public square were defined by women ridiculing, criticising and demeaning men, the next ten are going to be even more depressing, and even more socially divisive.

Welcome to the era of Minority Wars.

It sounds laughably ironic, but the modern leftist movement has argued itself into a position where people can be discriminated against on the basis of gender, skin color and orientation.

That's why you hear dismissive and in some cases even vituperative comments about "straight white males" in the media today: men are being ridiculed for things they cannot change about themselves. And it's the political left doing the discrimination.

The future of the progressive movement will be akin to the nightmarish community of grievance-bloggers on Tumblr, where minorities, both real and imagined, engage in an endless competition for supreme victimhood status.

This is why the left probably hates *you* too—even if you aren't a straight white male.

If you're gay, they'll ask what your skin color is.

If you're black, they'll ask if you're a woman.

If you're a woman, they'll ask you to stop worrying about Muslim rapists, you racist!

**Comment [A56]:** Clarify. All second things in the list are things you're born with, except for women: they worry.

And take those culturally appropriated bangles off at once!

If you happen to fit into every conceivable minority group, heaven help you if your opinions do not precisely follow political orthodoxy.

Rod, a comedian who hosts the podcast "The Black Guy Who Tips," jokingly tweeted on August 25, 2016, "Straight black men are really the white people of black people." Amazingly, one social justice leftist agreed with him, tweeting back: "Absolutely correct analogy. They think we act speak the same oppressive patriarchal language only difference, race is removed."

**Comment [A57]:** Is this accurate?

The modern left is an ouroboros, the ancient Egyptian serpent that eats its own tail, constantly eating itself in a twisted, never-ending cycle of victimhood and hatred. No matter how nice they are to you when they're focusing on your particular group's causes, they liberals will always find a way to shame you about some your-alleged "privilege."

No matter who you are, they'll find a way to shame/hate you.

**Comment [A58]:** Insert an example

And if they can't win by public hate and shame, they rage, quit and flounce off. Or at least threaten to: was any spectacle more entertaining in 2016 than the sight of all those celebrities walking back their promises to leave the country if Donald Trump was elected?

To the typical actor, threatening to leave the United States over the election was just another set of lines to read. Like proclaiming during a performance of *Henry V*, "Once more into the breach, dear friends, once more into the breach," -threats to leave the US were never meant to be real. A Trump presidency was supposed to be as likely as Jon Stewart holding the city of Harfleur under siege.

Did you notice, by the way, that these stropywhiny -celebs uniformly threatened to move to overwhelmingly white countries? Even Snoop Dogg, who promised to move to Africa, said he would only go to South Africa. Imagine the chutzpah and obliviousness it takes to call working-class Americans racist while you plan to move to Canada if your candidate loses.

**Comment [A59]:** Let's not call South Africa "white."

If it wasn't Canada, it was New Zealand, Australia or another primarily white, English-speaking country. Why not Mexico or the Gambia? It turns out that the Hollywood Left is even more racist than the high-level Nazis, many of whom settled in — shock, horror! — South American compounds after fleeing Germany.

**Comment [A60]:** I don't like using Nazi analogies. Ever. Let other people do that.

Of course, I'm forgetting the new definition of racist we have to use now. Everything is racist, provided you're a straight white male. Donald Trump -- and before him, Margaret



Thatcher -- ~~were~~as both right when they said that identity politics and name calling is what people they do when they don't have any arguments left.

### So Why DOES the Left Hate Us? Rebel Minorities

For ~~the old left,~~ there was only one group of people more despised than the bourgeoisie: scabs.

**Comment [A61]:** Specify how old. 1930s? 1960s?

"Scab" was a derogatory word used by unionized workers to describe strikebreakers: members of the working class who, during a strike, decided ~~that forcing unionized industries to give them a pay rise every week might not be entirely reasonable, or that feeding their families took priority over an abstract idea of left-wing solidarity.~~

**Comment [A62]:** Scab analogy in this whole section needs clarification

The left loathed scabs with a passion that far exceeded their hatred for the bourgeoisie. After all, the bourgeoisie were just following their interests when they cut pay and demanded lower taxes. But by not following the marching orders given to them by the left, scabs were allegedly betraying theirs.

~~So the word "scab" itself became an insult so damning that no amount of denial or explanation could expiate it. Once branded a scab, you and your family were scabs for life.~~

**Comment [A63]:** Add something like this to make clear that the name-calling was irrevocable, even before the Internet

Just as the old left invented words to describe people who betrayed their so-called "class interests," so too does the new left employ a range of slurs to describe women and minorities who don't toe their line--;

Blacks who suggest that killing policemen and burning local businesses might not be in their best interests are "coons," "Uncle Toms" and "House N\*\*\*ers."

Women who think that abandoning the rule of law on college campuses might not be the best idea are accused of "internalised misogynists."

Then there's the old fallback of the "self-hater," which can be applied to virtually any identity group. ~~Meanwhile white men can make entire careers by promoting how they're "woke," a "male feminist," or a "straight ally" even if they're totally unappealing and have no talent whatsoever. (See: Macklemore.)~~

**Comment [A64]:** This sentence is completely unclear.

No prizes then, for guessing why the left hates me so much. As I mentioned at the start of this chapter, —I'm gay, I'm metropolitan, and I've had more black men ~~in~~ on me than a college basketball team. Yet I'm not one of them. ~~I get the "self-hating gay" and "gay Uncle Tom" variants on a daily basis. But I am who I am, to quote a musical, "I am large, I contain multitudes," to quote Walt Whitman. I grew up listening to Wagner operas and shooting my dad's guns. I'm not aware of a specific term for the type of modern-day scab I am, although I get the "self-hating gay" and "gay Uncle Tom" variants on a daily basis.~~

**Comment [A65]:** Since this is inflammatory, don't toss it off casually. Use it only when you're able to discuss it.

I'm hoping that the modern left will in the future describe allegedly self-hating gays simply as "Milos." Can't be too long now!

~~Of course, the analogy with scabs doesn't really work, because at least it was easy to demonstrate the economic consequences of a worker breaking a strike, and how breaking a strike could, rightly or wrongly, impact the pay of other workers. It's much less easy to explain how I'm damaging my own team by pointing out that Muslims are a bigger threat to gays than Christian bakery owners.~~

**Comment [A66]:** This just weakens the whole section. If the analogy "doesn't really work," don't make it.

My existence infuriates the left, not ~~only~~ just because I debunk their myths with style, wit and humor that outclasses anything they've ever encountered, but also because their usual smears don't work on me. Feminists can't accuse me of suspect motives, because I'm not interested in women in anything other than an academic sense. ~~I certainly don't need them for fashion advice.~~

**Comment [A67]:** Doesn't land.

I can't be accused of being homophobic -- only that laughable charge of "self-hatred," which most ordinary people accused of it instinctively react to with an eye-roll. And, given my penchant for black men citizens of the dark continent, I can't be accused of being racist either. I'm the left's very worst nightmare.

**Comment [A68]:** Rephrase this "Dark continent" will irritate in the wrong way. It sounds like "darkies"

**Comment [A69]:** MAJOR POINT: Having sex with black people does not prove someone is racist. You will have to address the charge of racism clearly and with greater depth, preferably early in the book when you discuss Leslie Jones more fully

I'm also particularly terrifying to the left because of what I represent: a repeat of the 1980s, when workers across Britain and the United States turned to Reaganism and Thatcherism. The left are worried, you see, that I might not be the only dissident minority.

They're afraid you might agree with me.

They're afraid that, just as their old base abandoned them to become conservative-voting "Reagan Democrats" in the U.S. and "Essex Men" in the U.K., and the "Reagan Democrats" in the U.S., so too will a new wave of dissident women and minorities break apart their new coalition.

And you know what: They're right.

Women and minorities aren't idiots, and even with the left's impressive dominance of culture and education, they're starting to realize that the identity politics they champion are morally and empirically bankrupt.

One of the reasons the left reacted so hysterically to GamerGate, for example, was because so many female and minority gamers joined the fight. Rallying under the hashtag "#NotYourShield," groups that the left took for granted like gays, African-Americans, the disabled, and women stood up and told left-wing journalists to stop speaking on their behalf.

**Comment [A70]:** This will be astonishing news to your critics, who think that ALL minority groups are against you. Prove the point here or in the Gamers chapter

Rabid Social Justice Warriors considered #NotYourShield to be a "worse tag than #GamerGate itself," a highly revealing comment.<sup>7</sup> Other left-wing journalists made similarly disparaging comments, or, more commonly, ignored the tag entirely, pretending instead that GamerGate was

**Comment [A71]:** You also need to return to this topic in the Gamers chapter. Do you realize that you fail to bring up #NotYourShield even ONCE in that chapter?

**Comment [A72]:** Check source

<sup>7</sup> [https://twitter.com/arthur\\_affect/status/523908548913164288?lang=fil](https://twitter.com/arthur_affect/status/523908548913164288?lang=fil)

an exclusively white male uprising. Wishful thinking, but the thing about wishful thinking is that it lets you know what someone's deepest wishes are.

And the left's deepest wishes is that we rebel minorities didn't exist.

Nothing terrifies the left so much as the thought of their cherished identity classes going off the reservation. That's why they reacted so hysterically - or in many cases, so silently - to

#NotYourShield. It's why a black rapper repeatedly called *Breitbart* journalist Jérôme Hudson a "coon" for disagreeing with Black Lives Matter. And it's why I've been called a "self-hating" er, a gay Uncle Tom, and an internalized homophobe, as well as and every other absurd stand-in for "class traitor" you can imagine.

**Comment [A73]:** Needs citation

But there's another reason that you and I terrify the left: in addition to challenging their dominance of designated victim classes, I also represent to another constituency the left has long taken for granted:— the young.

The left needs ideological shock troops to propagate its ideas, and none have been more useful to them than impressionable young people, who eagerly take up left-wing causes out of their natural inclination to make an impact on the world.

Like the generals of World War One, the left convinces young people that they're going to be heroes. In reality, they end up being indoctrinated into the wackiest, flimsiest ideas that never stand up to scrutiny, challenge, or contact with the real world, leaving them disappointed, disillusioned, and angry. The left puts its foot soldiers in the intellectual equivalent of the Somme -- running at my machine guns armed with bayonets. No wonder they start running to their bunkers when they hear me coming!

**Comment [A74]:** Don't overlay your analogy

But the left's hold on the mind of young people is weakening -- and I am happy to be a leading cause. In addition to my efforts to support millennial gamers, my "Dangerous Faggot" tour is rapidly mobilizing a new breed of dissident student.

For too long, conservatives have relied on pundits whose audience is primarily over 60. ~~Some political strategists consider this an advantage, because old people vote more. This is true, but they also die more!~~

I am one of the few conservative pundits of my generation whose audience is filled with primarily under 30. ~~In fact, I increasingly find that my younger fans are barely pushing 15. Many~~ Young people are sick of being lectured to by the increasingly schoolmarmish left, and are looking for standard-bearers. The left is terrified that I might be that standard-bearer -- and rightly so. Without an endless supply of their eager young activists, the left is nothing.

I'm more than just an outrageous faggot who spits uncomfortable facts at easily-triggered lefties. I'm a cultural movement. For hundreds of thousands of students, attending my talks, reading my columns, watching my videos, and wearing my SWAG By Milo gear<sup>8</sup> has become the ultimate statement of rebellion. ~~And why wouldn't it?~~

In an age where progressives have succeeded in their long march through the left's cultural institutions, they've become the establishment. And young people have always been ~~are~~ nothing if not instinctively anti-establishment.

Authoritarian liberals have become so comfortable that their arguments have degenerated entirely into rhetoric and slogans -- whereas during the Obama years, libertarians and conservatives were forced to develop a stronger basis in fact ~~during the Obama years~~. It was only a matter of time before Trump and Milo appeared to add the individual touches ~~same kind of~~ rhetorical flourish and star power to the freedom-loving conservative vision of the world.

<sup>8</sup> Available at [www.swagbymilo.com](http://www.swagbymilo.com) while stocks last

And you can see how liberals~~they~~ respond when their backs are against the wall: with hate, because they've forgotten how to argue. We represent something liberals~~they~~ simply cannot bear and something they're afraid they cannot beat.

## WHY THE ALT-RIGHT HATES ME

**Comment [A75]:** I think it's important to put this chapter up front.

The Alt-Right hates me more than you liberals do. White supremacists want me dead.

To the people who are proud to call themselves white supremacists, I am a “kike faggot” and a “disease-ridden Jew.” But to NBC News and *USA Today* I am a “white nationalist leader.”

Anyone who calls me a white supremacist has no understanding whatsoever of what white supremacy is.

This chapter will tell you what it is and what I'm not.

**Comment [A76]:** Begin this chapter with something startling like this.

\*\*\*

In late November 2016, *Bloomberg Businessweek* published their annual “Jealousy List,” a collection of “stories we wish we’d done this year -- and don’t want you to miss.” The list included predictable names: *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, as well as BuzzFeed and Deadspin. And then, not-so-predictable, was Breitbart.

And it wasn’t just any Breitbart article either. *Bloomberg* specifically chose “An Establishment Conservative’s Guide to the Alt-Right,” the whopping 5,000-word explainer on the controversial movement written by Allum Bokhari and myself. In addition to singling out the piece as one of the best of the year and implicitly acknowledging they would have liked to have published it themselves, *Bloomberg* economics editor Peter Coy said he had “learned something” from the piece.

I will dispense with my usual humility, and admit that *Bloomberg* ~~was~~ completely correct to pick our piece. In March 2016, when Allum and I published our trailblazing explanation of the movement that had taken over social media, there was little commentary, and no trace of an authoritative definition of the emerging alt-right in the media beyond the usual hysterics and moral panic that, like clockwork, accompanies the rise of any popular new right-wing movement.

The Daily Beast described it as a “White Power movement,” which was not true. National Review portrayed them as embittered members of the white-working class, which was also not true. “Thuggish alt-right Trumpers” were the words used by Red State, another conservative outlet, that wrote in Sarkeesian-like terms about their penchant of these people for online trolling. BuzzFeed, perhaps the most accurate of them all, described them as a “white nationalist movement” where “rare pepes... are common.”

**Comment [A77]:** Identify for readers who do not know

**Comment [A78]:** Explain for readers who do not know

BuzzFeed also quoted lawyer Ken White, who lamented that it was “really hard to tease out the genuine white nationalists from the trolls,” but added that “at a certain point the distinction isn’t meaningful.”

Well, we thought that the distinction was very meaningful.

There’s a world of difference between someone telling jokes about forbidden topics to wind up stuffy establishment conservatives and whiny social-justice warriors, someone who’s debating forbidden topics, and someone like Richard Spencer, who genuinely wants a “peaceful ethnic cleansing” of the United States.

**Comment [A79]:** “Genuinely” is the wrong word here—makes it sound as if you’re okay with that

And, indeed, ~~†~~ There’s even an important distinction between Spencer and Neo-Nazis who gleefully encourage a coming race war ~~too~~. Both groups—the white nationalists and the neo-Nazis



look over this ill-defined term “alt-right,” and soon the initial people who enjoyed the label were being accused of sins they did not commit.

**Comment [A80]:** Add something like this here to clarify that the movement was invaded

It’s always anti-intellectual to substitute moral outrage for genuine understanding, but sadly, that was the approach taken by many otherwise-sensible commentators towards the alt-right when it first emerged. This was grossly unfair: in its early days, before the white-nationalist faction solidified its control over the movement, the alt-right included a member base as diverse as disaffected Tea Party supporters and 18-year old memesters who were curious, as all young people are, at a movement that defied so many taboos.

There are even Jews who still identify with the alt-right<sup>9</sup>

**Comment [A81]:** Check source

To deny the movement’s complexity in a frantic effort to virtue-signal, as so many columnists on the left and right did, was an act of supreme intellectual dishonesty.

**Comment [A82]:** Explain for readers who do not know the term

It was also wholly unjust to the younger members of the movement, who are perhaps the first young members of a generation to be denied a chance to experiment with dangerous ideas and not have their reputations tarnished forever. Their flirtation with the alt-right is nowhere near as deplorable as the youth of the 60s and 70s, who joined violent terrorist groups like the Red Faction (*Baader-Meinhof*) in Germany and the Weather Underground in the United States. Those who did not join them openly cheered them on.

Surprise surprise, if you join a left-wing extremist organization, your life is not going to be ruined. Many of the young terrorists of the 1970s now enjoy cushy professorships at leading institutions of higher learning. Wander into Columbia University, and you might find yourself in a class led by adjunct professor Kathy Boudin, a former Weather Underground terrorist who served 20 years in jail for assisting in the murder of two policemen of the Nyack, New York police department, including the first black officer in the precinct.

<sup>9</sup> <http://forward.com/subscribe/348466/im-a-jew-and-im-a-member-of-the-alt-right/>

Even before her release, the *Harvard Educational Review* was publishing her articles.

If you were in London and on the campus of the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in May 2002, you might have bumped into Leila Khaled, who was being hosted for a talk there<sup>10</sup>. What did Khaled do in her youth? Draw a picture of Pepe the Frog in a Hitler uniform, perhaps? No, nothing so grievous as that -- she just hijacked a plane on behalf of the Palestinian Liberation Organization in 1969.

And of course, if you were a student at the University of Illinois in the early 2000s, you may well have found yourself taught by Obama associate<sup>11</sup> William Charles "Bill" Ayers, an unreformed communist and co-founder of the Weather Underground, the same organization that inspired the murder of two policemen described above, as well as dozens of terrorist attacks on targets ranging from police precincts to the Pentagon.

Still, on the other hand, he never compared a black person to Harambe on Twitter.

You may say that neither ex-terrorists nor people who unrepentantly make racist jokes should be teaching college students. But that's not the paradigm we're operating with now, is it? And as long as we play the mainstream media's game, spending more of our attention treating **harmless memesters** as a greater moral outrage than Bill Ayers' professorships, we'll never get there either.

**Comment [A83]:** If the memesters sent the Harambe pictures, they were not "harmless." WHO DID WHAT must be made clear in your INITIAL explanation of the Leslie Jones story.

I have no sympathy for Ayers and others who took part in and directed terrorist violence in the 70s. Still, though, I'd be sympathetic to someone who hung a Weather Underground or P.L.O flag in their dorm-room in their youth because of the rebellious appeal they had in the that era. Young people have always dabbled in radical, dangerous ideas, and so long as such dabbling was only a phase and did not extend into violence, they shouldn't be punished for it later in life.

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.city-journal.org/html/terrorist-returns-9942.html>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2012/06/04/obama-ayers/>

Maajid Nawaz, former member of the Islamist group Hizb Ut-Tahrir and now one of the world's finest intellectuals and anti-extremist campaigners is an example of why we should ~~look~~ be lenient about what people do in their youth.

Those are the people, ~~which~~ Allum and I described as the “memesters” in our taxonomy of the alt-right, and those are the people that I will always speak up for. Because as a walk through the past of some of America's most notorious left-wing professors shows us, there are lot worse things you could do in your youth than shock *National Review* writers on Twitter.

As many realized during the election, *National Review* needed a little shocking.

### **Everyone's tThe Alt-Right Declares a Holy Crusade—Against Me**

Still, I didn't for a second expect the mainstream media to understand that. They had a different agenda: Let's —turn the alt-right into a synonym for “Neo-Nazi,” and then accuse everyone we they don't didn't like of being a member of the movement! It was an old game, one we've seen many times before, and it was growing exceedingly tedious.

Their first target was me.

Thanks to offering the only even-handed analysis of the alt-right, the mainstream media decided was to crown me queen of the movement, even though I never claimed to be a member, and even though I have frequently been informed by its more ardently racist elements that they don't want a “racemixing kike faggot” like myself at the head of their movement anyway.

The only people who want me at the head of the alt-right are the mainstream media, who have variously described me as a “leader,” a “self-proclaimed leader” and a “face” of the movement. These include NPR, the BBC, Bloomberg, The Daily Beast, *The Daily Telegraph*, *Prospect*, London's *Evening Standard*, *The New Republic*, and many, many more.

They're all wrong -- no matter how visually appealing my face is, the alt-right joins campus crybabies, the morbidly obese, and the Muslim Brotherhood as one of the few groups in America that does not want me associated with them. Perhaps some of the younger, less serious memesters wouldn't mind, but the hardline, white supremacists are unequivocal.

"I am hereby declaring a Holy Crusade against Milo Yiannopoulos, who is the single greatest threat our movement has at this time" wrote *Daily Stormer* editor and 5-foot-2 skinhead Andrew Anglin last year. "He is our arch-nemesis. We need to stop this kike." (Anglin, ironically enough, is rumored to be Jewish.)

**Comment [A84]:** Confirm quote

Yes, the editor of the most extreme alt-right site on the web declared me the movement's "arch-nemesis."

Yet according to the mainstream media I'm still the leader of the movement! I am overjoyed that both infantile communists and internet Nazis hate my guts, but for the record I consider anyone who utters the phrase "horseshoe theory" to be a twat.

**Comment [A85]:** Too important a point to end in a crude quip.

Breitbart News was another target of the mainstream media, who repeatedly sought to pigeonhole as an "alt-right" platform after our former Executive Editor, Steve Bannon, joined the Trump campaign. Yes, Breitbart, where virtually our entire editorial department is Jewish, the same Breitbart that publishes the "Breitbart Jerusalem" vertical, is supposedly a platform for a movement that (according to the mainstream media) hates Jews and Israel.

The media's ultimate target was the incoming Trump administration, which is why they stepped up their attacks after Bannon was appointed to the campaign team. During the transition, as the establishment fought the populists for a seat round Trump's cabinet table, the media unleashed its full arsenal against Bannon and Breitbart. The Huffington Post and The Intercept published mind-bending "explainers" on how Bannon was somehow both anti-semitic and pro-

Israel. According to *The Independent*, Bannon was an “alt-right media baron” with “the ear of the president.” According to the L.A Times, the alt-right was actually “Steve Bannon’s fringe brand of conservatism.”

Once again, the Fake News media displayed its talent for spinning a web of lies across multiple publications.

But this was 2016, a year that unlike any other proved just how absurd, powerless, and reputationally bankrupt the media has become. Donald Trump ignored the media pressure (did anyone really believe he would do otherwise?) and named Bannon his White House Chief Strategist.

### **The Fringe Takes Over**

The media didn’t succeed in its main intention, which was delegitimizing the most effective right-wing individuals of modern times. However, they may have succeeded in killing the alt-right.

Given what it’s become, that might not be a bad thing.

In his praise of our guide to the alt-right, *Bloomberg Businessweek’s* Peter Coy said that he thought the movement was “in a darker place” in November 2016 than it had been in March, when we wrote our piece. He’s correct, it is, and that’s largely the fault of the mainstream media.

You see, if you call something Neo-Nazi for long enough, it will invariably attract actual Neo-Nazis.

The alt-right has always had a fringe element of Reich-loving NEEETs who describe the Holocaust as a “Holohoax” and want to ban “race-mixing.” When we wrote our guide to the alt-

Comment [A86]: Identify

right, these were just one of many factions in the alt-right, alongside dissident intellectuals, taboo-breaking kids, and instinctive social conservatives.

An Israel-supporting former Tea Party member was, in those days, just as likely to be drawn to the alt-right as a Richard Spencer devotee, because it was the most exciting, dynamic, and effective right-wing movement to emerge since the Tea Party in recent times. Even leftist outlets like BuzzFeed acknowledged its power to dominate the internet and influence the news cycle. I recall one week in September, shortly after Hillary Clinton's speech on the alt-right, where the national broadcast media would talk of little else than Pepe the Frog. (If you're wondering why largely apolitical trolls are attracted to the alt-right, this is it -- nothing tickles them more than getting the entire world to discuss one of their memes):

**Comment [A87]:** Pepe warrants a fuller explanation

But, largely thanks to the willingness of old-school conservatives to march in lockstep with the mainstream media, the alt-right gradually came to be dominated not by pranksters and trolls but by actual white nationalists. A turning point came shortly after Donald Trump's election victory, when Richard Spencer foolishly encouraged a room full of his supporters to "hail Tump," which three of their members promptly did -- with sieg heils.

Even nominal white identitarians like Paul "RamZPaul" Ramsey decided they'd had enough with the movement after that, and promptly disavowed it<sup>12</sup>. The remaining hangers-on lamely tried to rebrand the sieg heils as "Roman Salutes."

Sorry, no offence, but no-one's ever going to buy that.

I'm happy to tell the alt-right when they're being stupid, and this was one of those times.

<sup>12</sup> [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n8HBLX\\_khwQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n8HBLX_khwQ)

It's probably something you're going to see happen more often, as sane people abandon the movement. It increasingly looks like the only people left in the movement will be Holocaust-denying Richard Spencer fans and Daily Stormer readers.

Well, if that's the case then I want nothing to do with the movement -- and, presumably, they also want nothing to do with me.

The only "Jewish Question" I'm interested in finding the solution to is how to get more yarmulke-wearers checking the Republican box on election day.

### **R.I.P the Alt-Right?**

I'll continue to do what I always have when it comes to the alt-right -- report on them honestly. At the moment, they appear to be a movement in rapid decline, with all respectable elements falling away, to be replaced by media-hungry Bitcoin-Brownshirts who think people will believe them when they call sieg-heils "Roman Salutes." If you're managing to scare off people like RamZPaul, one of the most heretical pro-white identity commentators out there, then I'm pretty sure your movement isn't going to get beyond a few thousand autists people on the internet.

**Comment [A88]:** 'Autists' sounds like a mental health slur

Fellow degenerate race-mixer John Lennon once wrotesaid, "But if you go carrying pictures of Chairman Mao, you ain't going to make it with anyone anyhow." The alt-right is too stupid to figure out the same thing applies to if you go carrying pictures of Nazis.

**Comment [A89]:** Is this what you mean?

That doesn't mean the alt-right were all bad. They did more than perhaps any other movement to widen the boundaries of free speech, to the point where even I seem far less shocking and controversial by comparison. They played havoc with the mainstream media as

well as ~~nd~~ with establishment conservatives. ~~(T~~; the energy everyone ~~they~~ wasted trying to decipher Pepe the Frog and MAGA-hat wearing anime characters was extraordinary.!)

It was also unquestionably a dangerous movement, full of dangerous ideas and dangerous discussions. I wouldn't encourage any young person to join it now, but I fully understand those who did.

Ultimately, ~~it~~ should be a reminder, ~~then~~, that the censors never win. If dangerous ideas aren't to be found on university campuses or talk shows or debating competitions, then guess what -- people will go and find them on ~~4chan~~ instead.

**Comment [A90]:** Explain for non-initiated

If there's one thing the alt-right can teach us, it's that suppressing the dangerous is a waste of time.

More to the point -- and quite ironically -- it's also dangerous.



## 3

**WHY TWITTER HATES ME**

In May 2016, I challenged Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg, ~~or Mark Cuckerberg as we call him at Breitbart,~~ to a live debate. He had a good reason to say yes. At the time, Facebook was embroiled in the second-biggest political controversy in the world of tech that year. (The first, obviously, was my suspension from Twitter. But more about that in a bit.)

**Comment [A91]:** Gratuitous—and positions the chapter as one to be read ONLY by Breitbart fans

Facebook had been caught in a lie: its “Trending News” feature, ostensibly designed to provide users with a list of the most popular topics being discussed on the platform that day, was in fact being manipulated from the top down, by a group of editors who were as biased as any mainstream media newsroom.

Despite heralding a new age of free, unfiltered information in their early days, it seemed that the differences between new media and old media were not so great after all. Both were spoon-feeding information to their readers, deciding for the public what they should and shouldn't be allowed to see.

It wasn't supposed to be this way. Users of social media were promised that information would be free, with users choosing for themselves what information they received, and from whom. That's how it was at the start -- in the early years of Facebook, the idea of an editor deciding what information you most needed to see today was laughable. Equally, there was no algorithm deciding who saw what posts, when, and where. Instead, the system was simple -- users followed other users, and saw a list of their posts, updated in real-time. Beyond the block button, there was no filtering. If your friend made a post at 6:15 PM, you saw it at 6:15 PM. The

present system, where Facebook chooses what you see, when you see it, and how you see it, is a radical departure from that early, democratic ideal of the internet.

Of course, Facebook says they're just delivering content to users that is high-quality and relevant to their interests -- both politically neutral metrics. But it's not hard to predict what will happen when a company in one of the most progressive industries (tech), located in perhaps the most progressive city of America (San Francisco), trusts its staff to be politically neutral.

In May 2016, it was finally revealed that the inevitable had indeed happened -- Facebook was discriminating against topics of interest to conservatives on its "Trending News" feature. A former employee of the team told *Gizmodo* that in addition to neglecting conservative trends, the company also suppressed stories about itself while artificially promoting stories about the Black Lives Matter movement

According to *Gizmodo*, Facebook's team of "News Curators" were "told to select articles from a list of preferred media outlets that included sites like the New York Times, Time, Variety, and other traditional outlets. They would regularly avoid sites like World Star Hip Hop, The Blaze, and Breitbart, but were never explicitly told to suppress those outlets." A leaked document later confirmed that Facebook would check against a list of preferred mainstream outlets (including the BBC, the liberal-leaning *New York Times* and CNN, and FOX) before assigning a story "national-level importance."

Now, appearing on a list with World Star Hip Hop would normally light up my entire day. But I wanted it to happen *after* I succeed in my ambition to turn Lil Wayne gay, not before!

**Comment [A92]:** Is this an accurate description of what went on there or will it be disputed?

**Comment [A93]:** Superfluous joke

Facebook's policy of discrimination against conservatives wasn't mandated from the top down, but it didn't need to be. The truth is, Silicon Valley companies don't have to institute

policies of bias against conservatives from the top-down -- all they have to do is give minimal oversight to their overwhelmingly left-leaning employees.

And that's exactly what Facebook did. "We choose what's trending," a former employee told Gizmodo. "There was no real standard for measuring what qualified as news and what didn't. It was up to the news curator to decide."

The source told Gizmodo exactly what this meant for conservative news, and for progressive news. In short, the former was suppressed ("deep-sixed," according to internal Facebook jargon) while the latter was promoted.

Among the deep-sixed or suppressed topics on the list: former IRS official Lois Lerner, who was accused by Republicans of inappropriately scrutinizing conservative groups; Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker; popular conservative news aggregator the Drudge Report; Chris Kyle, the former Navy SEAL who was murdered in 2013; and former Fox News contributor Steven Crowder.

Meanwhile, according to the source, stories about progressive causes like Black Lives Matter were promoted, due to pressure from Facebook's left-leaning staff (they would also pressure Mark Zuckerberg to use Facebook to help swing the election for Hillary Clinton, and blame him for not doing enough after she lost-).

**Comment [A94]:** Do you have credible evidence for this?

Facebook got a lot of pressure about not having a trending topic for Black Lives Matter," the individual said. "They realized it was a problem, and they boosted it in the ordering. They gave it preference over other topics. When we injected it, everyone started

saying, ‘Yeah, now I’m seeing it as number one’.” This particular injection is especially noteworthy because the #BlackLivesMatter movement originated on Facebook, and the ensuing media coverage of the movement often noted its powerful social media presence.

Facebook’s political-bias scandal took place after Twitter’s. But because unlike Twitter, Facebook is actually important, it caused an instant response from politicians.

A stern letter from Senator Jim Thune, then Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, called on Facebook to explain itself ~~themselves~~.

“If Facebook presents its Trending Topics section as the result of a neutral, objective algorithm but is in fact subjective,” wrote Thune, then “Facebook’s assertion that it maintains ‘a platform for people and perspectives from across the political spectrum’ misleads the public.” A petition was also created by the Republican National Committee saying “Facebook Must Answer For Conservative Censorship.”

Shocked by the response, Facebook leapt into action -- they announced a whitewashing “internal report” (which of course found no wrongdoing at the company) and invited a bunch of establishment conservatives to a behind-closed-doors meeting at their Menlo Park headquarters to look like they were taking the right’s concerns seriously.

*Breitbart* also received an invitation to attend the meeting, but unlike S.E Cupp, Glenn Beck and other assorted ~~shits~~, we refused to attend. Instead, I asked Mark Zuckerberg to answer, in a live debate with me, to the only group who mattered -- the millions of ordinary conservatives who used his platform. He refused, of course.

**Comment [A95]:** Use another word here, not this one, which only insiders use

I’m a humble man -- take a walk if you’re still laughing more 30 seconds after reading that -- who can of course handle not receiving attention, so my response to Facebook’s snub was

characteristically gracious and mild. Along with Allum Bokhari, I wrote a series of stories exposing the wacky progressive views of Facebook's Trending News team<sup>13</sup>, leading to them all getting fired and replaced with a computer algorithm<sup>15</sup>. You're welcome.

The wonderful anti-Islam activist Pamela Geller, who was inexplicably banned from Facebook (and then reinstated, following *Breitbart* coverage<sup>16</sup>) following the Muslim terrorist attack in Orlando, Florida, is also not letting the matter of Facebook's bias stand. Geller is currently suing the company<sup>17</sup>, and in an article for *Breitbart*, she explained why.

I am sick and tired of the suppression of our speech. We are unable to engage in the public square. And yes, Facebook is the public square; it's where we connect. We have to fight for it. Shouting into the wilderness is not freedom of speech. My Facebook page has close to 300,000 followers, and combined with my pages (SIOA, SION, AFDI), the reach is another 100,000. It's a critical connection.

Facebook has immense power over organic media — the sharing of our information and news between friends and associates. I would say too much power. They're trying to change the people by restricting our access to information.

---

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/07/14/facebook-trending-editor-ben-wagner/>

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/07/15/facebook-trending-editor-jennifer-jenkins-race-isnt-real/>

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/08/27/entire-facebook-trending-news-team-fired-following-breitbart-coverage/>

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/06/14/pamela-geller-stop-islamization-america-reinstated-facebook-following-breitbart-story/>

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/07/13/pamela-geller-suing-facebook/>

Geller isn't alone. Gun shop owners<sup>18</sup>, immigration hawks<sup>19</sup>, and admins of right-wing meme pages<sup>20</sup> have also faced censorship from Facebook.

Yet, amazingly, out of the leading web companies, Facebook is perhaps the best of the bunch. The pattern exhibited by the platform is that of a company trying desperately to manage overly-progressive employees. A report from *The Wall Street Journal* revealed that in the middle of the campaign, Mark Zuckerberg faced pressure from his community standards team to censor content from Donald Trump, who they argued was engaging in "hate speech." The team even threatened to quit if Trump wasn't censored, but Zuckerberg, for all his flaws, reportedly held his ground<sup>21</sup>.

Zuckerberg also held his ground when faced with pressure to remove Trump supporter Peter Thiel from Facebook's board, releasing a statement in support of political diversity<sup>22</sup>.

We care deeply about diversity. That's easy to say when it means standing up for ideas you agree with. It's a lot harder when it means standing up for the rights of people with different viewpoints to say what they care about.

This doesn't make Zuckerberg special, I should add. Assuming this isn't a deception (remember, he once called his own users "dumb fucks" for trusting him with their personal data),

he's doing the bare minimum of what we expect from our social media companies -- he's

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/06/17/gun-trainers-store-owners-banned-quickly-reinstated-facebook-orlando/>

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/05/18/facebook-censoring-content-critical-immigration/>

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/05/21/facebook-bans-canadian-commentator-for-saying-it-targets-conservatives/>

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/10/21/report-facebook-employees-wanted-to-censor-hate-speech-from-trump-threatened-to-quit/>

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/california/2016/10/20/facebook-zuckerberg-defends-trump-supporter-peter-thiel/>

basically like a Jewish girl who moves in bed, shouldn't be a big deal but is considering the competition—providing people with a platform to air their opinions, without letting his personal politics get in the way.

**Comment [A96]:** Gets in the way of the point you're making—and is not even funny

And he's barely accomplishing that -- Facebook requires constant policing from the conservative media to keep the biases of their staff in check. On numerous occasions, wrongfully suspended accounts - like Pamela Geller's - have only been reinstated following coverage from *Breitbart*. Facebook only took concerns over its Trending News team seriously after the conservative media got involved, and only fired them after *Breitbart* reported on their biases.

Despite the fact that he is basically on their side—angry progressives aren't known to tolerate anything but intolerance when it comes to conservatives—Zuckerberg's feeble defence of political diversity, and his unwillingness to drop Peter Thiel from the company's board of directors were, for progressives, unforgivable. And so, after Trump's victory, the social media company quickly became their go-to scapegoat.

"Fake news," an invention of the mainstream media to excuse their declining influence, became a bludgeon with which they hoped to beat the freedom out of social media. "A lie can spread on Facebook before the truth has even been posted" screamed a panic piece published immediately after the election by *The Guardian*, the same newspaper that published article after article accusing FBI director James Comey of pro-Trump sympathies over the bureau's investigation of Hillary Clinton's email server.

**Comment [A97]:** No. You can't say this. It actually exists and is used on both sides of the political spectrum

**Comment [A98]:** This section needs to be cut or drastically altered. To deny the existence of fake news entirely is preposterous. Too many people have seen—and fallen for—fake news stories for this section to have even a shred of credibility. DELETE.

As I explain in my earlier chapter on the mainstream media (which you should have read already—stop cheating and skipping to the back!), the outcry over "fake news" was echoed by virtually every other mainstream publication, each with similarly dubious track records. It wasn't

**Comment [A99]:** If you want to discuss how the concept of "fake news" has been used by people to tar news they don't like as you do on page 143—THAT would be valuable. But you can't deny its existence. (It's even being used against you.)

just sinners casting stones, it was sinners casting stones while screwing the local priest's sister with a pentagram-patterned condom on the Church altar.

Facebook, already subject to internal pressure from its left-leaning workforce, caved almost immediately. Within six days of Trump's election victory, they as well as Google drew up plans to deny ad revenue to alleged "fake news" sites<sup>23</sup>. Just a month later, the platform announced it would add a warning label to supposedly "fake" stories on the social network—such stories to be determined by the mainstream media's favorite "neutral fact-checkers"—Snopes, FactCheck.org, Politifact, and ABC News.

Let that sink in for a moment. Even if you discount Politifact, which once took a metaphor from Donald Trump for Hillary Clinton's use of the program "BleachBit" to wipe her email server ("Hillary Clinton acid-washed her email server"), interpreted it literally, and rated it "100% false," that still leaves ABC News, home of former Clinton advisor George Stephanopoulos. Why not go all the way and add Salon.com's editorial team? Why not let Chelsea Clinton do it? She needs a job now that those paid speeches are drying up.

The mainstream media have succeeded at installing themselves as gatekeepers over the news system of Facebook, where, according to Pew, 66 percent of its 156.5 million-strong American userbase rely on as a news source<sup>24</sup>. This should worry us deeply.

For a while, it looked as though Facebook and its CEO might, left to their own devices, retain a semblance of political neutrality. But after Trump's victory, there was no way progressives were going to allow it to happen. Social media, once heralded as the democratizing disruptor of the old media, was now marching to their tune.

<sup>23</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/california/2016/11/16/google-facebook-to-defund-conservative-sites-as-fake-news/>

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.journalism.org/2016/05/26/news-use-across-social-media-platforms-2016/>



Even so, at least this can be said for Facebook: they had to be browbeaten into it. Some social media platforms didn't even need any bullying.

### **Back to Twitter**

*“That trunk of humours, that bolting-hutch of beastliness, that swollen parcel of dropsies, that huge bombard of sack, that stuffed cloak-bag of guts, that roasted Manningtree ox with pudding in his belly, that reverend vice, that grey Iniquity, that father ruffian, that vanity in years.”*

I'm glad I studied Shakespeare in high school, because it gives me no end of colorful words to describe Twitter and its Black Lives Matter-loving, sandal-wearing, hobo-chic CEO Jack Dorsey.

It's fitting that the quote I chose was from *All's Well That Ends Well, Henry IV, Part I* because ~~all is indeed ending well. Not for Twitter,~~ where its stock has declined almost 80 percent since 2014, and where user growth has been in stasis since 2013, but for the rest of us, who receive the news of the company's misfortunes with the grim satisfaction that karma, cosmic justice, or (as I like to call it) divine retribution is alive and well.

**Comment [A100]:** This is not from All's Well. It's from one of my favorite scenes with Prince Hal and Falstaff.

Twitter was once the most promising of the social media platforms that promised to usher in a new age of instant, democratic free expression. Its character limit~~ed~~ encouraged us to share our rapid-fire thoughts with the world, without a filter. In its early days, Twitter could justifiably claim that it showed us what was on the world's mind at any given moment.

And it was fun! It was fun to watch governments and politicians humbled in the face of the global citizenry's unmoderated opinions. It was fun to engage in the raucous back-and-forth between liberals, conservatives and libertarians, on a platform which, for a while at least, made no effort to force everyone into intellectually stifling filter bubbles comprised of people who think exactly the same way. It was the opposite of a safe space. It could embarrass governments, kill officially-mandated myths, and even topple dictators. It was *dangerous*. Naturally, I was a fan.

Twitter provided three things: freedom, fun, and the humbling of authority. So, naturally, it was only a matter of time before the left, which hates the former and loves the latter, decided to crash the party.

They became particularly motivated after they figured out how much its users loved me (really, it shouldn't have taken them as long as it did to figure that out!). In October 2015, Fusion was already referring to me as "the internet's biggest troll" with "terrifying allure" (both true) and when, a few months later, Twitter removed my "verified" badge, the Huffington Post congratulated the platform for "standing up for women online."<sup>25</sup>

Apparently I'm more dangerous to women than Charlie Sheen, who accidentally shot women, pulled knives on them and put them at risk of HIV. What am I going to do to a woman, tell her them to drop 10 lbs and get better highlights?

**Comment [A101]:** Not worth the weak joke

Verified checks, for those of you who don't know, are given out to prominent figures who are likely to be impersonated. I'm probably the most impersonated individual who isn't ~~isn't~~ Beyoncé, yet Twitter still took away my check mark -- a move that was then without precedent.

<sup>25</sup> [http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/jessie-thompson/milo-yiannopoulos-unverified-twitter-blue-tick\\_b\\_8944126.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/jessie-thompson/milo-yiannopoulos-unverified-twitter-blue-tick_b_8944126.html)

Mark Twain once said he'd never be part of a club that wanted him as a member. I take the opposite view -- after I was unverified, it's pretty clear that the club's become a lot less exclusive, and a lot less cool.

The same was apparent after the subsequent permaban of my Twitter handle @Nero. I wasn't particularly upset when I heard about it -- I believe I was sunning myself somewhere in Florida. The immediate result was the greatest barrage of press attention I'd ever received (I've since surpassed it, naturally). CNN, CNBC, and ABC all wanted me on to talk about it. Like all progressive imbeciles, Twitter HQ willfully ignored the Streisand Effect -- whenever censorship is attempted, it simply draws ever more attention to its target. Sometimes I wonder if my biggest enemies are in fact my biggest friends, and are all secretly helping me out while pretending to be leftists in public.

**Comment [A102]:** You HAVE TO explain the events that led PRECISELY to your de-verifying and then to your being banned. You CANNOT be vague or coy about it or assume the reader knows.

The decision caused Twitter immense trouble, let me tell you. I was the number-one trending topic for a full day, with tens of thousands of users tweeting the "#FreeMilo" hashtag in solidarity. It wasn't long before my fans started scrawling the slogan in chalk outside Twitter's international network of offices.

One of my more mischievous fans even filmed himself convincing a group of animal rights activists to chant "Free Milo," after persuading them that I was a captive donkey.

My censorship was also one of the catalysts behind the rise of Gab.ai, a sleeker, sexier rival to Twitter built on the promise of unfettered free speech and is slowly eating into its competitor's conservative userbase.

Do I feel bad about being a catalyst for Twitter's censorship? No more than Jean-Luc Picard should feel bad about being a catalyst for the Borg's invasion of Federation Space. Like the Borg, the left have always been intent on assimilating all outposts of freedom.

With or without me, they would have set their sights on Twitter.

The left first proceeded with methods that were much the same as their later campaign against “fake news” on Facebook: with a barrage of pressure from their allies in politics and the media. A host of feminist whingers, including the ghoulish Democratic congresswoman Katherine Clark and the hand-wringing British Labour MP Stella Creasy and the ghoulish Democratic congresswoman Katherine Clark, ginned up a panic about “death threats” and “trolls” who were supposedly striking fear into innocent, powerless women on Twitter. (These women who, strangely, almost always seemed to be professional feminist activists and politicians.) on Twitter. The narrative was repeated breathlessly across the national media in both Britain and America -- and slowly, the platform that once proudly proclaimed its status as “the free speech wing of the free speech party” began to change.

The censors received a hipsterfied, limp-wristed boon in late 2015, when co-founder Jack Dorsey replaced relatively pro-free speech Dick Costolo as permanent CEO. Dorsey, a close friend of DeRay McKesson who had marched with Black Lives Matter in Ferguson, Missouri had a reputation for progressive values that were as wild as his Osama Bin Laden-esque beard, and he quickly set about turning Twitter into a safe space.

**Comment [A103]:** Is your description of what went on at Twitter with Dorsey defensible or will it be contested?

The censorship began almost immediately. Just two months after he became CEO, conservative actor Adam Baldwin received a temporary suspension for a tweet implying that conservatives and libertarians were hotter than lefties. The tweet broke none of Twitter’s rules, yet Baldwin was forced to delete it before his account was restored. This was at the same time when angry death threats to Donald Trump, then a contender for the Republican nomination, were a daily occurrence.

I knew it was only a matter of time before Dorsey came for me too. I was determined to cause him as much trouble as possible before it happened. And after it happened. And after Twitter is bankrupt. And after Jack Dorsey is disgraced and handing out Patreon donation links on the streets of San Francisco. Really, the man just sucks at picking enemies. If you believe the rumors, he also just sucks.

**Comment [A104]:** Again, you need to acknowledge and discuss it here—the Leslie Jones story—or calling this chapter ‘Why Twitter Hates Me’ is a cheat.

**Comment [A105]:** It’s not going bankrupt while Donald Trump is tweeting!

**Comment [A106]:** Too obscure? ‘GoFundMe’?

**Comment [A107]:** This rumor cannot appear in this book

Like any CEO, Dorsey can’t admit his political bias openly. On the rare occasions when he does address the issue, he insists that the platform is politically neutral. In an interview with the Today Show’s Matt Lauer shortly after my deverification, Dorsey flatly denied that the platform censors anything other than threats of violence, insisting that Twitter merely existed to “empower conversation.”<sup>26</sup>

This is the same platform that banned me for being unkind about a celebrity, put a “safety” filter on all outgoing links to the blog of Vox Day, sci-fi’s leading libertarian right-winger, and has kicked countless right-wingers off its platform. This included a conscious crackdown on the Alt-Right, directly after the election. Dozens of the movement’s prominent voices got the boot. Yet Twitter continues to profess its political neutrality.

**Comment [A108]:** Add names here: including XXXX, XXXX, and XXXX.

Twitter was also secretly discriminating against conservative news sources well before the words “Facebook” and “fake news” emerged from a progressive mouthpiece. In February 2016, a source who worked closely with Twitter revealed to *Breitbart Tech* that the company had been “shadowbanning” inconvenient Twitter users and maintained a “whitelist” of trusted news sources.

**Comment [A109]:** Is this the first time this news is being made public?

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.newsbusters.org/blogs/nb/tom-blumer/2016/03/20/twitter-ceo-dorsey-denies-censorship-today-show-interview-lauer-fails>

(“Shadowbanning,” for those who don’t know, is the insidious practice of removing or minimizing a user’s posts from public view without alerting the user, who often continues posting, believing nothing has changed.)

If Dorsey won’t address his platform’s blatant bias, he might one day have to answer to the courts. On March 4 2016, I asked President Obama’s White House Press Secretary, Josh Earnest, about the role that President Obama might play in reminding social media platforms about the importance of protecting free expression.

Earnest made it clear the President believes that the success of social media platforms is “predicated on the important protection of First Amendment rights to self-expression.” He also recommended that Twitter users who feel aggrieved by the platform’s policies should turn to lawsuits as a response. I’m betting that’s a future the site’s investors, already worried by the company’s tanking stock value, would want to avoid.

That was President Obama, the most powerful progressive of the last two decades. If Twitter’s censorious direction received stern words from *his* administration, Dorsey ought to be quivering in his locally-sourced sandals when Trump takes office.

~~The JLCft thinks the government has a moral obligation to force small-Christian-owned businesses to personally bake cakes for and to personally photograph gay weddings or provide free birth control, but a publicly-traded company valued at more than \$10 billion can discriminate all it wants—so long as the discrimination is it’s aimed at conservative white men.~~

**Comment [A110]:** Off topic

~~The death of Twitter is probably irreversible at this point, but Dorsey certainly isn’t doing anything to slow the process. Doesn’t he understand that if you suspend your platform’s funniest, smartest, and most attractive people (hello!), you’ll bore other users away as well? Not only that, but the censorship also creates a chilling effect, frightening other users from speaking their~~

**Comment [A111]:** Not as long as Trump goes on tweeting

minds. On Twitter, a site designed for rapid-fire streams of consciousness, that means nothing less than the death of the platform.

Twitter could save a lot of money these days by writing its executives' names on their doors with pencil instead of fancy placards. Like an episode of *Suits*, Twitter execs come, go, change jobs and disappear under black clouds every few minutes. The office removal costs alone must be astronomical.

And as for suspending me because of a spat with Leslie Jones... come off it. I mean, if you're going to sell out your core values to a celebrity, at least pick someone good looking/funny. Showbiz is one of the few areas where the fashionable and handsome outnumber the grotesque.

**Comment [A112]:** Again, you can't have this section without copping to the larger story

**Comment [A113]:** When you discuss Leslie Jones in this book—AND YOU MUST—don't resort to jokes about her looks

## Google

Twitter is the Silicon Valley company where progressive bias is most apparent, but Google is the company where it is the most dangerous. Google, the company that has perhaps more influence than any other in controlling what information we get to see on the web, and it wields a frightening amount of power. If Google decides that it doesn't want web users to find something, it would be very difficult to stop them. That's probably why, out of all the Silicon Valley companies accused of bias, it was Google's that Donald Trump addressed directly.

The occasion that led him to address it was the release of an explosive video showing bias in Google's search results. In [the](#) video, tech channel SourceFed demonstrated that searches for Hillary Clinton did not autocomplete to words that were popular searches if they reflected negatively on the Democratic candidate (for example "Hillary Clinton cri" did not autocomplete to the popular search term "Hillary Clinton criminal"). This contrasted with the competing,

though far less influential Bing and Yahoo search engines, where all search terms autocompleted correctly.

Google denied altering its search recommendations to favour Clinton, saying it does not autocomplete terms that are "offensive or disparaging when displayed in conjunction with a person's name." But a later experiment from Robert Epstein found that it was perfectly possible to get Google to autocomplete disparaging search terms next to a person's name -- so long as that person wasn't Hillary Clinton.

**Comment [A114]:** Identify. And support with citation

According to Epstein's findings, it was relatively easy to get Google to display negative search terms for Clinton's primary opponent, Bernie Sanders, and for Donald Trump. Another coincidence?

Eric Schmidt, CEO of the company that owns Google, is of course very much in the mould of Tim Cook, Jack Dorsey, and Mark Zuckerberg. But unlike those three, his involvement in politics suggests a direct link between his technology work and his support for left-wing politicians. Schmidt is the founder of campaigning organization "The Groundwork," the sole purpose of which was to put Hillary Clinton in the White House, by putting Silicon Valley's technological prowess at the campaign's disposal.

Schmidt, more than the other CEOs, save perhaps Tim Cook, was committed to Hillary Clinton's failed run for President. And Epstein's experiment, remember, showed that Google displayed negative search terms for both Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders -- only Hillary was let off.

It's not just Schmidt, either. A report from *The Intercept* in April 2016 revealed just how close Google's relationship with the Obama administration was<sup>27</sup>. The report showed that

<sup>27</sup> <https://theintercept.com/2016/04/22/googles-remarkably-close-relationship-with-the-obama-white-house-in-two-charts/>



Google representatives attended meetings at the White House “more than once a week, on average, from the beginning of Obama’s presidency through October 2015.”

*The Intercept’s* report also showed how Google operated a “revolving door” with the White House, with employees frequently moving between both.

...55 cases of individuals moving from positions at Google into the federal government, and 197 individuals moving from positions inside the government to jobs at Google. The data includes positions at firms that Eric Schmidt owns or controls — Civis Analytics, The Groundwork, and Tomorrow Ventures — along with two law firms and three lobbying firms that have represented Google. On the government side, staffers at Obama for America and a handful of other political campaigns were included.

The data includes individuals from Google appointed to government boards while maintaining their positions at the tech firm. Google board member John Doerr was appointed to the President’s Council on Jobs and Competitiveness in February 2011. Eric Schmidt has been part of the President’s Council of Advisers on Science and Technology since 2009. He was also more recently appointed to lead the Defense Innovation Advisory Board at the Pentagon, which occurred outside the time frame of the data.

But the bulk of the moves involved job changes. Google alums work in the departments of State, Defense, Commerce, Education, Justice, and Veterans Affairs. One works at the Federal Reserve, another at the U.S. Agency for International Development. The highest number — 29 — moved from Google into the White House.

With such a close relationship, it's little wonder that Eric Schmidt fought so hard to elect Hillary Clinton, the Obama continuity candidate.

Google's bias matters immensely. Some might consider conservatives fortunate that tech companies didn't use all the powers at their disposal to influence the election. Google could, if they wanted to, ban all links to *Breitbart*, as could Twitter and Facebook. But they would be wrong -- in the current climate, conservatives feel just safe enough on social media not to flock to competing platforms. There is growing awareness that the companies that serve as conduits for speech on the web are no longer politically neutral, but not enough to trigger a mass exodus.

The numbers should horrify anyone who holds out hope that future elections might be fair ones. One of Robert Epstein's earlier experiments found that manipulation of search results can convince undecided voters to back a candidate with frightening efficiency<sup>28</sup>. In some demographics, Epstein found that the conversion rate was up to 80 percent.

If conservatives thought mainstream media bias was bad, just wait until they see the effects of social media bias -- or worse, search engine bias.

### **Why Conservatives Must Take on Silicon Valley**

Given the high-tech forces ranged against him, it's nothing short of a miracle that Donald Trump won the presidency. In 2020, when social media and search engines are likely to wield even more power, he may not be so lucky. If conservatives want to keep winning, they need to get serious, and it needs to happen fast.

They need to be aware that, aside from rare exceptions like Peter Thiel, almost everyone in the world of tech hates them. Jack Dorsey is an ardent Black Lives Matter supporter who has

<sup>28</sup> <http://www.pnas.org/content/112/33/E4512.full.pdf?with-ds=yes>

joined the ~~cop-hating~~ group on marches in Ferguson, Missouri. He has appeared on stage with the group's leading member, DeRay Mckesson, and as we covered above, has brought censorious feminists into Twitter to advise the company on who it should ban from the platform.

**Comment [A115]:** Gratuitous here

Mark Zuckerberg, meanwhile, is an ardent globalist who believes that the United States should "follow Germany's lead on immigration." (~~Yes, the same Germany that invited hordes of Muslim immigrants into Europe, who proceeded to engage in a campaign of terror and sexual assault across the continent that lasted for months.~~) Despite his flowery words in favor of political diversity, he also banned employees from writing "All Lives Matter" on company whiteboards.

**Comment [A116]:** Don't do this in an offhand comment. It will be tough enough in the Islam chapter to describe all Muslims with the actions of the worst.

Eric Schmidt is less vocal, but as we saw above, potentially far more dangerous. He already worked to ~~put~~ Hillary Clinton in the White House. Who knows what he will do to sabotage Trump over the course of his presidency?

The biases of social media companies matter in a big way. Misused, the power of Silicon Valley could easily swing elections. And all of that power lies in the hands of a few ultra-progressive plutocrats.

Social media bias is far more dangerous to conservatives than mainstream media bias. Users believe they're choosing information sources themselves, and are more trusting as a result. If conservatives -- and that includes President Trump -- want to avoid disaster, they need to get serious about pressuring Silicon Valley to stay honest. They should raise the spectre of antitrust, media regulation, and all the other regulatory demons feared by America's social media companies -- who have many legal and financial reasons for wanting to remain perceived as politically neutral platforms.

Republicans need to get aggressive, they need to constantly scrutinize and investigate social media companies, keeping them under the spotlight at all times. They need to organize around and encourage competitors.

It may be difficult for 60-year old politicians who grew up before fax machines were invented, but it's their own political future at stake.

**Comment [A117]:** This chapter needs a stronger conclusion

**WHY FEMINISTS HATE ME**

**Comment [A118]:** This will be a highly scrutinized chapter. Try to remove all bombast and name calling

*"I don't mind living in a man's world as long as I can be a woman in it."*

- Marilyn Monroe

*"For me, the issue of feminism is just not an interesting concept"*

- Lana Del Rey

*"Math is hard, let's lie about rape."*

-- Feminist Barbie

**Comment [A119]:** Is this same as "Feminist Hacker Barbie" Explain

Later in this book, you will encounter a chapter called "why ugly people hate me." It occurs to me that I could just copy and paste that chapter under this title, and it still would be completely accurate.

Nevertheless, I think there's more to be said. Indeed, there are entire books I could write about the problems with feminism (and I probably will). For now, my triggering will be confined to one chapter — any feminists reading will only need to take one XXL tub of Häagen-Dazs to their safe space to recover, not 10. You see, I can be nice!

**Comment [A120]:** Don't start chapter with accusation that feminists = fat. It destroys any seriousness of purpose in a chapter that will (obviously) be closely scrutinized by your critics. If you troll them, they won't listen. You will be speaking ONLY to the already initiated

And I've got a good reason to be nice to feminists, because I owe them my career.

Without their constant stream of mendacious, fact-free, man-hating garbage, I'd have to rely on my epic hair, charming personality and an ass so firm I'm taller when I sit down than when I

stand up in order to gain fans. I have to say in all modesty, I'm the feminist Anti-Christ. I guess that's why my birthday is now celebrated as World Patriarchy Day.<sup>29</sup>

It's a guess, but I'd say that at least one in every three of my followers is a current or former liberal who was finally pushed off the edge and driven into my loving arms by the deranged rantings of an Anita Sarkeesian, a Lindy West, or, worse, a Paul Feig.

Conservatives, too, should be thankful. There are few groups on the progressive left that do more to drive moderate leftists over to the right than feminism. During the GamerGate controversy, which I will address in detail later in the book, I was amazed by the number of web commenters who appeared beneath the pages of *Breitbart* - previously a leftist-free zone - to explain that they were leftists who had, as a last resort, come to the site because it was their last refuge against feminist hectoring and propaganda.

**Comment [A121]:** Back this up?

A snap survey of GamerGate supporters by my Breitbart colleague Allum Bokhari hinted at how damaging feminism had become for the left -- although 54% of respondents identified themselves with the left, 63% said that their opinion of left-wing news outlets had declined due to the controversy. Conservative and libertarian news sources, meanwhile, received a net increase in popularity of 19%<sup>30</sup>. While gamers still identified with the left, they hated left-wing journalists and their love of feminism.

Beyond GamerGate, other leftists have been driven to distraction by feminists' disregard for facts and willingness to destroy the lives of others. After trying to ignore the problem, moderate liberals staged a quiet revolt against feminism in a string of critical op-eds in 2014 after *Rolling Stone* published an article about a fictional rape at the University of Virginia. Campus feminism is a target of constant criticism for moderate liberals like Jonathan Chait, Steven Pinker

**Comment [A122]:** This is exactly what they accuse YOU of. COMMENT on this

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/10/18/milo-clemson-harambe-left/>

<sup>30</sup> <https://archive.is/09Tsr>

and Nick Cohen. He didn't focus on it, but Jon Ronson's influential book *So You've Been*

**Comment [A123]:** Is this accurate?

*Publicly Shamed* (2015) was essentially a discussion about a form of vicious online form of

mobbing championed by feminists who have always preferred vigilantism to due process.

**Comment [A124]:** This is what you are accused of, with Leslie Jones and Gamergate

Moderate liberals discovered something I could have explained to them-- reasoning with

feminists is like herding cats.

An appropriate analogy because cats are the typical feminist's only life companions.

**Comment [A125]:** Makes your points without comments like this

Because so much of contemporary feminism is merely a capitalist con-job -- a money-

grab designed to sell t-shirts to Taylor Swift and Beyoncé fans with asinine slogans and feel-

**Comment [A126]:** Um... like your MILO SWAG?

good girl power motifs -- it's easy to see the whole thing as harmless. And indeed the "we just

want the same treatment" brand of feminism is unarguable.

I am myself that kind of feminist -- what Christina Hoff Sommers calls an "equity feminist."

But lurking beneath the surface for the last decade has been an entirely more toxic and disgusting brand of misandrist, lesbianic bigotry designed to justify the hatred of men. Feminism as practised by celebrities in the 2000s was just *Mean Girls* writ large: women competing to be the hottest. Madonna used to say that women hate each other, while men protect each other.

**Comment [A127]:** No need to drag the lesbians into this! And DON'T use lesbian as a slur!

It's completely hypocritical. They police the slightest perceived infraction from men and call it "manspreading" or "mansplaining" while treating women who dare, for instance, to go off the reservation ideologically as subhumans. Witness the Rob Lowe roast with Ann Coulter. If anyone dared call Amy or Lena a cunt as many times as they said it to Ann on that show -- and believe me, I've been trying -- there would be uproar.

**Comment [A128]:** Use another name?

Feminism now, specifically the third-wave variant taught in universities and vomited out of the press and from the mouths of talentless non-entities like Lena and Amy, is something else

**Comment [A129]:** Use another name?

entirely. The dirty little secret of third-wave feminism is that they love to read about handsome men ravishing beautiful women, and they will all love my book too. I could have hit the best-seller list just based on copies feminists bought with their Patreon donations.

**Comment [A130]:** Avoid references to publishing process

**Comment [A131]:** 2nd reference to Patreon—too obscure?

To be a feminist is to have already been defeated in life. Dumb girls will marry for their true love, motivated ones will marry for money, and those too unappealing to gain love or money turn to feminism to explain why it's really they who are rejecting men.

**Comment [A132]:** Makes your points without these references to being unattractive

Because I'm a compassionate soul, I'm going to lay out this chapter a little differently.

I'm still going to explain why feminists hate me, but I'm first going to explain how feminists can turn things around for themselves. I'm not just doing this because I'm kind and gracious and generous of course. I'm actually fond of giving my enemies a guide to beat me. Like a lion toying with a gazelle, it just makes the final kill that much more satisfying.

It also doesn't hurt that when I explain the real world to feminists it drives them even crazier than they already are.

They call it Milosplaining.

## Stop Hating Men

Hatred is a theme that runs through the politics of the left. Socialists hate the financially successful. LGBT activists hate fundamentalist Christians. Black Lives Matter hate white people, police officers, especially and above all white police officers. But none of these groups hate with the PMS-fuelled, *Mean Girls* pettiness of feminism.

**Comment [A133]:** You can

In 2015, when the British student activist Bahar Mustafa was pictured beneath a sign reading "no white cis men please," while she made a faux tearful gesture beneath it, it caused a firestorm. The incident occurred just as the mainstream press were becoming aware of the return

**Comment [A134]:** Unclear what she did and when. Explain



of segregation on campuses, under the guise of “safe spaces” for women and minorities. As the press dug through Mustafa’s history, they found tweets in which she used the hashtags “#KillAllWhiteMen” and #WhiteTrash. Moderate liberals and establishment conservatives alike both huffed and puffed.

But as always, the establishment was late to the party. Mustafa wasn’t the first of her kind -- she was just the first that the media took notice of. For years beforehand, the hateful instincts of Mustafa had been running rampant amongst what is known as the “nu-feminist” left -- often with the tolerance and even tacit approval of the establishment. Mustafa was set upon because she was an easy target; less easy a target was Jessica Valenti, who posed for pictures wearing a sweater bearing the slogan “I BATHE IN MALE TEARS” more than a full year previous.

**Comment [A135]:** You use the phrase “bathe in the tears of my enemy” on page 232

Valenti is a columnist at *The Guardian* and therefore considered a protected class by other journalists. No one should ever be investigated for hate speech, as Mustafa was, but it’s clear from the example of Valenti, who once wrote the headline “Feminists Don’t Hate Men, But It Woudn’t Matter If We Did.” that hate speech is permissible if it’s done under a byline.

**Comment [A136]:** But isn’t she just trolling people like you here with a headline like this? How can you take seriously the trolling of a troll against the troll—and then take people not to take you so seriously?

**Comment [A137]:** If that headline is hate speech, THIS WHOLE BOOK is hate speech.

Whether you’re going to be arrested for it or not, wearing shirts boasting about bathing in the tears of the male gender isn’t going to win you many friends with men or women. In Britain, where Mustafa is from, only 7 percent of people chose to label themselves as feminists<sup>31</sup>. In America, the number is higher, but still dire -- only 18 percent of Americans consider themselves feminists.<sup>32</sup>

**Comment [A138]:** Of Americans, including men? Or American women?

When you tell a feminist you don’t believe in feminism, they’ll often respond with the inane line “So you don’t believe in equality for women!” Yet in both polls above, large percentages supported equality of the sexes -- 86 percent of men and 74 percent of women in the

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/life/only-7-per-cent-of-britons-consider-themselves-feminists/>

<sup>32</sup> <http://nytlive.nytimes.com/womenintheworld/2015/04/09/82-percent-of-americans-dont-consider-themselves-feminists-poll-shows/>

U.K, and 85 percent overall in the U.S. Clearly both genders believe that feminism and equality no longer mean the same thing.

And why would they believe that, when all they see of feminism is blue-haired lesbians harpies shrieking about killing all men and bathing in their tears? In newspaper columns, social media and on college campuses, the only feminism the public is coming into contact with is shrill, angry, and hateful. The cult that believes the only thing worse than a man is a woman who believes caring for children is a valid life choice.

**Comment [A139]:** Don't say "all." There's more to see

**Comment [A140]:** To anyone over the age of millennial, "blue-haired" means old-lady-who-dyes-her-hair not a young woman

**Comment [A141]:** Don't use lesbian as a slur

**Comment [A142]:** Not true

**Comment [A143]:** Feminists can care for children. (So can lesbians.)

Incidentally, why is it that America's nanny state never controls the really unhealthy behaviors that plague our culture? They will ban large sodas, but not put a waiting period on blue hair dye. They check ID for alcohol purchases if you look younger than 35, but do they weigh feminists before serving them venti frappuchinos? Put a warning label on cigarettes but not on a Bikini Kills record.

**Comment [A144]:** Three unfunny jokes in a row DELETE

**Comment [A145]:** Versus "Women Are Whores"?

How many Hollywood movies can be summed up by the phrase "Men are pigs?" *Thelma and Louise*, *9 to 5*, and of course the appalling *Ghostbusters* reboot. And those are the explicitly feminist movies -- others that aren't so explicit, from *Star Wars* to *The Simpsons* will still be riddled with cheap, petty, "fuck men" moments. Gradually, Homer Simpson became practically every dad on TV, a bumbling nincompoop who rarely does anything right.

The feminist-dominated mainstream liberal media follows suit. Headlines like "Men Wrongly Believe They're Smarter Than They Are" (Jezebel), "Why Are Men So Angry?" (The Guardian) and "Can You Spot The Fuckboy?" (BuzzFeed) are commonplace. Feminist bitterness disdain towards men isn't merely tolerated at mainstream and digital media outlets -- it's the norm.

**Comment [A146]:** Jezebel and Buzzfeed are not "mainstream"

**Comment [A147]:** This just feels overstated

It's no surprise that even women want nothing to do with this. Most white people reject racism, most straight people reject homophobia, so why wouldn't most women reject an openly misandrist ideology? Hating men, like hating minorities or hating women, is a feeling clung on to by a tiny, bitter minority. It is an accident of history that this form of hatred came to be endorsed by mainstream media and culture. But the support of BuzzFeed or *The Guardian* is no guarantee of popular support, amongst women or men. Indeed, the opposite is usually true.

Oh, and speaking of men...

### Take Men's Issues Seriously

**Comment [A148]:** This whole section is filled with assertions that don't have the weight of fact. Understand the difference and back up every claim here, because this section will be hotly scrutinized.

Another thing feminists could do if they want to salvage what remains of their credibility is start taking the growing number of issues that affect men seriously. But of course, they've done the exact opposite.

"What about the Menz" is a characteristically spiteful feminist meme aimed at belittling men, from MRAs to ordinary online commentators, who want their gender's issues to be given a fair hearing. Or even any kind of hearing.

**Comment [A149]:** Spell out

One of the clearest examples is men's health. Women's cancers like breast and ovarian cancer are widely publicized. You can't go anywhere without those pink ribbons being in your face. On the other hand you hear so little about prostate cancer. I wouldn't be surprised if feminists believe it is a social construct.

**Comment [A150]:** Not true

**Comment [A151]:** Says who? Can you support this statement?

A Breitbart analysis of stories on NPR's website showed there are 2.8 times as many stories on women's cancers as men's. However, it's not the lack of publicity that kills men, but the lack of research money.

Breast cancer and prostate cancer affect a similar number of women and men respectively, and kill a similar number of their sufferers each year. Yet the funding gap is huge -- breast cancer typically receives anywhere between \$850 and \$900 million dollars per year in research funding. Prostate cancer usually struggles to break \$400 million<sup>33</sup>. Breast cancer receives more than double the research funding of prostate cancer, for no other reason than it affects women.

**Comment [A152]:** This seems untrue. CAREFULLY source this claim, not just Daily Caller.

**Comment [A153]:** From government or fundraising?

**Comment [A154]:** How can you say this is the only reason?

**Comment [A155]:** Don't use a conservative source for this claim—that only makes your research suspect. Use a MEDICAL source.

In a competition of tits vs. taint, the ladies win.

~~Breast cancer receives more than double the research funding of prostate cancer, for no other reason than it affects women.~~

It's not just cancer either. In all of the top 10 causes of death -- heart disease, cancer, stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, accidents, pneumonia and influenza, diabetes, suicide, kidney disease, and chronic liver disease and cirrhosis -- men are more likely to die than women<sup>34</sup>. According to 2014 figures, American women have an average life expectancy of 81.2 years. For men, it's 76.4<sup>35</sup>, and it's not just because women are nagging men to death.

**Comment [A156]:** This joke feels OLD.

Another leading killer of men is suicide, frequently described as a "silent epidemic" due to the rapid increase in the number of male victims over the past decade. CDC research tracking suicides from 1999 to 2014 found that the rate of male suicide increased 62 percent faster than the rate of female suicide<sup>36</sup>. Men are now more than four times as likely as women to commit

<sup>33</sup> <http://dailycaller.com/2010/10/05/breast-cancer-receives-much-more-research-funding-publicity-than-prostate-cancer-despite-similar-number-of-victims/>

<sup>34</sup> <http://www.webmd.com/men/features/mens-top-5-health-concerns#1>

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/10/08/us-life-expectancy-hits-record-high/16874039/>

<sup>36</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/04/28/male-suicide-rates-massively-increase/>

suicide, with the rate increasing as men age. Men over 85 have a suicide rate that is a staggering 1400 percent higher than women's<sup>37</sup>.

Now, not all of this is necessarily the fault of feminism or women. For example, women are 33 percent more likely than men to visit a doctor<sup>38</sup>. Yet whenever there is a problem that affects women, whether real (breast cancer) or imagined (wage gap), society usually snaps to attention.

**Comment [A157]:** Men smoke more, drink more?

**Comment [A158]:** You haven't demonstrated that it's 'imagined'

**Comment [A159]:** It could be argued that society snaps to attention only because of feminism

On the other hand, when men try to raise their issues, they are usually treated with indifference, anger, or scorn by feminists. "Mo-vember" is an annual event in which men grow their mustaches to raise awareness for prostate cancer -- a whimsical grassroots effort, it is one of the few instances in which awareness of a male cancer briefly rises to the fore.

Feminists, instead of helping, decided to complain. The left-wing *New Statesman* went further, complaining that Mo-vember is "divisive, gender normative, racist and ineffective."

(Why racist? Because "large numbers of minority ethnic men" use mustaches as a "cultural or religious signifier," according to the *New Statesman*). Or maybe because some races can't grow facial hair to save their life. An article in Rabble, a Canadian news site, complained about sexist "Mo Bros" and their "exclusionary" behaviour<sup>39</sup>. *Slate* published an article from two feminists whining that Mo-vember "celebrated masculinity" in order to fight cancer -- apparently a bad thing.

From the article:

<sup>37</sup> <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/how-do-life/201510/male-suicide-the-silent-epidemic>

<sup>38</sup> <http://www.webmd.com/men/features/mens-top-5-health-concerns#1>

<sup>39</sup> <http://rabble.ca/news/2013/11/open-letter-why-i-dont-participate-movember>

“Are we grumpy contrarians and feminist killjoys who hate things precisely because other people love them? Probably, but...”

Well, at least they have some self-awareness, but self-awareness alone won't change the fact that the number of people who identify as feminists in the west is approaching the number of people who believe that blacks are innately inferior to whites<sup>40</sup>. (That's fewer than 10 percent, for any progressives who think the number is high.)

Testicular cancer is also one of the few men's diseases that has a grassroots awareness campaign, called #CockInASock. It's fairly self-explanatory and receives wide praise in Huffington Post and Buzzfeed. Articles show chiseled men exposing most of their body to raise awareness. Do men's lives matter? Apparently only if they're good looking enough to make a feminist flip the bean.

There are some feminists who insist that they do take men's issues seriously. “Patriarchy hurts men too,” they whine. But these same feminists will then turn around and write articles condemning Mo-vember, or sing songs mocking male suicide (yes, someone a feminist actually did that -- just a few minutes after she trotted out the talking point about patriarchy hurting men too<sup>41</sup>).

Feminism of course defines the patriarchy as a sinister and invisible conspiracy to keep women down. But the fact that men are the majority of suicides, combat deaths, and almost ALL workplace deaths, along with lagging behind women in higher education, shows this is a made up fairytale. Just like a feminist's sex life. And really everything else feminists believe -- like the fact that mentally ill transsexuals constitute a “civil rights frontier.”

**Comment [A160]:** But not the other way around? This cannot be blamed on feminists.

**Comment [A161]:** Dumb joke

**Comment [A162]:** Are they the same? How do you know?

**Comment [A163]:** Cite them

**Comment [A164]:** No, this does not 'show' this at all

**Comment [A165]:** Gratuitous

**Comment [A166]:** I will not accept a manuscript that labels an entire class of people 'mentally ill.'

<sup>40</sup> <http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/attitudes-toward-racism-and-inequality-are-shifting/>

<sup>41</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KWuL.VtH6vgM>

They really shouldn't push it so much, because people might start to ask what the patriarchy has done for them. They will discover that the answer is: almost everything. Everything from the aerosol can to the zipper came from the mind of a man. Are there a bunch of wonderful women's inventions being hidden, I hear you ask? Of course not. Feminists are like vegans and atheists: they never shut up about it. Trust me, if a feminist had an amazing invention, she'd be throwing it in the face of all the other women around her.

**Comment [A167]:** All of them?

**Comment [A168]:** This is just off topic

**Comment [A169]:** What about Marie Curie, Stephanie Kwolek, or Hedy Lamarr?

Feminists try to push forward women as successful inventors, but what we end up with is charlatans like Elizabeth Holmes of Theranos. Any man doing what Holmes did would have been dismissed as a fraud long ago, but the media is afraid to call her a faker, because of her gender. Now *that's* privilege.

**Comment [A170]:** How do you know this to be true?

Beyond the individual level, feminists will actually attempt to block efforts to discuss men's issues. When the University of York's equality and diversity committee announced they would mark International Men's Day with an event addressing men's issues, they faced a campaign from more than 200 activist students and professors demanding the event be cancelled. "We believe that men's issues cannot be approached in the same way as unfairness and discrimination towards women, because women are structurally unequal to men." The University of York quickly complied.

**Comment [A171]:** What does this mean?

Fewer than 24 hours after the decision, a male student at the University of York committed suicide<sup>42</sup>. Male suicide had been one of the issues set to be discussed at the cancelled event.

**Comment [A172]:** Are you tying the suicide to the decision? Ridiculously reductive

<sup>42</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2015/11/18/male-university-of-york-student-commits-suicide-on-day-his-university-ditches-international-mens-day-after-pressure-from-feminists/>

When feminist filmmaker Cassie Jaye made a documentary about men's rights issues called *The Red Pill*, feminists didn't just tell people to avoid it, they protested theaters around the world to prevent the film from even being shown. So much for the sisterhood.

Rather than being a twenty-first century version of Amazons, the mythical Greek warrior-women like Xena, modern day feminists are more like a revamped version of the Donner Party. They'll eat their own at any point if they sense their ideology is in trouble.

**Comment [A173]:** Dumb joke

Feminists give a bad reputation to their gender. Women have been nothing more than two-faced backstabbing bitches except Mother Theresa... and even she's suspect.

**Comment [A174]:** The use of a phrase like "two-faced backstabbing bitches" diminishes your overall point.

The actions of feminists match their hateful rhetoric. Far from promoting equality, which the original equity feminists did, contemporary feminism represents they are a tribal ideology dedicated to advancing the interests of women and setting back the interests of men. Even when women aren't affected, as in the case of York's abortive men's day, or Mo-vember, feminists will still try and throw a spanner in the works. There can be no better indication that feminism is now an ideology animated by hate. Until it ends, and

Until feminists put their money where their mouths are on men's issues, they will continue to decline into irrelevance, much like many all-the-other hate-based movements that came before them.

**Comment [A175]:** Unclear

### **The Question of Rape Culture Stop Denying Reality**

On November 14, 2014, *Rolling Stone* published a now-infamous article called "A Rape On Campus: A Brutal Assault And Struggle For Justice At UVA." It told the story of Jackie, a female student at the University of Virginia who claimed to have been repeatedly raped by members of the Phi Kappa Psi fraternity.



"Shut up," she heard a man's voice say as a body barreled into her, tripping her backward and sending them both crashing through a low glass table. There was a heavy person on top of her, spreading open her thighs, and another person kneeling on her hair, hands pinning down her arms, sharp shards digging into her back, and excited male voices rising all around her. When yet another hand clamped over her mouth, Jackie bit it, and the hand became a fist that punched her in the face. The men surrounding her began to laugh.

Horrifying, isn't it? It sounds like something out of *Law & Order: Special Victims Unit*.

There was just one problem with this story -- none of it was true. ~~It was something from my sexual fantasies -- and perhaps Jackie's as well. Either way, it never happened.~~

**Comment [A176]:** Inappropriate place for humor

Within days of publication, the story began to unravel. *Worth* editor Richard Bradley first began to raise questions about the story on his personal blog, followed by paleo-conservative pundit Steve Sailer. Bradley pointed out that Sabrina Rubin Erdley, the *Rolling Stone* journalist who wrote the story, failed to identify or reach out to any of the men who according to Jackie, repeatedly raped her. Nor did she appear to have identified or communicated with Jackie's two friends, who allegedly corroborated her story.

*The Washington Post* eventually did track down the people who allegedly "corroborated" Jackie's story, only to receive a completely different account from them. They told the *Post* that they felt Jackie had "manipulated" them, and that they had requested their names be taken out of the *Rolling Stone* article, to no avail. It also emerged that *Rolling Stone* had agreed, at Jackie's request, not to contact any of her alleged attackers for their side of the story.

A subsequent police investigation involving 70 people, including Jackie's friends, colleagues, and members of the Phi Kappa Psi fraternity found no one to corroborate her story. By mid-2015, *Rolling Stone's* article had been retracted and removed from the site, the editor responsible for publishing the story had resigned, and the magazine was facing multiple lawsuits.

*Rolling Stone's* article came at the height of the "rape culture" panic on college campuses, in which feminist activists convinced the media, as well as the White House, that college-aged women were being raped at levels comparable to ~~South Africa or the Democratic Republic of Congo.~~

~~It was a fictitious story that flowed from a fictitious narrative.~~

In fact, ~~t~~The story itself seemed to prove the ~~opposite~~ ~~is a clear sign~~ that rape culture is nonexistent. *Rolling Stone* went ~~searching for~~ a good case to write about, but had to go with a shoddily constructed fantasy. If rape culture was real, why did they ~~have to search so hard~~, and why ~~did they~~ choose a story with more holes than one of my shooting targets?

Rape is terrible.

~~Well, I assume it's terrible for most people. Personally, I've never gotten off faster than when I've had a gun to my temple. My boyfriend will tell you I can't even get hard these days without a knife to my throat. That's just me though., and~~

I understand why society ~~h~~was ~~been~~ gripped by the "rape culture" panic for so long – anyone who challenged it looked like they were challenging the accounts of rape victims. ~~Who would want to do that?~~

Even so, I find it incredible that people could be so dumb. Maybe it's because I ~~in so smart and brilliant and~~ saw through it ~~immediately~~, but I just can't understand how everyone allowed themselves to be hoodwinked for so long. Rape has existed since the first caveman saw

**Comment [A177]:** This feels gratuitously racist, like you're just denigrating African countries

**Comment [A178]:** This whole section will be scrutinized—it cannot afford ANY sloppy thinking on your part

**Comment [A179]:** Avoid using phrases like "clear sign" when discussing hot-button issues on which many people disagree with you. It's not persuasive to say "clear sign."

**Comment [A180]:** If you want to say that rape culture is nonexistent, you can't do it superficially. You have to establish it as a point and then back it up and demonstrate its truth. You can't simply assert it.

**Comment [A181]:** How do you know they were "searching"?

**Comment [A182]:** Circular reasoning

**Comment [A183]:** Deleting this. It's clearly the wrong joke in the wrong place. At a certain point, you have to decide that the importance of your message is more important than your irreverent side

**Comment [A184]:** Rape victims are routinely challenged. They have been for decades. That's how all this started

**Comment [A185]:** This is definitely not the pace for more of your narcissism

**Comment [A186]:** Immediately?

a cavewoman with less facial hair than usual and picked up a bone club. H—how did we get the idea that it's a brand new crisis, worse than it's ever been? The crime statistics are inarguable:

**Comment [A187]:** Demonstrate that they are inarguable. Don't just say it.

rape has declined nearly 75 percent since the early 1990s<sup>43</sup>. If this continues, getting myself thrown in jail will be my only way I can get a decent hatefuck without having a consent form and mandatory safety word.

**Comment [A188]:** All rape or college rape?

**Comment [A189]:** So much inappropriate humor is irritating.

But though it is shocking, it is not really so surprising. For some time now, feminists have preferred fiction and feelings to fact and reason. As discrimination against women has largely disappeared, feminists have had to invent new, fake problems in order to stay relevant and in order to have something to be angry about. “Campus rape culture” is a particularly egregious and damaging example, but there are many more.

### Is Gender Really a Social Construct?

The concept of the glass ceiling, for instance, is also laughable. The shrieking that passes for feminist discourse would shatter a glass ceiling in seconds. To actually keep feminists out, all you need is something that takes two or more people to open in cooperation—feminists don't play well with others, or see through projects to completion.

Joking aside, the pay gap is perhaps the most well-known and widespread feminist myth. Taken as an article of faith by business leaders and politicians alike, this feminist lie claims that women (on average) are only paid 0.79 for every dollar earned by a man.

<sup>43</sup>

[http://www.slate.com/articles/news\\_and\\_politics/foreigners/2014/12/the\\_world\\_is\\_not\\_falling\\_apart\\_the\\_trend\\_lines\\_reveal\\_an\\_increasingly\\_peaceful.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/foreigners/2014/12/the_world_is_not_falling_apart_the_trend_lines_reveal_an_increasingly_peaceful.html)

Study after study<sup>44</sup> has shown that the wage gap shrinks to nonexistence when non-sexist factors like chosen career paths, chosen work hours and chosen career discontinuity are taken into account.

The key word is *chosen*. There is a gap between the average pay of men and the average pay of women, but this gap is virtually entirely explained by women's choices. Men prefer the technical jobs -- they go into engineering, petroleum, nuclear fission, while women prefer the people-oriented professions: teaching, nursing, social work. Men also tend to go into the dirty, dangerous professions -- it's not for nothing that 97 percent of workplace deaths are male. And it just so happens that the jobs preferred by men tend to be higher paying as a result.

When the debate reaches this stage, feminists will usually pivot and make one of two arguments: (a) that "women's jobs" should be higher-paying or (b) that the pernicious social influence of the patriarchy brainwashes women into staying away from high-paying STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) fields.

In its economic illiteracy, the former argument betrays the Marxist pedigree of third-wave feminism. The latter is one of the more interesting chicken-and-egg problems in feminism. They say they want more women in STEM, yet also encourage women to sign up for worthless gender-studies degrees. As [Christina Hoff Sommers](#) says: "Want to close the wage gap? Step one: Change your major from feminist dance therapy to electrical engineering."<sup>45</sup>

Comment [A190]: Identify

~~Still, I suppose the lesbians need somewhere to go. Look at any gender studies faculty in America, and you're likely to a list that goes something like "dyke, dyke, dyke, divorcee, dyke,~~

<sup>44</sup>

[http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/goldin/files/dynamics\\_of\\_the\\_gender\\_gap\\_for\\_young\\_professionals\\_in\\_the\\_financial\\_and\\_corporate\\_sectors.pdf](http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/goldin/files/dynamics_of_the_gender_gap_for_young_professionals_in_the_financial_and_corporate_sectors.pdf)

<sup>45</sup> [http://www.hawaii.edu/religion/courses/Gender\\_Wage\\_Gap\\_Report.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/religion/courses/Gender_Wage_Gap_Report.pdf)

<sup>46</sup> <https://twitter.com/chsommers/status/664172152992722944>

“genderqueer,” dyke, dyke.” Lesbians should be thrown out of academia altogether and put back where they belong — porn! God hates fags, but he hates feminists more.

Comment [A191]: DELETE UGH

The feminist war on science, one of the biggest components of the wider left-wing war on science doesn't end there (oh, you thought the Republicans were the ones waging war on science? Think again<sup>47</sup>). Possibly a greater intellectual travesty is what feminists have done to the study of gender differences, which ought to be one of the most fascinating subjects out there but, under the direction of feminists, has become a mindless repetition of 1960s social-science shibboleths.

One of the reasons that feminists fight so hard to stop supermarkets selling “girls toys” (dolls houses, baby pushchairs, stuffed toys) and “boys’ toys” (action figures, toy trucks, building sets) is because they fervently believe that these innocuous playthings socialize men and women into their respective gender roles. They really think that if you make a girl play with a truck or a train set, she'll be more likely to grow up to be an engineer.

Thanks to decades of pseudoscience from feminist academics and left-wing sociologists, this last argument is more difficult to unravel. Indeed, some of the era's foremost psychologists - Steven Pinker, David Buss, Robert Plomin, Simon Baron-Cohen -- have spent much of their careers doing just that.

The sum total of their research is overwhelming -- gender roles are largely governed by nature, not nurture as feminists would have you believe. The most compelling research comes from Baron-Cohen, perhaps the world's leading autism researcher. Baron-Cohen grew interested in gender roles after he noticed that boys were approximately four times more likely to be diagnosed with autism<sup>48</sup> than girls. He knew that autism was a result of an over-systemizing, or

Comment [A192]: Is this proven? Really?

<sup>47</sup> John Tierney, *The Real War On Science* <http://www.city-journal.org/html/real-war-science-14782.html>

<sup>48</sup> <http://www.autism-help.org/points-gender-imbalance.htm>

over-technical brain. So he decided to test if boys really were, as the old sexists believed, born with more technically-oriented brains than women.

The lynchpin of the feminist argument that women are made, not born, is the claim that girls are socialized into their female roles during their early childhood. In order to test this claim, Baron-Cohen decided to run experiments on newborn babies -- before any socialization could take effect. He provided male and female babies with a physical-mechanical object (a mobile) and a social object (a face). Lo and behold, the male babies showed greater interest in the mobile, while the female babies showed more interest in the face.

Other studies also drive home the inescapable reality that men and women are simply wired differently. Surveys of women across countries have found that women in developing countries, where jobs and resources are scarce, are more likely to enter STEM fields<sup>49</sup>. Yet in the vastly more feminist west, where women have greater financial security and career choices, women choose different professions. In other words, when women have a choice, they don't choose STEM.

That's not to say women don't find *any* scientific fields appealing. Psychology (people oriented) and biology (plants, animals, and again people) are both dominated by women. Whenever I meet a feminist who claims that the patriarchy prevents women from going into astrophysics and computer science, I always ask them why it hasn't also prevented them from going into biology, where 58 percent of bachelor's, master's degrees, and doctorates are given to women<sup>50</sup>. I've yet to hear a convincing answer.

---

<sup>49</sup> [http://psych.fullerton.edu/rlippa/abstracts\\_2009.htm](http://psych.fullerton.edu/rlippa/abstracts_2009.htm)

<sup>50</sup> <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/06/education/edlife/where-the-women-are-biology.html>

There is more. Men and women respond differently to stress -- women prefer to be with people, while men prefer to be alone<sup>51</sup>. Men and women also experience romantic jealousy differently -- men are more upset by sexual infidelity, while women are more upset by emotional infidelity (the thought that a man might be forming an emotional connection with another lover)<sup>52</sup>. Gender differences can also be observed in entertainment -- men prefer realistic shooters and competitive video games, while women prefer social games like *The Sims*.

Men prefer action movies, women prefer rom-coms. No matter how hard the leftists of entertainment try to change things, men and women continue to give money to the products that they like.

There is now an overwhelming array of evidence ranged against the out-of-date, 1960s theory that gender is socially constructed. But really, we don't even need it, do we? Unless you live in your basement for your entire life (and some men do, but only men!), the reality of gender differences is inescapable.

Nothing is more amusing than watching the frustration of feminist parents as they come to terms with this reality. One amusing incident occurred in September 2016, when a writer for the left-leaning Canadian magazine *Macleans*'s, Shannon Proudfoot, lamented on social media that she could "already see her daughter preferring pink."

"I have no idea why because we've worked so hard to avoid that," wailed Proudfoot, perhaps unaware of the low-key hilarity of her comments.

---

<sup>51</sup> <http://www.webmd.com/women/features/stress-women-men-cope>

<sup>52</sup> <http://news.health.com/2015/01/14/straight-men-more-prone-to-jealousy-over-sexual-infidelity-study/>

Joel Wood, an assistant professor (of course) at Thompson Rivers University quickly replied with some emotional support. “Pink and Disney princesses” Woods complained. “We tried to discourage them, but our daughters gravitated towards both.”<sup>53</sup>

You’d think Mattel was selling pole-dancing Barbie the way these feminists want their daughters to reject what most young girls actually like.

I find the anecdote both hilarious and uplifting. It’s hilarious, in the same way that watching the plans of a cartoon villain humiliated by the plucky hero is hilarious, and it’s uplifting because no matter how hard leftists try, they simply can’t beat human nature.

But why should they try in the first place? There’s nothing more annoying than the constant demands of feminists for utterly pointless gestures, whether it’s a lack of gendered toy aisles in supermarkets, or the alleged scourge of “brogrammers” and their sexist banter that allegedly keeps women out of STEM fields (though again, strangely, not biology).

In pursuit of their hare-brained crusade to destroy gender roles, feminists want to control the lives of boys and girls in absurd detail. Ordinary people recognize this for what it is: stupid, pointless authoritarianism. And feminists wonder why they’re unpopular.

If feminists want to regain credibility, and perhaps tackle the issues that still matter to women, they will first have to come to terms with reality -- and that starts with the reality of gender roles.

### **Do We Even Need Feminism?**

In 2014, it would have been easy for me to answer this question with a resounding “no.”

<sup>53</sup> <http://libertyunyielding.com/2016/09/02/liberal-parents-twitter-distraught-children-normal-healthy/>



Feminism in the west serves little purpose other than hating men, making pointless demands, and obsessing over trivial issues. It has poisoned relations between the sexes, nearly destroyed due process on campus, and constantly saddles businesses with pointless gender diversity requirements.

But now, I'm sorry to say, thanks to the mistakes of progressives, we *do* need feminism in the west -- or at least, some parts of it.

Whereas the "rape culture" on college campuses is a figment of feminists' imagination, the rape culture brought to the west by Muslim migrants, invading Europe by their millions, through the courtesy of horrendously misguided European elites, is very real. So too is their culture of wife-beating, "honor killing," female genital mutilation, and forced marriages. After spending years trying to make feminism relevant again with phony faux-issues like gendered toys and Twitter harassment, progressive immigration policies have finally succeeded. That probably wasn't the plan, but there it is.

If feminism wants to recover its lost credibility, it needs to look overseas, to the feminists of Muslim countries. If all feminists were like Ayaan Hirsi Ali, a survivor of FGM in Somalia who is now one of the west's foremost critics of Islam and champions of women in Muslim countries, I expect they wouldn't be so unpopular.

Feminists can also look to the Kurdish women of the People's Protection Units in Syria, whose version of smashing the patriarchy is putting bullets in the chests of ISIS members.

That's a feminism that I'd have no problem getting behind.

Feminists hate me for a myriad of reasons. When no one else was speaking out against them, I took on some of their leading millennial champions during the GamerGate controversy, and exposed their bogus complaints of "online harassment."

**Comment [A193]:** Move this to the Islam chapter—it just feels like a drive-by incitement here.

I go on TV and call them “darling” to their faces. They hate that.

I stick up for men.

For instance, I resist the new trend for “affirmative consent.” Amazingly, yet predictably, feminists aren’t satisfied that the scales are already tilted in women’s favor. They want complete control over romantic relationships. It’s not enough that they can destroy a man’s self esteem with a word of rejection. They also want to throw men in jail if their advance is too awkward, or if they themselves say yes and later regret it. It wouldn’t be surprising if they push for the death penalty for any man who can’t find their G-spot.

**Comment [A194]:** Dumb joke

That’s the reason we now have affirmative consent, perhaps the most kafkaesque set of laws in America. It’s the idea that if you don’t consent at every stage of a sexual encounter, it’s rape. That means asking for every kiss and asking for every boob squeeze. It’s almost as if feminists want everyone to remain celibate.

**Comment [A195]:** Where in the US is this law?

Just because they can’t get any sex, they want the rest of us to have deserts down there too.

**Comment [A196]:** Attacking feminists over and over with the same ancient trope about them not having sex is what makes it seem directed at ALL women. In the end, it’s your WEAKENS argument against feminism, not your strongest. Your strongest is the

Another thing feminists hate that I like is numbers. Feminists aThey’re really bad at math! How else could they come up with patently absurd howlers like the pay gap? Given the dire state of feminist statistics, one has to wonder if there isn’t a reason why women seem to do so poorly at STEM.

**Comment [A197]:** ASSERTION: Cite the newspaper reports of the pay gap the reader might have seen and demonstrate how it’s not true!

Feminist women are of a particularly attention-seeking variety. They’re more desperate to be noticed than Kanye West at an awards show. Add this to the fact that women are naturally attention-seeking by nature, and you can only imagine how incensed they must be to have to share a spotlight with me, — better at attention-seeking than every last one of them. Not only that,

**Comment [A198]:** This is what people say about you

**Comment [A199]:** Assertion: How can you say they are “more desperate to be noticed”?

**Comment [A200]:** Too much ego.

but I actually stand up to them, something they've been trained to think of as misogyny and hate speech.

Most of all though, I think they hate me because ~~like all feminists, they're fag hags~~

Comment [A201]: DELETE

Whenever I meet a feminist in person, they usually end up adoring my personality (and fashion sense) as much as they hate my words. They're torn between hating me and wanting to be my best friend.

Well they needn't be torn any longer, because while I don't love feminism, I do love women (not sexually of course, ~~sorry ladies!~~).

I want to protect ~~women~~ them from the threats that do exist, not the ones they imagine in their head. And the threats today come from bearded, chanting fanatics from the east, not trolls from 4chan or college frat boys.

I think feminists have passed the point where they'll ever be popular, but if they focus on the real threats to women today, they might at least win back some measure of respect.

And for the ones who don't? Well, they can still provide a useful purpose -- providing the fuel for my meteoric rise to stardom with their tears. It's a little-known fact, and my personal trainer disapproves of it because of its high salt content, but I've actually survived on nothing but spinach and leftist teardrops for the past two years. (My trainer is ~~He's~~ fine with the spinach.)

Really though, where would I be without Anita Sarkeesian? Had she not pissed off so many people with her relentless, Mother Superior-like hectoring, I might not have any fans! I mean, who would have given a ridiculous, attention-seeking faggot like me any attention if they hadn't seen the leftist alternative? The last backlash to feminism and political correctness introduced the world to Camille Paglia, Christina Hoff Sommers and Bill Maher.

The new one introduced the world to me -- and the world likes it. Thanks, girls!

In a generation, I predict that these radical feminists will be forgotten to history. Many of them will die prematurely from obesity-related complications, of course, and there's no chance of the rest procreating. Feminists don't invent anything, except reasons to blame men for all their problems. Men, on the other hand, are constantly inventing. And only some of those inventions are designed to kill other men.

**Comment [A202]:** This rant is off the point.

The rise of feminism has fatally coincided with the rise of video games, internet porn, and, sometime in the near future, sex robots. With all these options available, and the growing perils of real-world relationships, men are simply walking away. In 2015, I wrote an article on

**Comment [A203]:** This chapter needs a stronger finish

this trend, which I call the "sexodus."<sup>54</sup> It was an astonishing success, and was read and shared millions of times. Clearly the idea resonated with a lot of men growing up in a modern, feminist society.

**Comment [A204]:** "It was an astonishing success" - don't blow your own horn.

Men who retreat aren't necessarily the biggest victims here. They can function without real-world relationships much better than women. The real catastrophe is what it's doing to society as a whole. Birth rates are collapsing. If you took away immigrant communities, who tend to have higher birth rates, many western countries would have birth rates approximating those of Japan.

Of course, beyond the sexodus, feminism is also affecting birth rates by producing the pathetic, unloveable phenomenon known as the "male feminist." You're unlikely to get laid if you're part of the sexodus, sure, but celibacy is practically guaranteed as a male feminist.

<sup>54</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/12/04/the-sexodus-part-1-the-men-giving-up-on-women-and-checking-out-of-society/>

<sup>55</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/12/09/the-sexodus-part-2-dishonest-feminist-panics-leave-male-sexuality-in-crisis/>

These beta orbiting cucks proudly carry the feminist banner, but they look at the cause as their best hope to get laid. Why do you think so many male feminists turn out to be virgins, perverts or, even more often, both?

**Comment [A205]:** Stick with virgins  
"Perverts" is unnecessary

## 5

## WHY BLACK LIVES MATTER HATES ME

I love black people.

Indeed, I love black people so much that my Grindr profile once said “No Whites.”<sup>56</sup> I’d considered “Coloreds Only Served in Rear,” but that was a little too edgy, and Grindr once deleted my profile once for writing: “Don’t contact me if you’re under seven inches or you know who your dad is.”

But alas, some black people -- the ones conned by Black Lives Matter -- don’t love me as much as I love them back.

And after everything I’ve done for the black community, really! I’ve lost count of the number of black youths I’ve lifted out of poverty. Admittedly, I send them back the next day in an Uber-Lux.

Sometimes I get depressed just thinking about the ingratitude. But then I remember that Black Lives Matter are only a small, vocal section of the black community, who are bankrolled by malicious progressive white billionaires, and elevated by a disingenuous press.

Really though, Black Lives Matter should be thanking me. After all, I exposed one of their leaders as a charlatan. In August 2015, I published a story on *Breitbart* highlighting the extraordinarily dodge of Shaun King, who was then claiming leadership of the movement along with Johnetta Elzie and Deray Mckesson (with whom King would later have a very public falling out).

**Comment [A206]:** This chapter is so well researched and well argued that you should reconsider the supercilious jokes in it. They detract from what might otherwise be your best chapter.

**Comment [A207]:** This just feels patronizing.

<sup>56</sup> This is an actual thing that worries progressives, by the way. It’s called “sexual racism.” <https://www.queerty.com/many-white-guys-grindr-many-racist-blogger-laments-20161001>

King, you see, claimed to be half-black, born to a black father, but is remarkably white-skinned. That doesn't mean anything, necessarily. Lots of people with black ancestry are light-skinned. However, a closer examination of King's family tree by blogger Vicki Pate revealed a shocking truth in King's birth certificate -- it identified Jeffrey Wayne King, a white man, as Shaun King's father.

It also identified Shaun King as ethnically white.

**Comment [A208]:** You must tell the whole story here—including his Daily Kos article saying his birth father was not the man listed on the birth certificate and your response to that.

As it turned out, these explosive new racial allegations are just the latest in a string of controversies surrounding Shaun King: on July 21, a conservative blog reported that his account of a “brutal, racially-motivated beating” in 1995, which at least two reports have described as “Kentucky’s first hate crime,” did not match up with a police report from the case.

“King, 35, has related the story of the hate crime on his blogs and in his recent self-help book, seemingly to bolster his credibility as an activist and as a self-help guru,” wrote the Daily Caller’s Chuck Ross. “While King has said that he was attacked by up to a dozen ‘racist’ and ‘redneck’ students, official records show that the altercation involved only one other student.”

“And while King has claimed that he suffered a ‘brutal’ beating that left him clinging to life, the police report characterized King’s injuries as ‘minor,’” Ross reported.

King’s story is increasingly common -- left wingers, especially on campus, are fond of faking hate crimes to boost their own public profiles and bolster support for their political causes. But King was doing far more than that -- he was using his position as one of the unelected “leaders” of Black Lives Matter to fill his pockets.

**Comment [A209]:** Proof of this?

Taken together, King’s insistence on his blackness makes perfect sense. He is the perfect example of victimhood as a commodity, something that an artful trader can quickly turn into real dividends. In an America governed by identity politics, it’s profitable to be a victim.

**Comment [A210]:** What is taken together?

King's story is mirrored by that of Rachel Dolezal, who built a career in the NAACP by pretending to be black. After she was exposed, Dolezal claimed, amazingly, that she "identified as black." In other words, that she was trans-racial. Months before the Dolezal story broke, I joked that after transgender people, the next frontier of left-wing identity politics would be transracial. I didn't expect to be proven right so soon!

Unlike Shaun King, Dolezal did not attempt to convince anyone that she was ethnically black. She might have succeeded had she done so—~~King proved how remarkably gullible Black Lives Matter really is.~~ But she didn't, and as such she attracted huge volumes of hatred from BLM in return for her honesty. I felt sorry for her, more than anything. Her case is ridiculous, and I was happy to ridicule it, but it's also quite sad.

**Comment [A211]:** Unnecessarily insulting

But it isn't really surprising. The left have made victimhood prestigious, profitable, and in some regards even sacred. Even with all the legitimate problems faced by black people in America, it makes perfect sense that some people would pretend to be members of the race and reap all the attendant rewards.

With all the benefits that come with victimhood, it's little wonder that so many wealthy and powerful people do so much to sustain the political edifice that supports it. The Black Lives Matter movement, indisputably the primary vehicle for black victimhood today, is an ~~astroturfed~~ campaign propped up by hundreds of millions in donations of grants, including \$33 million from progressive billionaire George Soros.

**Comment [A212]:** Unclear. See comment page 110

~~Why don't we see donations from prominent black leaders like Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton?~~

~~Perhaps they are too busy lining their own pockets.~~

**Comment [A213]:** Gratuitous insults. Sharpton and Jackson are not being discussed here



As I will show in the next section, the point of these donations is strictly to advance the cause of identity politics and racial division. They do nothing to serve the black community or black lives.

Worse -- they do extraordinary damage to both.

### **The Police Protect Black Lives**

**Comment [A214]:** This section is very incendiary. Every syllable will have to be carefully measured and then vetted

There is a malicious, violent force in America that seems to kill only black people and ignore whites. Its presence can be felt in every city. In some areas, this threat means black people cannot walk the streets without the fear of being shot.

As liberals would rather you didn't know, this force isn't the police. ~~It's other black people.~~ The numbers are indisputable. Between 1980 and 2008, blacks made up 52.5 percent of homicide offenders, despite making up just 12.2 percent of the population according to 2010 data. The victim of black violence is their own community. In the same 1980-2008 survey, it was found that 93 percent of black homicide victims were killed by other black people.<sup>57</sup> ~~Black criminals targeted black men more often than I did on Grindr.~~

**Comment [A215]:** This is such an incendiary statement that it is important not only to discuss the statistics but also to explain WHY it is important to discuss the topic at all. Otherwise, it seems like you're just doing it to say something negative about African-Americans

**Comment [A216]:** Inappropriate humor here.

Black Lives Matter focuses exclusively on deaths caused by the police, yet this is far eclipsed by the black deaths caused by other black people. In 2014, there were 238 black deaths at the hands of police, a number sensationally reported by Raw Story as "more black deaths than on 9/11." But in the same year, there were 6,095 black victims of homicide -- more homicide victims than any other race. ~~And virtually all~~ of the victims died at the hands of other black people.

**Comment [A217]:** Citation

<sup>57</sup> <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/htus8008.pdf>

The dramatic gap between deaths at the hands of police and deaths at the hands of other black people raises the question of why Black Lives Matter focuses its energies exclusively on the police, and so-called “white racism.”

Unlike the wage gap, the black murder gap is very real, and simply isn’t discussed by black activists. As is so often the cause in politics, I suspect it’s a matter of tribalism. It’s always easier to blame other people for your problems, instead of undergoing the difficult process of looking inward. Like feminists who blame their everyday grievances on an invisible “patriarchy,” or Neo-Nazis who think the Jews are responsible for everything bad that happens to them, or Democrats who blame the Russians for Hillary losing the 2016 election, it’s very easy to dodge responsibility if you have a great big boogeyman to lump the blame on.

**Comment [A218]:** Using “tribalism” in a discussion of black people is just baiting your critics

Leftism, which combines tribal identity politics with a disdain for personal responsibility, is the ultimate political expression of this instinct.

~~But it’s not enough that Black Lives Matter ignores gang violence, the number one threat to young black lives other than abortion. Obviously, abortion is wrong and horrible. Think about it, teen moms — you could be terminating something nearly as beautiful as me. But the real reason I hate Planned Parenthood is that they murder so many black babies who, had they lived, could have been installed in my Nubian harem in 16 or 17 years’ time.~~

**Comment [A219]:** Abortion is off topic here — too hot-button an issue for a stray comment. And the Nubian harem joke is inappropriate here

The violence is more easily solved. Yet BLM aren’t just ignoring the problem — they end up ~~re-actively~~ making it worse. Whenever Black Lives Matter torches another city district (usually their own neighborhoods), police are left with no option other than withdrawing from proactive policing until tensions cool. That means fewer patrols in black neighborhoods and fewer ~~stop-and-searches~~ of black people. It can be almost impossible to counter Black Lives Matter-inspired action, peaceful or otherwise, regardless of whether it makes sense or not.

**Comment [A220]:** To say “actively” implies intent, which you would then have to prove

**Comment [A221]:** Don’t mention hot-button issues like “stop-and-search” in drive-by references like this.

**Comment [A222]:** Unclear

Remember when BLM cucked Bernie? Not that I don't love a bit of left-on-left in-fighting violence, but is there a white person on earth less likely to end a black life than Bernie Sanders?

**Comment [A223]:** This seems out of place here while discussing violence.

It's all so nonsensical, and impossible to control or police when it spirals into violence.

In a 2015 column, I openly pondered just how real Black Lives Matter was.<sup>58</sup> Is the Klan still around? I ask because Black Lives Matter has been so busy turning the entire American population against its own cause, you have to wonder if BLM is an astroturfed ploy of the American Nazi Party or some related anti-black organisation like the Kardashian family, which has destroyed the lives of nearly as many black guys as BLM.

**Comment [A224]:** The way you casually bring up the KKK makes no sense.

**Comment [A225]:** See comment page 107.

**Comment [A226]:** Delete. Not worth explaining why the Kardashians are anti-black.

By the way, if you've ever wondered whether Black Lives Matter is ultimately just another delicate group of social justice warriors, give this a try: tell them "all lives matter" and watch them shake, cry, and urge the student senate to pass a resolution banning the phrase from their campus.

**Comment [A227]:** If you're going to make a joke out of the "all lives matter" situation, you should go into it: WHY do they object to the expansion of the phrase from "black lives matter" to "all lives matter" and WHY do you approve of it?

The result of all this is eminently predictable: gang violence is skyrocketing across America. Baltimore suffered its deadliest year in history after the riots in that city, with 344 homicide deaths in 2015. In 2014, progressives at Raw Story were wringing their hands over 238 black deaths caused by police officers across the entire country. In 2015, Baltimore's black deaths passed that number by over 100 -- in just *one* American city.

**Comment [A228]:** Can you really prove a causality between BLM and crime rate?

At first, the left vociferously denied the idea that there was a "Ferguson Effect" -- a spike in violent crime across America caused by the rolling back of proactive policing in response to Black Lives Matter. But eventually, the evidence grew so compelling (10 heavily black cities saw a homicide surge of over 60 percent<sup>59</sup>) that even Vox admitted the problem was now "too

<sup>58</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/10/movements-less-ridiculous-than-black-lives-matter/>

<sup>59</sup> <http://www.wsj.com/articles/the-nationwide-crime-wave-is-building-1464045462>

clear to ignore” and grudgingly conceded that the Ferguson Effect was “narrowly correct, at least in some cities.”<sup>60</sup>

The great lie of Black Lives Matter is saying that police hurt black people rather than the truth, which is that police help them. A cursory glance at arrest statistics reveals the group’s claims to be shockingly fraudulent. It’s true that police shootings disproportionately affect black people -- they make up 26 percent of police shooting victims, despite making up 13 percent of the population<sup>61</sup>. But as has been tirelessly pointed out by every conservative journalist who covers this topic, they are also vastly overrepresented in crime statistics. As the *Wall Street Journal* notes:

Some may find evidence of police bias in the fact that blacks make up 26% of the police-shooting victims, compared with their 13% representation in the national population. But as residents of poor black neighborhoods know too well, violent crimes are disproportionately committed by blacks. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, blacks were charged with 62% of all robberies, 57% of murders and 45% of assaults in the 75 largest U.S. counties in 2009, though they made up roughly 15% of the population there.

**Comment [A229]:** Answer charge that you and the WSJ are “whitewashing” the killing of unarmed black men

When paired with the crime statistics, 26 percent is not a surprising number. Moreover, it is not always white police officers who are doing the shooting, a fact that casts doubt on hysterical claims from BLM activists and progressive journalists that there is an epidemic of white racism in America’s police force. From the same article:

**Comment [A230]:** Don’t use a word like “hysterical”

<sup>60</sup> <http://www.vox.com/2016/5/18/11683594/ferguson-effect-crime-police>

<sup>61</sup> <http://www.wsj.com/articles/the-myths-of-black-lives-matter-1468087453>

The Black Lives Matter movement claims that white officers are especially prone to shooting innocent blacks due to racial bias, but this too is a myth. A March 2015 Justice Department report on the Philadelphia Police Department found that black and Hispanic officers were much more likely than white officers to shoot blacks based on “threat misperception”—that is, the mistaken belief that a civilian is armed.

A 2015 study by University of Pennsylvania criminologist Greg Ridgeway, formerly acting director of the National Institute of Justice, found that, at a crime scene where gunfire is involved, black officers in the New York City Police Department were 3.3 times more likely to discharge their weapons than other officers at the scene.

What do these black officers know that the white ones don't? Draw your own conclusions.

There are white people that Black Lives Matter should look up to, and they're not Shaun

King. ~~They're Rudy Giuliani, the former mayor of New York, whose proactive policing caused~~

~~gang violence in the city to plummet.~~ They're Heather MacDonald, the tireless Manhattan

Institute researcher who has outlined the damage done to black lives by the Black Lives Matter

movement in meticulous detail (many of the citations in this chapter are from her work). They're

Rudy Giuliani, the former mayor of New York, whose proactive policing caused gang violence

in the city to plummet. And they're the hundreds of thousands of police officers, white and

black, who patrol America's streets at night, preventing young black men from murdering each other.

**Comment [A231]:** Put Rudy second—or use another example. He's viewed as a partisan and not likely to bolster your argument to people skeptical of your position.

On the rare occasions when police officers do shoot a black suspect, they're just as likely to do so if the officer themselves were black. Or even if the officer was a Bblack LIVES Mmatter activist! Whenever black critics of the police have dared submit themselves to "use of force" simulations, which put participants in police scenarios where the use of force against a suspect is an available option, they end up pulling the trigger just as often as white policemen<sup>62</sup>.

Black lives don't matter to Black Lives Matter. If they did, they wouldn't focus on police-related deaths, which make up a tiny part of preventable black deaths, they would focus on the problems of their own community rather than decrying dwindling "white racism," and above all they wouldn't force police off America's streets.

The great truth obscured by the media and left-wing politicians is the fact that the police are not enemies to black lives, but in fact their greatest defenders.

~~It's amazing that they've put up with it for so long.~~

**Comment [A232]:** Stronger to end with above.

### The Facts

Despite ~~my~~ the obvious degeneracy, I consider myself pretty right-wing. ~~I like to mess with leftists' heads by dressing up in drag and bragging about cum-soaked gay orgies on one evening, and unloading a pump-action shotgun into a placard marked "feminism" while "The Star Spangled Banner" plays in the background on the next. If Madonna can do it, why not me?~~

**Comment [A233]:** Joke falls flat here

~~Still, not even a proud right-winger like me would deny that there are real, structural issues in America that make it more difficult to be a black person. Unlike the largely bogus complaints of feminists and gay people, who are at this point largely privileged classes, African-Americans are still second-class citizens to a large degree.~~

**Comment [A234]:** Give this admission more prominence!

<sup>62</sup> <http://www.fox10phoenix.com/news/1382363-story>

Education is the prime example. Schools in America are still largely segregated -- black pupils overwhelmingly go to schools in lower-income neighborhoods, where class sizes are large, the standard of teaching is poor, and where gangs prey upon adolescent boys. In 83 out of the 97 large American cities where data is available, the majority of black students attended school where most of their classmates were low-income. In 54 out of the 97 cities, at least 80 percent of black students did so<sup>63</sup>.

For far too many young black adults in America the only dream they have of escaping a life of poverty is playing professional sports, or becoming a music artist, ~~or dating me~~.

**Comment [A235]:** Again, joke falls flat here

Unlike lashing out at the police, fixing America's schools would go a long way to solving the deep-seated issues that cause black people to remain stuck in a cycle of crime and poverty. But unlike the angry, tribal politics of Black Lives Matter, the political dividends of such reforms could only be reaped in the very long term. Efforts to fix America's schools, as George W. Bush discovered when he attempted to do so, typically cause more political damage than gain.

The problem of black schools is part of a wider maelstrom of disadvantage faced by black people in America. Black children are more likely to live in inadequate housing, are more likely to grow up in conditions of relative poverty, and are more likely to have uneducated or poorly educated parents -- one of the strongest indicators of future academic and professional success.

You'll notice "parents" is plural in the previous sentence, but 70% of black children are born to single women<sup>64</sup>. Furthermore, black children are likely to grow up surrounded by crime, which makes them more likely to fall into the lifestyle themselves, and more likely to be affected by crime -- which obviously has a host of ramifications that affect educational attainment,

<sup>63</sup> <http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/02/concentration-poverty-american-schools/471414/>

<sup>64</sup> [https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr64/nvsr64\\_12.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr64/nvsr64_12.pdf)

including absenteeism and stress. (Real stress, not the “triggering” that feminists experience when they encounter something they disagree with.)

Then there’s the war on drugs, which needlessly puts hundreds of thousands of black people in jail. Unlike leftists, I don’t celebrate drug use or encourage it as a lifestyle. Sure, in my younger days I led what can only be described as a “Hunter S. Thompson” lifestyle, consuming things that didn’t even have street names yet. But that was a mistake! —I wouldn’t wish the mistakes of my youth on anyone else – my lifestyle is a warning, not an example. Drugs are degenerate. But banning degeneracy, in this case at least, has only pushed the problem underground. More than that, however, it’s caused entire generations of young black men to be lost to the prison system. It must end.

**Comment [A236]:** Generalization

**Comment [A237]:** You’re at your best persuasive when you keep using this word. It means something to YOU that you will be unable to convey in a book like this.

I don’t claim to have the answer to these problems. But I wouldn’t attack progressives if they truly wanted ~~who want~~ to discuss them, and I would never ~~or~~ pretend that these problems don’t exist. Indeed, I’d like to see more Republicans take these issues seriously. I’m no libertarian, but it’s no surprise that Senator Rand Paul was polling so well with black voters before he dropped out of the Republican presidential race in 2016<sup>65</sup>. Paul’s proposals for drug reform, prison reform, and education reform were specifically designed to address issues in the black community.

The fact of continued racial disadvantage in America will be uncomfortable for conservatives who are sick of constant, bogus complaints about racism. Those bogus complaints do exist, it’s true. But that’s no excuse for ignoring the facts. Structural disadvantage does still exist, and something has to be done about it. I’ve never known conservatives to react to uncomfortable facts with the hand-wringing and denialism that the regressive left do, so I have every confidence that they’ll receive these with an open mind.

**Comment [A238]:** You would help the book by making stronger points of things like “structural disadvantage” on which you agree with your critics.

**Comment [A239]:** Reader doesn’t know how the left is regressive.

**Comment [A240]:** Conservatives have these facts already. Everybody does. They’re FACTS.

<sup>65</sup> <http://rare.us/story/rand-paul-is-getting-more-black-support-than-almost-any-other-republican/>



I'm actually far more concerned by where progressives, who have been complaining about racism and racial disadvantage for decades, are moving on racial issues. Having made the problem of racial disadvantage worse with ill-advised welfare programs that try to fix black poverty by throwing money at the problem, they are now moving on to Black Lives Matter, a movement that is leading to more black lives being lost.

**Comment [A241]:** You still haven't clearly demonstrated WHY more black lives are being lost

As we shall see in the next section, they are also moving on to issues that are entirely trivial.

### The Narrative

Black Lives Matter is instructive, because it illustrates how the political and cultural establishment can spread lies when the truth is in plain sight. After all, it's not as if data on homicides, deaths in police custody and arrests is hidden away. Anyone can access the information they need to debunk the lies of Black Lives Matter.

But that takes time and effort. Activists, cultural elites and the mainstream media know that most people have too much going on in their lives to fact-check the narrative. Especially if the narrative is blasted out of every TV network, broadsheet newspaper and online social network.

In the mainstream media, there is perhaps one major mainstream newspaper -- the *Wall Street Journal* -- that regularly publishes articles critical of Black Lives Matter. Every other newspaper is completely on board with the poisonous message that America's police officers, one of the most important groups *defending* black lives, somehow have it in for black people.

**Comment [A242]:** How do you know this is true of "every other newspaper"?

Here are a selection of headlines from mainstream outlets published in the past two years.

*The Washington Post*: “Black Lives Matter And America’s Long History of Resisting Civil Rights Protesters.”

*The New York Times*: “Dear White America.” (the article condemned a “system that continues to value black lives on the cheap.”)

*The Chicago Tribune*: “I Never Have To Worry I’ll Be Shot in Chicago. I’m White.” (the article amazingly manages to talk about the problem of gang violence while simultaneously condemning allegedly overzealous policing.)

**Comment [A243]:** VERY IMPORTANT DISTINCTION: Are these editorials or op-eds?

You know, if I was fed a constant stream of articles telling me that the world hated me because of the color of my skin, I might burn down a city or three too. I would of course do it much more elegantly than Black Lives Matter. Why is it that no left-wing protester knows how to rock a good pair of aviators? And why can’t they carry their Molotov cocktails around in a Louis Vuitton instead of a drab black rucksack? For God’s sake, lift your pinky when you’re throwing rocks at the riot squad! Act like a lady! My goodness, at least the political street thugs of the 1930s had a sense of style! I’d also have the good sense to burn down someone else’s neighborhood instead of my own. There’s nothing worse than having a good riot only to return home and find that your neighbors burned down your house too, not to mention the pharmacy where you pick up your grandma’s medicine.

**Comment [A244]:** Attempts at humor here are too weak and too long

Despite my urge to correct the poor aesthetic decisions of black rioters, I’m not going to burn down a city, because I don’t read the Daily Stormer every day. I don’t believe that my race is under siege. Plus white people only usually riot when a college basketball team wins the championship, which makes as much sense as Chelsea Clinton entering a beauty contest.

**Comment [A245]:** Gratuitous insult diminishes credibility

Unfortunately, African-Americans rarely hear anything else. They don’t need a “Daily Stormer” because they’ve already got Ta-Nehisi Coates’ column at *The Atlantic*.

**Comment [A246]:** Cut comments. Otherwise you have to explain Daily Stormer. Also Coates is reporting his experience not saying how the world feels

It's not just the mainstream media either. Social media, which has far greater potential to subtly influence ordinary members of the public, is also in bed with Black Lives Matter. —in some cases literally, if you believe certain scandalous rumours about BLM leader Deray McKesson and Twitter CEO Jack Dorsey, with whom he has appeared at numerous high-profile public events.

**Comment [A247]:** This is what people say about YOUR social media

**Comment [A248]:** No, we will not traffic in rumors

Facebook is no better. Mark Zuckerberg is a well-known progressive who praises Germany's disastrous immigration policies and pushes for their adoption in the United States. In February 2016, he wrote a letter to Facebook employees reprimanding them for replacing "Black Lives Matter" slogans with "All Lives Matter" on company whiteboards. "This has been a deeply hurtful and tiresome experience for the black community and really the entire Facebook community, and we are now investigating the current incidents" wrote Zuckerberg<sup>66</sup>.

Twitter's embrace of fashionable progressive narratives needs no introduction. This is the company whose CEO has marched alongside Black Lives Matter protesters in Ferguson. This is the platform that permanently banned conservative blogger Charles C. Johnson because he threatened to "take out" Deray -- all neutral observers, including the feminist tech journalist Amanda Hess, agreed that this was clearly a metaphor for a journalistic expose. Yet Twitter banned him anyway, because Deray is one of Twitter's political VIPs. This is the company that has a "Black Lives Matter" poster hanging in its office. If they really cared about black lives, they'd have a framed photo of Sheriff David Clarke.

**Comment [A249]:** Identify for readers who do not know him

[This is also the platform that banned me on the trumped-up charge of leading a harassment campaign against *Ghostbusters* actress Leslie Jones. I did no such thing. All I did

<sup>66</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/02/26/zuckerberg-reprimands-facebook-staff-for-rejecting-black-lives-matter/>

was say she looked like a man. That's not harassment, it's a fact! Despite appearing nowhere in Twitter's rules, it appears that hurting the feelings of a prominent black celebrity is a bannable offense.

**Comment [A250]:** These hit-and-run superficial mentions of the Leslie Jones situation backfire on you. Again, you need to clearly set out the ENTIRE SITUATION at the first mention.

Progressives have considerable power to shape a narrative. They control the mainstream media, Hollywood, and the commanding heights of the new social media economy. If they wanted to, they could use this power to create inexorable pressure to solve the real issues of America's black population.

**Comment [A251]:** Straw man

Instead, they're using it to push Black Lives Matter, one of the most destructive movements in the country's history.

It's actually worse than that. They're also pushing issues that are utter trivialities.

### **Dreadlocks**

**Comment [A252]:** This section feels phenomenally petty after the well-researched material previously. Delete

In March 2016, a video emerged of a black woman in a fit of rage, physically accosting a white man. Was the white man a racist? Did he say the N-word? Was he wearing a Klan robe?? No. He was wearing dreadlocks.

The video quickly went viral, leading to hurried denials from SFSU that the black woman was an employee of the university. But it was hardly the first dreadlocks incident. Rarely a month goes by without a teenager on social media (particularly women) being mobbed by furious left-wing activists for "appropriating" black culture in some way, whether it's wearing dreadlocks, or in Miley Cyrus' case, twerking.

I have some sympathy with the left-wing activists here. Like them, I also think that wearing dreadlocks is a cardinal sin. My reasoning is slightly different to theirs, however. I think white people who wear dreadlocks should stop, not because it's "cultural appropriation," but

because it's *heinous*. I take aesthetics very seriously. (I spent years doing it doggy so I didn't have to look at the trick's face.) You'll know this if you follow me on Instagram or Snapchat. But I don't elevate it to a political issue, much less an issue of race.

Large corporations who ought to know better, particularly in Silicon Valley, have a similar obsession with trivialities. These companies could be using their financial heft to fund education programs and initiatives against gang violence. Even a conservative supervillain like me wouldn't oppose that.

Instead, however, they're blowing eye-popping quantities of cash on diversity initiatives — \$300 million in the case of Intel, which astonishingly came at the expense of their actually-useful R&D budget<sup>67</sup> — that do little more than pluck a small selection of already-privileged minorities from top colleges and plant them in technology companies. That money could be helping the genuinely disadvantaged.

They're also spending money on another trivial obsession of the regressive left: “microaggressions,” or, as Intel calls them, “microinequities.” In November 2015, Intel manager Andy Robbins sent a letter to employees — *all* employees — encouraging them to attend the companies’ “microinequities” training, which promised to teach attendees about the “subtle, usually-subconscious messages we all send that devalue, discourage and ultimately impair performance in the workplace<sup>68</sup>.”

The tech world's obsession with microaggressions was mocked by the creators of the hit comedy *Silicon Valley*, which satirizes the worst instincts of America's nerd kings. On the show's blog, the fictional tech company Pied Piper published its “workplace harassment policy”:

<sup>67</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/09/10/intel-cuts-300m-in-jobs-research-education-and-talent-to-fund-feminist-frequency/>

<sup>68</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2015/11/20/intel-thrusts-hilariously-weird-microinequities-diversity-training-on-employees/>

Pied Piper will join the cutting edge of the harassment-detection industry in forbidding microaggressions, nanoaggressions, picoaggressions, yoctoaggressions and all such oppression “particles,” if you will, down to the quantum level.

Pied Piper additionally forbids man-splaining, white-splaining, straight-splaining, cis-splaining, able-splaining, splain-splaining, splain-plaining, splain-shaming and, in general, saying things people don’t like. Discussion or possession of the Kurt Vonnegut short story “Harrison Bergeron” will be grounds for immediate termination.<sup>69</sup>

The result of this weird, over-the-top focus on trivialities, besides making excellent fodder for comedians, is that no one pays attention when diversity-obsessives start to talk about real issues. It’s the black man who cried dreadlocks. When there are so many real issues affecting the black community, the obsession of left-wing activists with issues like dreadlocks and twerking is simply absurd. It causes such damage to the already threadbare credibility of the left that when they do talk about real issues, like black education, few reasonable people are willing to listen. I don’t blame them.

### **Blood ion the Streets**

When Lyndon B. Johnson was discussing the need to tackle racism in America, he was under no illusions about the gravity of the problem facing the nation. “The Negro fought in the war [World War Two]” Johnson told an aide “He’s not gonna keep taking the shit we’re dishing out. We’re in a race with time. If we don’t act, we’re gonna have blood in the streets.”

<sup>69</sup> <http://www.piedpiper.com/201555our-workplace-harassment-policy/>

It's been more than fifty years since the Johnson administration signed the 1964 Civil Rights Act into law, and America has blood on its streets. But it can no longer be blamed on racism -- at least, not on white racism.

On July 7, 2016, the black supremacist Micah Xavier Johnson opened fire on police officers in Dallas, Texas, killing five officers and injuring nine others, as well as two civilians. It was the deadliest incident for U.S. law enforcement since the September 11 attacks.

Just ten days later, another black supremacist, Gavin Eugene Long, opened fire on police officers in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. He killed two officers and hospitalized three others, one critically.

Both Micah Xavier Johnson and Gavin Eugene Long grew up in a society in which university professors, celebrities, and mainstream news outlets all told them that the police were racist and wanted to kill them. Both men turned to virulently racist forms of black nationalism, which -- unlike, say, Pepe the Frog -- receives scant scrutiny or attention by media and political elites. In many university departments, the racist, anti-white views held by Long and Johnson are virtually encouraged.

**Comment [A253]:** Use other words to describe their views, words the reader can agree with

Both men are individuals responsible for their actions, but it would be simplistic to argue that they weren't also products of their upbringing, and the messages they were bombarded with since birth. While the progressive left harangues white twerkers and dreadlocks-wearers as racist, and while the establishment media wrings its hands over alt-right memes, black people in America are being fed a daily dose of anti-white, anti-police hatred that, inevitably, spills over into violence.

The greatest tragedy is that the primary target of this violence is the police, one of the greatest, largely unacknowledged *allies* of black communities. It is the police who stand between

black people and the greatest threat to black lives, gang violence. It is the police who disperse black rioters when they're burning down their own neighborhoods. And, amazingly, they will continue to do both, despite the fact that they seem to receive only bullets and bloodshed from black people in return.

I'm proud to enjoy the support of police officers and other men and women serving America. I am never more humbled and grateful when I receive praise from these people, who risk so much and give so much for their country, often in return for nothing but scorn from the public and politicians. There are few things make me angry -- or "rustle my jimmies," as I believe the kids like to say - but this persistent injustice is surely one of them.

Black Lives Matter hates me, and I hate them. ~~They are poisonous, hateful, and violent.~~  
 But I don't hate them because they pose a threat to white people. ~~If you aren't a police officer,~~  
~~you'll probably be fine.~~ No, I hate them because they do precisely the opposite of what they claim to do. They cause *more* black lives to be lost, not less. And they do so by attacking the one group of people, the police, who are trying to help their communities.

**Comment [A254]:** These gratuitous epithets destroy the intelligence of this final paragraph.  
 Delete

The people who *really* ought to hate Black Lives Matter are other black people.



## 6

## WHY THE MEDIA HATES ME

*"Every time I speak of the haters and losers I do so with love and affection. They cannot help the fact that they were born fucked up!"*

—Donald Trump

**Comment [A255]:** This seems to be the wrong quote to start this chapter off—and where did it come from? He doesn't usually say fuck

It was two weeks after the election of Donald J. Trump as President of the United States, and the Deputy Prime Minister of Japan, Tarō Asō, was visibly annoyed. But he wasn't annoyed at Donald Trump.

Speaking in Japan's National Diet (parliament), the famously blunt Deputy Prime Minister shot down a suggestion that the country should begin to make plans for Trump's policies, as predicted by the American media.

"There's no point in Japan making policy based on the guesses of American newspapers when they're always wrong" said Asō. "We shall just have to wait until things are decided."<sup>70</sup>

Asō was right to be annoyed. What is a Japanese politician to do when previously-trusted names in western news, like the *New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, BBC and CNN fail so comprehensively to describe what's going on in American politics? It's best not to pay attention at all.

It's an option that a growing number of Americans have taken as well.

A Gallup poll conducted less than a month before the election found that Americans' trust in the mainstream media had fallen to an all-time low. Just 32 percent said they had a "great

<sup>70</sup> [https://www.youtube.com/watch?time\\_continue=2&v=fjyz-NtENhl](https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=2&v=fjyz-NtENhl)

deal” or a “fair amount” of trust in the media, the lowest figure that Gallup has recorded since they began conducting the poll in 1972. Just ten years ago, the same figure stood at 50 percent.

Even Democrats, who the media caters to, are lukewarm on the subject. Gallup found that just 51 percent of them said they had a great deal or a fair amount of trust in the media, compared to 30 percent of independents and 14 percent of Republicans -- roughly the same number who supported John Kasich in the primary.

Even more worryingly for the media, trust is in particular decline amongst younger people. From 2011 to 2016, trust in the 18-49 age bracket fell by nearly twenty points, from 43 percent in 2011 to 26 percent in 2016. For the older generation (50 and over), trust only declined by six points in the same period, from 44 percent in 2011 to 38 percent in 2016.

In other words, the few people who still trust the media in America will soon be either retired or dead.

Isn't it deliciously ironic that the children of the 1960s, that era when the young rose up against the heroic, selfless World War Two generation, are now stuck in the same old jam as their grandparents? After working so hard to destroy conservative values, they settled into a lazy complacency after destroying conservative values, foolishly believing they had won the culture war forever. Now they have to watch as their own children rise up against them in glorious rebellion, embracing the very values that they sought to destroy.

So, the children of the 70s and 80s listened to punk rock instead of Walter Cronkite? Well the children of the 2010s read 4chan and watch my live roasts of feminism instead of Anderson Cooper. Cosmic justice is alive and well.

The media has no way to dig itself out of this mess. They are stuck in the greatest circle-jerk of virtue-signalling ever seen in history. Their primary concern is no longer conveying the

**Comment [A256]:** Define for the reader.

latest information about current events to the American public, but with demonstrating their own commitment to the politically correct worldview of their colleagues and peers in the ever-shrinking world of the metropolitan bubble.

Most of their leading lights have lost any interest of objective news reporting, of Woodward & Bernstein-style investigative journalism, of speaking truth to power. Those who do are terrified of ~~being ostracized~~ ~~destracization~~, and go along with the virtue signaling -- as a result, any good journalism they eventually come out with is left ignored by an increasingly disgusted, disillusioned public.

That's why they missed the rise of Trump: ~~not~~ ~~It wasn't~~ because the signs weren't obvious -- they were hiding in plain sight, in the tens of thousands who attended his rallies, even in previously-solid Democrat strongholds like Michigan and Pennsylvania. They were ~~hiding~~ ~~from~~ ~~in~~ ~~inevitable~~ ~~the~~ ~~brutal~~ ~~attacks~~ ~~from~~ ~~violent~~ ~~left-wingers~~ against open Trump supporters, which led his more cautious backers to conceal their true allegiances from pollsters.

**Comment [A257]:** According to CBS, they were not hiding, so not all media reported that

~~And of course, they were also hiding in the millions of people who watch my YouTube videos and share my Facebook posts. If the media wanted to judge where the wind was blowing,~~ they should have paid attention to my soaring Google rankings. ~~I mean, I know it's difficult to acknowledge a roaring, unstoppable success like me when your own ratings are tanking, but furious, teary-eyed bitterness is no excuse for not doing your job, guys! Grab a box of napkins and get to work!~~

**Comment [A258]:** Ego gets in the way in this paragraph. Delete

Precisely the same thing happened in Brexit, unexpectedly won by the populist right, and in the 2015 British Parliamentary elections, unexpectedly won by the centere-right Conservative party. In both cases, left-wing hysteria led voters to keep their heads down until election day, when they quietly voted for the right.

Why ~~But didn't~~ the media ~~didn't~~ spot the signs? ~~→~~ Because they didn't want to. In their worldview, Mitt Romney's failed bid for President in 2012 proved the dominance of the new Democratic coalition of urban voters and minorities. They grew drunk on the delusion of their own power. Surely Trump, who said far more offensive things than Romney, would go down to a historic defeat. Not at the hands of the Democrats, but at the hands of the media.

~~I'm sure that a~~ Not every journalist working in the mainstream media failed to see the tsunami that was about to engulf the Democrats and their allies in the media elite, but those who suspected it was coming they probably decided that keeping their heads down was the best career choice. A couple of examples prove that they likely made the right choice.

When Huffington Post blogger David Seaman published two articles for the site breaking with the left-wing and mainstream media's self-imposed vow of silence on Hillary Clinton's health issues, retribution was swift and merciless. Not only were his two articles on the subject ("Hillary's Health Is Superb, Aside From Seizures, Lesions, Adrenaline Pens," and "Donald Trump Challenges Hillary Clinton To Health Records Duel") deleted, but he was fired, locked out of his editing account, and then his *entire history of articles* at the online news site was ~~ere~~ scrubbed from the site.

Understandably miffed, Seaman took to YouTube to express his astonishment.

"Whenever a video concerning a presidential candidate's health is viewed more than 3.5 million times, somebody under contract to the Huffington Post should be able to link out to that, especially as a journalist living in the US without having their account revoked" said Seaman. "I've filed hundreds of stories over my years as a journalist and pundit and I've never had anything like this happen."

**Comment [A259]:** How do you know there wasn't another reason or reasons he was fired and deleted. This feels like half the story.

**Comment [A260]:** The accuracy of this account will be questioned.

Seaman was not the only example. There was also Michael Tracey, a reporter for *Vice* whose relentless Hillary-bashing was tolerated only during the primaries, when Tracey was a vocal supporter of Sen. Bernie Sanders. ~~But once Clinton had wontricked her way to a victory over the Sanderssenile socialist,~~ however, Tracey's views were suddenly unwelcome. ~~He found himself as unwanted a rent boy after his customer has climaxed. (Take it from me.)~~

**Comment [A261]:** Sarcasm and sexual humor get in the way of your point here.  
DELETE

Nonetheless, he persisted, repeatedly highlighting the failings of Hillary Clinton on social media in the months leading up to the election. On September 6, 2016, he published one of the election cycle's more prescient columns: "The Mainstream Media Has a Donald J. Trump-Sized Blind Spot." Tellingly, it wasn't published at his home turf of *Vice*, but at the Daily Beast.

In his column, Tracey described how the media's tactics were backfiring.

I can't tell you how many ordinary folks I've spoken with who don't trust that the rolling Trump outrage machine otherwise known as current mainstream media is giving them the real story. This includes people who generally dislike Trump. One representative example was a restaurant worker in Philadelphia during the Democratic Convention in July who told me that she assumes anything Trump says or does will instantly be blown out of proportion, so has decided to just ignore the coverage. For her, it's a rational reaction to such disproportionate, all-consuming furor: She says she cannot process it all and also retain her sanity. So even if a controversy arises that is legitimately worth getting up-in-arms about, she will no longer know it<sup>71</sup>.

<sup>71</sup> <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/09/06/the-mainstream-media-has-a-donald-j-trump-sized-blind-spot.html>

Tracey was right and the mainstream media were wrong. Not only did they fail to anticipate that Trump's unstoppable momentum would carry him to the White House, but they also likely aided the process, by crying wolf so many times that the voting public simply switched off.

Presumably, Tracey's superiors at *Vice* aren't big fans of "I-told-you-so" moments, and quickly found an excuse to get rid of him after the election, despite his rapidly-increasing readership. Unwilling to be as blatant in their pro-Clinton bias as the Huffington Post, *Vice* instead opted to fire Tracey after he questioned another progressive icon -- Lena Dunham, and her claim to have participated in the closed Democratic primary in New York despite not being registered with the party<sup>72</sup>.

I don't think Tracey or Seaman will end up with their careers particularly damaged in the long-term. They were right and the furious progressives who fired them were wrong. They won't want for employment in the new media ecosystem. But in addition to creating a chilling effect in the mainstream media, where journalists decline to defy the narrative out of fear for their jobs, it also shows how committed the mainstream media is to remaining in its cycle of error. The few reporters who do see past the biases of the bubble are purged. And so, the cycle continues.

Nevertheless, I have good news for Japan's politicians, and for anyone else wondering where to look for truth in this new age of partisan propaganda masquerading as journalism. You see, as virtue-signalling intensifies and the Overton window grows ever narrower, it's no longer just the cranks and the UFO-hunters who are left outside the mainstream -- journalists and fact-hunters who actually *do* know what's going on in the world are left outside too. Some of them

**Comment [A262]:** Except it wasn't only the liberal media who were wrong. CONSERVATIVE pundits and Trump staffers also thought he'd lose.

**Comment [A263]:** Just FYI: the right also cries wolf. Inventing outrage after outrage that Obama or the Democrats commit. The story you are missing—and that no one has told—is why enough of the public stopped listening to the stories about Trump and believed all the stories about Clinton. But it's probably not your story to tell.

**Comment [A264]:** Much wasn't "wolf"—much of what the media reported about Trump was true.

**Comment [A265]:** This doesn't make sense.

**Comment [A266]:** This needs better sourcing. It seems made up.

**Comment [A267]:** You MUST ACKNOWLEDGE that this is EXACTLY what people accuse you and Breitbart of being: "a new age of partisan propaganda masquerading as journalism."

**Comment [A268]:** Explain for people who don't know.

<sup>72</sup> <http://theralphretort.com/hamburger-harper-gets-michael-tracey-fired-vice-proved-lena-dunham-liar-11011016/>

are handsome, funny, charismatic and fabulous. And if you want to know when the next Donald J. Trump is coming around the corner, all you have to do is find them.

I am of course referring to myself, to *Breitbart News*, and to my fellow travelers in the anti-establishment press. ~~Although in fairness, I'm not really a journalist these days—more of a movement, or perhaps a cult leader. If I wasn't a devoted Catholic, I might found my own religion. To be honest, I sometimes wonder why I chose to start out in a whorish, dishonest profession like journalism.~~

**Comment [A269]:** This gets in the way of your point here. DELETE

I made many mistakes in my youth – dropping out of college, spending too much time blowing drug dealers, not resisting Father Michael's advances – but picking journalism as a career was probably the biggest one ever. What was I thinking! It's certainly not a path I'd advise anyone else to take, unless you fancy answering to miserable, soft-spoken nerds in plaid shirts who want you to convince the public that Islam is nothing to be afraid of and that “mansplaining” is a thing that exists.

Nevertheless, if you are going to be a journalist, tell the truth. Your career options will be limited initially, but honesty pays off where it matters – with the public. And you don't even have to be left wing! I trust anti-establishment leftists like Michael Tracey far more than *National Review* or RedState columnists, who revealed themselves during the campaign to be little more than watered-down versions of the virtue-signalling mainstream. ~~(Glenn Beck is the exception— he tried to dissolve himself in Cheetos, not water).~~

**Comment [A270]:** Too important a chapter to be scoring points against Glenn Beck here.

We are not hard to find. The alternative media is increasingly difficult to ignore -- *Breitbart News*, for example, maintained the top spot in political news on Facebook and Twitter for most of the election year. Despite the best efforts of biased Silicon Valley CEOs like

Twitter's Jack Dorsey to silence our leading voices, we are the ones that people want to share, and we are the ones that people want to pay attention to.

During my career as a tech journalist in Europe, I quickly learned that tech journalism is a corrupt mess populated by hacks. Then during Gamergate we learned the gaming press is a corrupt mess populated by hacks not interested in the hobby, merely in politicizing it. Now during this election we've learned that the entire mainstream media is a corrupt mess populated by hacks pushing the political views of those in power with zealotry and mendacity.

Just a few years ago, you'd have been laughed out of the room for saying stuff like that. Now everyone knows it's true.

### **Fake News**

Having been embarrassed so often and so spectacularly by the alternative media, you would expect the mainstream to show a little humility after Trump's victory. Instead, they opted to double down, in an ill-conceived attempt to take vengeance on those who humiliated them. As always, their efforts would backfire completely. ~~They can't help but imitate their idol Hillary~~

~~Clinton, even in failure.~~

Instead of asking themselves why they (and the Democrats, ~~but I repeat myself~~) had lost the people's trust, the media instead asked why the people had lost trust in them. A subtle, but important difference as we shall see.

The media decided that the people had been duped.

Instead of listening to pure, truthful, ~~Democrat~~ propaganda, the people were listening to, reading, and watching ~~the~~ alternative media. Something had to be done. But what? Well, the mainstream media could always engage with the alternative media and its arguments directly. -----

**Comment [A271]:** Removing ALL superciliousness from the next section so that the force of your argument comes through



but t-~~no, no, what a silly suggestion~~. That would require facts, evidence, debate, open-mindedness, and other long-forgotten qualities in the mainstream media. ~~It would have to be a~~ smear campaign, as always.

**Comment [A272]:** Absurd name calling

In the days following the presidential election, the media seized on a new meme emerging from left-wing academics and analysts desperate for a reason to absolve them of responsibility for losing America. That meme was “fake news” -- the idea that Donald Trump had won because of the power of social media to spread misinformation. Voters’ anger at elites wasn’t legitimate, you see -- it was all because of the alternative media - sorry, I mean *fake news sites*’ - lies.

A few examples of genuine fake news (sites that create fake stories for clicks and ad revenue like the sites with the extra suffix “.co”: abcnews.com.co, DrudgeReport.com.co, MSNBC.com.co, usatoday.com.co, Washingtonpost.com.co) were relentlessly focused upon by the media to prove the existence of a wider problem. Two false stories about high-profile endorsements of Trump (from Pope Francis and Denzel Washington respectively) and one activist’s mistaken photo about bussed-in anti-Trump protesters in Austin, Texas were used to paint a picture of a deluded electorate<sup>7374</sup>. ~~Other similar stories were cited, including the much-discussed “Pizzagate.”~~

**Comment [A273]:** Acknowledge here in relation to fake news

Despite the fact that we didn’t report on any of those stories, *Breitbart News*, along with InfoWars, Prison Planet, The Blaze, Project Veritas, Private Eye, The Independent Journal Review, World Net Daily, and ZeroHedge were placed on a list compiled by a left-wing

<sup>73</sup> <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/20/business/media/how-fake-news-spreads.html>

<sup>74</sup> <http://www.nbcnews.com/tech/tech-news/facebook-google-crack-down-fake-news-advertising-n684101>

academic of so-called “fake news sites.”<sup>75</sup> It wasn’t just the alternative media either - even more liberal sites like Red State and the Daily Wire made the list!

Now aware of the existential threat posed to his world order, even outgoing president Barack Obama got involved. According to *The New Yorker*, just a few days after the election Obama was talking “obsessively” about a BuzzFeed article attacking pro-Trump fake news sites<sup>76</sup>. In his public statements, Obama also blamed “fake news” for the public’s lack of belief in man-made climate change.

“An explanation of climate change from a Nobel Prize-winning physicist looks exactly the same on your Facebook page as the denial of climate change by somebody on the Koch brothers payroll.” complained Obama.

~~Despite the constant bashing of the 1950s there were two things about the era that Democrats loved: there was only establishment media on radio and television and the top income tax was over 90 per cent.~~

**Comment [A274]:** Off the point

What horror! People can actually publish and share information that casts doubt on what ivory-tower scientific authorities are saying! Information can flow freely! Something must be done!

Obama continued, without any hint of irony. “The capacity to disseminate misinformation, wild conspiracy theories, to paint the opposition in wildly negative light without any rebuttal — that has accelerated in ways that much more sharply polarize the electorate.”<sup>77</sup> You could be forgiven for thinking he was talking about CNN.

<sup>75</sup> <http://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2016/11/breaking-media-list-fake-news-websites-includes-breitbart-infowars-zerohedge-twitchy-blaze/>

<sup>76</sup> [http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/11/28/obama-reckons-with-a-trump-presidency?mbid=social\\_twitter](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/11/28/obama-reckons-with-a-trump-presidency?mbid=social_twitter)

<sup>77</sup> [http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/11/28/obama-reckons-with-a-trump-presidency?mbid=social\\_twitter](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/11/28/obama-reckons-with-a-trump-presidency?mbid=social_twitter)

Wow, that sounds like a serious problem! Just how polarizing and negative are these fake news sites going? Are they writing inflammatory stories about their political opponents with headlines like “This Is How Fascism Comes To America”? Oh wait no, that was the *Washington Post*, in an article about Donald Trump<sup>78</sup>. Are they suggesting that Democrats will commit genocide if elected? Oh wait no, that was ~~an~~ ~~the~~ ~~op-ed~~ ~~editor~~ ~~for~~ ~~in~~ the *New York Times*, writing about Donald Trump<sup>79</sup>.

The subheading “just say it: Trump sounds more and more like Hitler” was, again, not published on any of the sites on the left-wing “fake news” list, but on Slate, a once-respected magazine that once featured columns from Christopher Hitchens<sup>80</sup>.

Obama is right, there is a problem with hysterics and misinformation in the press -- but it’s a problem of the mainstream press, not the alternative media.

One of the fake news media’s most common targets is me. I partly forgive them for this - I’m at least as interesting as national events. But I don’t forgive the lies. Just google “Milo Yiannopoulos” and the terms “alt-right” and “white supremacist,” and count the number of times I’ve falsely been called a leading advocate of both.

These aren’t just sub-par lefty rags like ThinkProgress either (although of course they’re included<sup>81</sup>). It’s supposedly respectable publications like NPR, which called me a “self-proclaimed leader of the alt-right,<sup>82</sup>” *The Guardian*, which called me a member of the

<sup>78</sup> [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/this-is-how-fascism-comes-to-america/2016/05/17/c4e32c58-1c47-11e6-8c7b-6931e66333e7\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.34a69326dd42](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/this-is-how-fascism-comes-to-america/2016/05/17/c4e32c58-1c47-11e6-8c7b-6931e66333e7_story.html?utm_term=.34a69326dd42)

<sup>79</sup> <http://www.ibtimes.com/will-donald-trump-commit-muslim-genocide-president-new-york-times-op-ed-warns-about-2382483>

<sup>80</sup> [http://www.slate.com/articles/news\\_and\\_politics/politics/2016/10/nobody\\_s\\_like\\_hitler\\_but\\_trump\\_is\\_getting\\_closer.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2016/10/nobody_s_like_hitler_but_trump_is_getting_closer.html)

<sup>81</sup> <https://thinkprogress.org/trump-embraces-the-alt-right-cd91cc889154#.wo07v4zto>

<sup>82</sup> <http://www.npr.org/2016/08/26/491452721/the-history-of-the-alt-right>

movement,<sup>83</sup> and GQ, which called me a “prominent voice” in the movement<sup>84</sup>. Britain’s *Daily Telegraph*<sup>85</sup> (I used to write a column for them -- they’ve clearly gone downhill since I left), and Bloomberg Businessweek<sup>86</sup> both called me “the face” of the alt-right, although the latter did it in so inadvertently gracious a manner that I couldn’t help but be flattered. (“The pretty, monstrous face of the alt-right,” they said).

Less flatteringly but no less falsely, both Teen Vogue<sup>87</sup>, the sister publication of Vogue, and *The Stranger*<sup>88</sup>, a weekly newspaper in Seattle, both referred to me as a “White Nationalist” in their headlines.

**Comment [A275]:** Don't cite articles about the book deal in this book

Hilariously, the media has also held me responsible for “leading” the campaign of racist harassment against Leslie Jones<sup>89/90/91</sup> (I simply said she was ugly and that the character she played was a stereotype. Both are true!). Bizarrely, I’ve also been held responsible for the release of Jones’s nude photographs, which were obtained in a hack and released on the web a month after my suspension from Twitter<sup>92</sup>. Are these people mad? Even if I were straight, I’d want nothing to do with them! Especially if I was straight, frankly.

**Comment [A276]:** The points made in this paragraph, without the “hilariously” and “bizarrely” need to be placed when you first mention her.

One of these articles, at *The Week*, carried the headline “How To Explain The Leslie Jones Hack To A 7-Year Old.” It was written in the style of a fairytale, featuring “A boy named Milo” who decided to become famous by “finding the little monsters inside of people that make

<sup>83</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/dec/30/breitbart-milo-yiannopoulos-claims-deal-autobiography>

<sup>84</sup> <http://www.gq-magazine.co.uk/article/milo-yiannopoulos-nero-milo-andreas-wagner>

<sup>85</sup> <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/11/21/school-cancels-talk-far-right-trump-cheerleader-milo-yiannopoulos/>

<sup>86</sup> <https://www.bloomberg.com/features/2016-america-divided/milo-yiannopoulos/>

<sup>87</sup> <http://www.teenvogue.com/story/milo-yiannopoulos-has-been-given-a-book-deal>

<sup>88</sup> <http://www.thestranger.com/slog/2016/12/29/24773362/white-nationalist-lands-250000-book-deal>

<sup>89</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/jul/20/milo-yiannopoulos-twitter-ban-leslie-jones-bad-idea>

<sup>90</sup> <http://www.express.co.uk/entertainment/films/691418/Twitter-leslie-jones-racist-ban-ghostbusters-tweets-breitbart-milo-yiannopoulos>

<sup>91</sup> <http://www.vanityfair.com/style/2016/12/milo-yiannopoulos-leslie-jones-book-deal>

<sup>92</sup> <http://ca.complex.com/life/2016/12/worst-people-2016/james-comey>

people hate things and feed[ing] them.<sup>93</sup> —Congratulations to the author — she correctly identified the mental age of *The Week's* readers!

These are all mainstream, respectable publications staffed by professional journalists. The very same people that we are supposed to believe will provide the public with real, not fake news. Yet this is how they behave towards even the mildest of disagreement: a constant game of virtue-signalling and vice-signalling -- telling others whom to shun by slapping the latest negative buzzword on them, and simultaneously signalling to their friends that they're with the "good guys."

**Comment [A277]:** Again, this is what you are accused of as well

They act like the *Mean Girls* character Regina George, who victimizes any other girl that could possibly be a threat to her popularity, only to discover at the end of the movie that no one actually likes her. Is it any wonder that no-one trusts these reprobates?

Unable to face up to their own failings, the metropolitan media-political bubble has opted for projection instead. So, there's nothing for it. We have to strap them to a chair, tape their eyes open, and make them look in the mirror.

### **Narrative Over Truth**

When the mainstream media want to attack the alternative media, they have no option but to conflate us with obviously fake sites. The truth is, we rarely get it wrong -- because if we did, our error would be trumpeted ceaselessly around the mainstream media for days. On Wikipedia, where left-wing editors have long since taken over, the entry for *Breitbart News* erroneously lists us as a platform for the alt-right at the top of our page, and provides a helpful list of the few stories the site has got wrong in its nine years of existence.

<sup>93</sup> <http://theweek.com/articles/645146/how-explain-leslie-jones-hack-7yearold>

If I were to publish a list of all the mainstream media's errors, half-truths and misinformation in the same period, it would probably fill a book of its own. Still, we can give it a go.

Let's start with one that we all remember: that Donald Trump is a puppet of President Vladimir Putin of Russia. "Vladimir Putin has a plan for destroying the west" wrote *Slate* in an article that was shared over 80,000 times across Twitter and Facebook. "And that plan looks a lot like Donald Trump." Their evidence? The fact that Trump and Putin have complimented each other publicly, the fact that former Trump campaign staffer Paul Manafort once did business in the Ukraine, and the fact that Trump advisor Lt. Gen. Michael Flynn attended a gala hosted by the news channel *Russia Today*. The fact that Trump's secretary of state nominee Rex Tillerson was awarded the Russian Order of Friendship in 2013 was pointed to at later as a sure sign of impending doom.

**Comment [A278]:** Say something about Tillerson here since his connections are more serious than Manafort's or Flynn's

This, according to *Slate*, made Trump "The moral equivalent of Henry Wallace's communist-infiltrated campaign for president in 1948, albeit less sincere and idealistic than that."

The narrative was echoed throughout the mainstream and left-wing media until election day. Politico ran an article calling Trump "The Kremlin's Candidate," using even less evidence than the *Slate* piece. It focused exclusively on Lt. Gen. Flynn's relationship with *Russia Today*, a network which I have also appeared on, and his view that Russia and the U.S. should co-operate to defeat ISIS -- an underwhelmingly common view among analysts.<sup>94</sup>

*The Guardian*, meanwhile, published the account of a no-name think tank employee who claimed that Trump could "endanger western security interests" and said she expected "a lot of appeasement when it comes to Ukraine and Syria."

<sup>94</sup> <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/04/donald-trump-2016-russia-today-rt-kremlin-media-vladimir-putin-213833>

Stories repeating the same circumstantial irrelevancies—Manafort, Flynn, Trump and Putin—appeared in the *Washington Post*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *L.A. Times*, NBC, the BBC, CNN, and Fox News among others. It’s a pattern we see time and time again with the mainstream media:— Once one outlet picks up on a story, however weak or inconsistent, that might damage conservatives, every other mainstream outlet runs with it as well.

Establishment conservatives who believed Trump was unelectable, and would alienate women and minorities should have remembered 2012, when the media did to Mitt Romney precisely what they tried to do did to Trump. When Mitt Romney remarked during his second debate with Barack Obama that he asked for, and received “binders full” of resumes of qualified women when he was facing a deficit of female applicants for jobs in his administration as Governor of Massachusetts.

**Comment [A279]:** Not a sentence

The media seized on Romney’s mild feminist virtue signalling (do you see why we call him a cuck yet, conservatives?) and twisted it into a story about out-of-touch Republican sexism. Within a day, the story was dominating the news cycle. Everyone from the *Wall Street Journal* to CNN was covering it, just as they did again in 2016 with the breathless bogus Trump-Putin connections.

**Comment [A280]:** Let’s leave ‘cuck’ out of it here

**Comment [A281]:** This whole paragraph is off topic.

The story fitted in perfectly with a narrative that had been advanced in the mainstream and left-wing media throughout the election: that conservatives in America were waging a “war on women” due to their opposition to abortion, and for questioning feminist myths like the “wage gap.” The narrative actually continued far beyond the 2012 election, and tied into one of the most damaging examples of “fake news” in recent history -- the “rape culture” panic of 2012-2014.

**Comment [A282]:** one of the most ?

The fact that Romney, a man so boringly moderate his speeches could easily be sold as sleeping aids, was painted as a sexist by the media should have clued Republicans in to the fact the fact that the media would behave the same no matter how their candidate behaved. The best strategy their candidates could adopt, in fact, was one of defiant indifference to media narratives. And in 2016, Donald Trump proved it.

The defeat of Romney wasn't the end of the "war on women" narrative. The narrative actually continued far beyond the 2012 election, tying into one of the most damaging examples of "fake news" in recent history — the "rape culture" panic of 2012-2014.

**Comment [A283]:** Repeats what you said 2 paragraphs ago

If you want a clear example of the difference between the "fake news" that leftists complain about, which at worst duped a few thousand voters into believing that a presidential candidate got a celebrity endorsement, consider what the rape culture narrative did to American college campuses. Miscarriages of justice up and down the country. Colleges facing crippling lawsuits from ex-pupils. Male and female students terrified of one another - the former, of being dragged through the new kangaroo courts springing up on college campuses, and the latter, of a fake rape panic that painted college-aged men as insatiable, psychopathic monsters.

All of this was down to the media, which leaped on the rape culture panic for clicks and political advantage. The bogus statistic - the "fake news" if you will - at the center of the narrative was the lie that 1 in 5 female American college students will be sexually assaulted during their time at university. The real number, according to Justice Department statistics, is closer to 1 in 170, or 7.6 per 1,000<sup>95</sup> -- and plummeting over time.

Yet virtually every media outlet insisted that some variation of sexism in the media, "lad banter" and "frat culture" was responsible for a new epidemic of rape. Video game developers

<sup>95</sup> <http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2014/12/14/campus-rape-uva-crisis-rolling-stone-politics-column/20397277/>



found themselves being accused of “rape culture” if they made their characters too sexy. News stands faced pressure to take raunchy magazines off shelves. *Blurred Lines*, an innocuous pop song by Robin Thicke, was portrayed across the media as a “rape anthem” for the line “I know you want it,” and banned across multiple college campuses in Britain and America. Any criticism or trolling of feminist commentators was portrayed in the media as an outbreak of society’s unquenchable misogyny.

If GamerGate hadn’t demonstrated just how fed up wide sections of the public were with this narrative in 2014, I suspect that the mainstream media would have attempted to keep the narrative going all through the 2016 election and beyond.

GamerGate, of course, was subject to ~~its own~~ ~~their own~~ furious narratives from the mainstream media. For their critique of feminism in video games, the gamers were labelled as misogynists and harassers of women. The games press behaved like a microcosm of the mainstream press -- just as every mainstream news outlet published an article about Mitt Romney’s alleged sexism the day after his “binders” comment in 2012, virtually every gaming publication published an article calling for the “death of the gamer identity” in the week that gamers rose up. Gamers, as the press quickly discovered, were an uncommonly relentless group of people, and never let their press forget the infamous “Games Are Dead” narrative.

We’ll examine their exploits in full in ~~another~~ ~~later~~ chapter, but they are also relevant to this one. Gamers proved that it was possible to fight the media narrative. Gamers didn’t apologize, they held their ground, and they used social media to spread truth faster than the press could spread lies.

Unknowingly or not, the Trump campaign followed the GamerGate model in 2016. Trump’s victory, spectacular and total as it was, was only the second-greatest humiliation of our

mainstream media. Before him, they were beaten by humble gamers fighting back from their basements.

Establishment conservatives should remember that when they wring their hands about how the media will make hay out of Trump's taboo-defying words.

### **The Reckoning**

On Monday 21 November, as Donald Trump was preparing for his transition to office, he called some of the biggest names in American news media to Trump tower. They reportedly expected that the meeting would be about access to the Trump Administration during its time in office. Instead, they received a historic dressing down; what one source at the meeting described to *The New York Post* as a “fucking firing squad.”

“Trump kept saying, ‘We’re in a room of liars, the deceitful, dishonest media who got it all wrong.’ He addressed everyone in the room, calling the media dishonest, deceitful liars. He called out Jeff Zucker by name and said everyone at CNN was a liar, and CNN was [a] network of liars,” the source said.

“Trump didn’t say [NBC reporter] Katy Tur by name, but talked about an NBC female correspondent who got it wrong, then he referred to a horrible network correspondent who cried when Hillary lost who hosted a debate — which was Martha Raddatz, who was also in the room.”

The stunned reporters tried to get a word in edgewise to discuss access to a Trump administration.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>96</sup> <http://nypost.com/2016/11/21/donald-trumps-media-summit-was-a-f-ing-firing-squad/>

Kellyanne Conway would go on to tell reporters in the lobby of the Trump Tower that the meeting was “excellent.” I like to imagine her smirking internally as she said it.

~~A day later, and the post-election roasting had yet to stop. “I cancelled today’s meeting with the failing @nytimes when the terms and conditions of the meeting were changed at the last moment” tweeted Donald Trump. “Not nice.”~~

~~“The failing @nytimes just announced that complaints about them are at a 15 year high” Trump tweeted a few minutes later. “I can fully understand that.”~~

**Comment [A284]:** Mention that the Times denied that the meeting conditions were changed

**Comment [A285]:** Just cut. Off topic.

Trump spent most of his election campaign playing the media like a fiddle. His deliberately provocative comments at the start of the campaign (“When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best... They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists.”) were designed to maximize media coverage. And the media fell for it and played along.

**Comment [A286]:** Do you KNOW Trump designed this or are you just surmising? Also how do you know he didn’t mean it and coverage was just the effect, not the plan? CRUCIAL POINT

The media finally figured out they were being played on Friday 16 September, when Donald Trump’s announcement that he was going to make a statement on the “birther” conspiracy about Barack Obama at the opening of his new hotel in Washington D.C brought what seemed like the entirety of America’s political press corps to Trump’s doorstep. They expected he was going to say something crazy, the final wacky comment that sunk his campaign. Instead, they found themselves covering the opening of a new Trump hotel, and 20 minutes of veterans arriving in front of the cameras to endorse his run for president. Finally, at the very end, Trump appeared to give a two-line comment on the birther issue.

**Comment [A287]:** Again, how do you know they expected that? You can describe YOUR THEORY of these events, but you can’t say this is what Trump thought unless you know firsthand

“President Barack Obama was born in the United States, period. Now we all want to get back to making America strong and great again. Thank you very much.”

The press were fuming. “I don’t know what to say here” said CNN’s chief national correspondent, John King. “We got played again, by the [Trump] campaign.” Meanwhile, Jake Tapper, live on air, called it a “political rickroll.” Tapper perhaps thought he was insulting Trump for engaging in the political equivalent of a prank invented by internet trolls.

Everyone else thought it was hilarious – especially me.

I was one of the first major conservative commentators to back Trump. My headline, published on Breitbart, called Trump “The King of Trolling His Critics” and argued that he should be “The Internet’s Choice for President.”

At the time, few people saw the connection between Trump and internet trolling. Now, everyone sees it. I’ve had some amazing ~~peak sexual experiences in my time, but I never enjoyed anything as much came quite as hard as when Trump rickrolled the media at the Trump International.~~

**Comment [A288]:** Gratuitous sexual comment destroys your authority here

~~It was the perfect troll:~~ it revealed suppressed truths, dismayed and entertained the public in equal measure, and was directed at a deserving target – the media. The entire broadcast media establishment, gloriously humiliated all at once, in front of everyone.

**Comment [A289]:** I still want to know if trolling is really planning out these things in advance or just throwing stuff at the wall and seeing what sticks

Only Daddy could have done it.

### **Don’t Fear the Media**

Establishment conservatives think that Republicans have something to lose by taking on the media. As gamers, and Breitbart, and Nigel Farage in the U.K, Trump and myself have all proved, they don’t.

The press has unloaded everything they have against ~~us~~we five, and what has been the result? GamerGate gathered popularity for two years, unstoppable. Breitbart is one of the most

popular news sources on the planet, and the most popular political news source on social media - and we're still growing. Nigel Farage, condemned as a racist by the media, took his political party to unprecedented electoral successes and almost singlehandedly drove the Euroskeptic movement that culminated in Brexit. Donald Trump, who attracted more media smears than everyone else combined, is our new president.

And look at me, too. Other than Trump, Farage, and possibly Ann Coulter, is there anyone in the English-speaking world that the mainstream media prefers to smear and misrepresent? I've been called a sexist, a misogynist, a racist, and ~~Islamophobe~~, a transphobe, a homophobe (yes, really<sup>97</sup>), a white nationalist, a white supremacist, a supervillain, an attention-seeker (guilty!) and every other nasty label you can imagine. And just look where it's got me!

~~quarter million dollar book deal and my own tour bus.~~ I really hope the mainstream media continues trying to destroy me! ~~Keep it up lads, I'm sure it'll work eventually! Any day now!~~ Believe in yourselves!

**Comment [A290]:** NO MORE REFERENCES TO YOUR BOOK ADVANCE OR THE PUBLISHING PROCESS

The truth is: In an age when nobody trusts the media, taking them on makes you popular.

So do what the media doesn't want you to do: tell the truth bereft of politically correct niceties. Be patriotic. Tell offensive jokes. Engage in "locker-room" talk. The media will hate you for it. They'll call you names. They'll try and smear your reputation. But you really needn't worry -- no-one is listening to them. Except for a small group of their fellow blind, deaf and dumb journalists.

~~Success is the best revenge~~ provided your enemies know just how much success you're enjoying, which is why I always email unfriendly journalists updates on my positions in book charts and my Facebook and YouTube stats. They just love their monthly Milo updates!

**Comment [A291]:** This whole section has to go. Too much ego at a point when you've had truly eye-opening insights into contemporary media. The ego stuff just trivializes everything.

<sup>97</sup> <http://www.latimes.com/books/jacketcopy/la-et-jc-milo-yiannopoulos-book-deal-20161229-story.html>

And sometimes they tweet them, thinking they are being arch and dismissive but actually they're just doing my marketing for me.

And I don't mind telling them now why I do it, because I know they will never stop talking about me even if it helps me. I'm just too smart, too funny, too popular and too successful to ignore. If they tweet and write about me, I get more famous. If they don't, they lose, they don't get to tell their readers lies about me or try to shape public opinion. They just miss out on the story entirely. It's heads I win, tails they lose.

I'm at the stage now where Conde Nast magazines are getting butthurt because I won't give them interviews. That's not because I'm scared of what they might write about me—you know me better than that by now—but because frankly I sometimes can't be bothered wasting hours of my day on outlets that only snobbish elitists read.

The poor dears at British *GQ*, for instance, are upset with me. They spent the week this book was announced reposting an ancient, sleazy hit job on me to cash in those pageviews. I'll put the hit job in question in the footnotes of this book, because I don't care what they say about me and they don't scare me.<sup>98</sup> I always link to the worst things journalists write about me so people can make up their own minds. Trust me, it's not me they end up hating.

Anyway, after trolling around for retweets and shares, cashing in on my success, the magazine complained because I wouldn't spend time with them for a profile.<sup>99</sup> Like, what? Sorry, lads. My time is precious, speaking to me is a privilege and you just didn't make the cut. If I could tell my colleagues in the media four things, they would be:

1. Everyone hates you,

<sup>98</sup> <http://www.gq-magazine.co.uk/article/milo-yiannopoulos-nero-milo-andreas-wagner>

<sup>99</sup> <http://www.gq-magazine.co.uk/article/milo-yiannopoulos-snowflake>

2. ~~N~~no one is afraid of you;
3. ~~N~~no one believes what you say, ~~and n~~
4. ~~N~~obody owes you anything.

If every journalist in America realised those four things, their behavior would transform overnight, immeasurably for the better, and the US might finally get the fourth estate it deserves.

In the meantime, yes. All journalists are liars and frauds unless proven otherwise.

~~Make them earn your trust -- including me.~~

Comment [A292]: End here

~~You need no more evidence of what I'm saying than the book you're holding in your hands right now. If you only read the media coverage about it, you'd imagine it was 2016's *Mein Kampf*. Actually, the only things I have in common with Hitler are being powerful and famous and having great taste in uniforms. What they don't realise is that their lies and moral panics just make me want to go outside in full Nazi drag just to fuck with them, like something from *Ilsa, She-Wolf of the SS*.~~

~~Of course, if I did that, they'd write it up as me being a national socialist. And that's how the Kafkaesque cycle works: the media annoys us all so much with their fibbing that they make us act out, then they write up those provocations and cries of despair as evidence they were right all along. And America kept falling for it ---- until Donald Trump.~~

## WHY OTHER ESTABLISHMENT GAYS PEOPLE HATE ME

"Some people are so precious -- all this hoo-ha about bad role models and positive images! Of course gay people are murderers, bigamists, drug addicts and nasty people -- just as much as heterosexual people are all of these things. What it all boils down to is, we are all people, and we all have the same human desires. It just happens that some desires go this way and some desires go that way. It's sad when people are oppressed. But it's a question of rising above it. Personally, mentally and, if you have to, physically. "

-- *Jaye Davidson (the hot androgynous kid that who played Ra in Stargate)*

**Comment [A293]:** This chapter is in the worst shape of any chapter in the book—and it will be one of the most scrutinized. You can't just toss off poorly thought out theories about "going back into the closet," as you might in a college lecture—people will come to this chapter with legitimate questions about how a gay man goes against the gay/liberal grain. You have to meet their curiosity with an appropriate level of intellectual rigor.

**Comment [A294]:** This quote does not help you set up the chapter.

In April 2013, I appeared on an edition of the British panel show *10 O'clock Live* to take part in a debate. The topic was gay marriage, a cause to which I was then opposed. My opposite number was Boy George, and it was a rare occasion in which I wasn't the most flamboyantly-dressed person on set (although even today, I would never wear anything like Boy George's purple eyeliner - my god!).

My mere opposition to gay marriage was enough to baffle the audience. In 2013, gay marriage had become a kind of litmus test of social acceptability for the left. If you were for it, you were a normal human being. If you were against it, you were a bigoted, malicious relic of the past -- something to be dumped in the trash-heap of history.

Merely being introduced on the show as a gay Catholic opposed to same-sex marriage was all that was needed to baffle my fellow panelists. Before the show was over, I was called a



“homophobic gay man” and accused of “self-loathing,” both of which I am by now used to, for my opposition to gay marriage.

I pointed out that gay marriage reinforced the idea that being gay is a normal or acceptable lifestyle choice, which I believe it isn't -- and shouldn't be. The very term “mainstream gay” is at odds with everything homosexuals have always represented, but nonetheless we are forced to use it because gays have become a monolithic political block.

To mainstream gays, as well as the unfailingly fagophile metropolitans who made up the bulk of the panel show's studio audience, my mere existence is bizarre and shocking. I ~~am~~ was a gay anomaly, like ~~a lesbian without a violent girlfriend~~. And that's *before* I voice my opinions, which cause even more dissonance for traditional left-leaning gay people.

**Comment [A295]:** Leave the lesbians out of it.

Mainstream gays, many of whom are happy to cast scorn on the ~~lives~~ ~~festyles~~ of, say, conservative midwestern ~~Christian~~ families or southern evangelical Christians, “hicks,” simply can't ~~allow~~ understand the possibility that ~~why~~ someone might cast scorn on ~~not~~ consider ~~their~~ lives, ~~festyles~~ to be an object of aspiration, or something that ought to be celebrated in every book, TV show and Hollywood movie.

When you ~~reduce~~ everything is reduced to identity politics and political talking points like this, ~~expecting~~ all gay people are expected to believe the same stuff. People stop ~~and~~ not really listening to each other any more ~~and~~ you rob every one ~~loses~~ of the ability to see and discuss interesting things.

For instance, ~~mainstream gays refuse to understand the fact~~ that Donald Trump is a fabulously camp cultural figure. He's the drag-queen ~~president~~ you can vote for! It's easy to see why so many gays I know secretly adored him. All that pizazz and bluster! (To say nothing of

his strong stance against positions on Islamic homophobia.) He's obviously ought to be a gay icon. He *oozes* control and authority.

That's why I coined the nickname "Daddy" for him,<sup>100</sup> which annoyed just about everyone.<sup>101 102</sup>

Ironically, some of the extreme members of the alt-right also have difficulty grasping the fact that I don't think gayness is a good thing (or, more accurately, I don't *want* gayness to be a good thing). When the *Daily Stormer* called me a "degenerate homosexual," they meant it as an insult. But I take it as a compliment— I became a homo precisely because it *is transgressive* degenerate. And I want homosexuality to continue being transgressive—even degenerate.

The gay establishment is rightly horrified by this view, because it goes against everything they've been working to achieve since the 1990s. But before AIDS, gay men delighted in being transgressive. I think we should go back to that tradition.

**Comment [A296]:** This need something like this to connect your outrageousness to the gay outrageousness of the past.

Gay organizations/foundations are pouring money into programs to stop kids *ussaying* "gay" *asin* at the playground *slur* or calling people "faggots" on the web, but my "Dangerous Faggot" tour, watched by millions of young people around the world, has *done more to reclaim the words gay and faggot than all their programs: them tearing out their rainbow-dyed hair in rage*. Straight kids who used to beat up gay kids now see the gay kids as dangerous and cool and kids to be admired. I'll be I've done more to end bullying than any number of over-earnest public-service announcements.

**Comment [A297]:** Can you phrase this in your own way and back it up anecdotally? Either here or in the Gamers & Frat Boys chapter.

<sup>100</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/06/19/happy-fathers-day-daddy-donald/>

<sup>101</sup> <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/434570/donald-trump-not-your-father>

<sup>102</sup> <http://www.dailywire.com/news/4222/donald-trump-allfather-ben-shapiro>

Every attempt ~~thing on the part of~~ the mainstream organizations ~~attempts to drag~~ gays into the stultifying domesticity of marriage ~~to the campaigns against “homophobic bullying”~~ has one aim: to make gays normal.

I say: Who wants to be *normal*?

Just as mainstream gays are amazed by me and my opinions, I’m ceaselessly amazed by the gay community’s myopic eagerness to sacrifice everything that has made our lifestyle unique, exciting, and dangerous, in exchange for mere *normality*. Just look at the pandemonium<sup>103 104 105 106 107</sup> that was unleashed when OUT magazine dared to publish a nuanced, intelligent profile of me.<sup>108</sup> They just don’t want to hear from anyone whose opinions lay outside a tiny band of far-left lunacy.

If you doubt how much the gay community hates me, consider this: I’ve been banned from San Francisco!<sup>109</sup> Me, the gayest person on the planet. Banned. From San Francisco, the queerest city in America. Apparently I’m just too dangerous a fag, ~~even for a city that feeds AZT directly into the water supply.~~

As the great Camille Paglia says, there’s no way gays could be normal even if they wanted to be.

“Homosexuality is not normal. On the contrary it is a challenge to the norm.

Nature exists whether academics like it or not. And in nature, procreation is the single

<sup>103</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/09/21/out-magazine-profiles-milo-triggers-its-delicate-gay-readers/>

<sup>104</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/09/21/15-most-triggered-responses-to-milo-out-magazine-profile/>

<sup>105</sup> <http://www.mediaite.com/online/backlash-grows-over-out-magazines-decision-to-feature-milo-yiannopoulos/>

<sup>106</sup> <http://www.thewrap.com/out-magazine-milo-yiannopoulos-backlash/>

<sup>107</sup> <https://thinkprogress.org/out-magazine-milo-open-letter-e0d3db3fe7ac#.9z7kgti4i>

<sup>108</sup> <http://www.out.com/out-exclusives/2016/9/21/send-clown-internet-supervillain-milo-doesnt-care-you-hate-him>

<sup>109</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/california/2016/03/18/ive-been-banned-from-san-francisco/>

relentless rule. That is the norm. Our sexual bodies were designed for reproduction. No one is born gay. The idea is ridiculous. Homosexuality is an adaptation, not an inborn trait.

Gay activism has been naive in its belligerent confidence that “homophobia” will eventually disappear with proper “education” of the benighted. Reeducation of fractious young boys on the scale required would mean fascist obliteration of all individual freedoms. Furthermore, no truly masculine father would ever welcome an feminine or artistic son at the start, since the son’s lack of virility not only threatens but liquidates that father’s identity, dissolving husband into wife. Later there may be public rituals of acceptance, but the damage will already have been done. Gay men are aliens, cursed and gifted, the shamans of our time.”

Smart gays who have been around the block, like RuPaul, who I’m convinced is a closet Republican, understand this instinctively. He knows that going mainstream would be death to drag culture and once in a while is brave enough to say so in interviews.<sup>110</sup> RuPaul was the victim of a bit of social-justice censorship himself, when the trans lobby forced *RuPaul’s Drag Race* to stop using the phrase, “You’ve got she-mail,” in case any transgender people were offended.<sup>111</sup>

RuPaul correctly tells gay men they should be striving to stay outside “the matrix.”

~~That’s what I had in mind when I performed *Angel Mom*, my performance art piece at Lucian Wintrich’s “Twinks 4 Trump” art show in New York City.<sup>112</sup> <sup>113</sup> I bathed in freezing cold~~

**Comment [A298]:** Off the point here.

<sup>110</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hnHEWU-WHGE&app=desktop>

<sup>111</sup> <http://www.pinknews.co.uk/2015/03/02/ru-pauls-drag-race-axes-youve-got-she-mail-catchphrase/>

<sup>112</sup> <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2016/10/07/pro-trump-mile-linked-art-show-in-doubt-after-threats-from-anti-trump-activists.html>

pig's blood for 45 minutes, surrounded by images of innocent Americans slain by terrorists and illegal aliens. Now there was a genuinely subversive piece of art: gay men celebrating the orange Antichrist! Could you imagine if Madonna or Paris Hilton released a video with a bunch of underage boys in MAGA hats? No of course you can't, because the only people pushing the envelop in art these days are Republicans.<sup>114</sup> Strange, but true.<sup>115</sup>

Even if we could achieve normality, would we want to? Our weirdness is our strength -- it gives us an edge, a power and a charm over everyone else. For decades, being gay has meant transgression and the violation of taboos. It's been an act of rebellion; an automatic entry pass into society's underworld. Why would we want to give all that up?

When audio leaked in 2012 of Paris Hilton saying gay sex was "scary" and most gays "probably have AIDS," I wasn't mad, because not only was she right, but *that's what I love so much about it.*<sup>116</sup>

**Comment [A299]:** Paris Hilton is NOT the best authority to quote here. Stick to Camille Paglia

Being perverse is okay. Listen to Camilla Paglia, my fellow fags. Realise you have an energy and power others Satanists and goths would die to access. I don't want to have a spouse and kids and a front lawn, I want to be hurled out of a nightclub at three in the morning in a drug-fueled stupor, landing in the gutter next to the gangbanger I'd been sucking off in the toilets. Like Lindsay Lohan on a Tuesday night minus the fire crotch flashing.

Because the alt right is correct -- I'm a degenerate. Which is also And that's why I'm a Catholic.

No really, I'm not trolling you. Hear me out.

<sup>113</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/09/13/exclusive-pictures-milo-twinks-for-trump-photoshoot-lucian-wintrich/>

<sup>114</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/08/29/twinks-for-trump-photographer-fired-after-being-praised-by-milo/>

<sup>115</sup> <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/10/08/a-pro-trump-art-show-but-the-artists-are-interesting.html>

<sup>116</sup> <http://radaronline.com/exclusives/2012/09/paris-hilton-blasts-gay-men-aids-audio-recordings/>

## Dionysus and Apollo

I enjoy being a degenerate. I enjoy violating rules.

So does everyone, to some extent -- the thrill of violating taboos is what lies behind every great cultural rebellion, from the kids who defied their parents to follow touring rock bands in the 60s and 70s, to the gamers who turned *Mortal Kombat* and *Grand Theft Auto* into smash hits precisely because they knew how shocking those games were to polite society, right up to the young memesters of the alt right, who photoshop Nazi uniforms onto cartoon frogs and ~~eat~~ anime characters, not because they are neo-Nazis, but because they know it winds up establishment columnists.

Whether you're breaking down sexual taboos or political ones, the thrill is the same.

But in order to violate a taboo, there must first be a taboo to violate. In politics, this usually takes care of itself -- one set of language codes is usually replaced with another, as new groups of cultural elites take over from the next. But what about sexuality? That, after all, is more important -- because while violating a language code is exciting, it doesn't come close to committing some depraved sexual act that would get you beheaded in most countries outside the developed world.

For sexual mores, it is now straight male sexuality that seems to be most stigmatised.

Normal male behaviour, like awkward sexual advances, cheeky flirting and raunchy songs are now condemned as "rape culture." Not rape itself, which is heinous, but rape culture. In some states, male students can now be charged with rape itself if they don't fulfil the absurd requirements of "affirmative consent," a romance-killing feminist law which calls for verbal consent at every stage of a sexual encounter.

**Comment [A300]:** Add something like this

**Comment [A301]:** Clarify that there SHOULD BE consent but that the idea of affirmative consent, in defining it, makes it too socially conscious. In other words clarify that lack of consent is bad

**Comment [A302]:** Second time you called it 'law' — explain where it is a law.

As a gay man this makes me extremely upset.

On the one hand, ~~this~~ will have a catastrophic effect on gender relations, the worst thing to happen to straight men since the Kardashians reached the age of consent, and ~~it~~ is likely to accelerate the male gender's ~~Japan-like~~ retreat from women. The already-bad birth rates of westerners will get worse, adding to the demand for more immigrants from illiberal countries.

This is all terrible, but it also infuriates me for another reason: I ~~wanted chose to be~~ gay because it was subversive and forbidden and ~~masculine~~ degenerate, ~~but~~ ~~and~~ ~~once~~ ~~now~~ it's straights getting all the fun! ~~And instead of fighting this disturbing development,~~ mainstream gay culture started to ~~is~~ ~~encourageing~~ the normalization of gayness, which ~~now~~ ~~looks~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~inevitable~~. Gay men ~~started to~~ ~~have~~ ~~taken~~ ~~on~~ ~~to~~ ~~so~~ many basic female tendencies: They want get married, have children, live in the suburbs. ~~I~~ ~~hear~~ ~~t~~They're even faking orgasms these days. ~~You~~ ~~have~~ ~~no~~ ~~idea~~ ~~how~~ ~~many~~ ~~gay~~ ~~men~~ ~~spit~~ ~~on~~ ~~their~~ ~~partner~~ ~~'s~~ ~~backs~~ ~~and~~ ~~yell~~, "I'm done, you were the best!" It's almost as if they *want* the happily married life in the suburbs with a family dog and bad sweaters at Christmas.

**Comment [A303]:** 'Choice' is a loaded word. Don't use it here unless you're prepared to argue it.

**Comment [A304]:** Too silly to sustain the serious argument you're making.

I can't bear the horror of such an eventuality. I want to remain degenerate. I want to continue violating taboos and breaking rules. But in order to do so, there first needs to be a book of rules to break -- like the Catholic Bible, for example.

~~Is my argument a few paragraphs back~~ ~~starting to make sense now?~~ You see, in order to be a taboo-defying rebel, there first needs to be some taboos to break. And if you break them beyond repair, you're going to quickly find that you've run out of fun. That's the subtle point that culture warriors of mainstream fagdom don't get: their gay pride marches and flamboyant displays are only bold and subversive in a society that thinks gayness is unacceptable.

**Comment [A305]:** NO!

Without that thrilling, dangerous reality of social disapproval (and perhaps even persecution), a gay pride march is just a bunch of ~~homos in thongs traumatising children in~~ Trafalgar Square or downtown Toronto. It ceases to be an act of rebellion and instead becomes an affirmation of the establishment's values, (as well as an annoyance to passers-by, who probably don't want to see *any* man in a thong, gay or straight, on their way to work-).

**Comment [A306]:** This is NOT what pride parades are nowadays. Pride parades are mostly floats of the gay employees of Citicorp or Delta Airlines or Starbucks, plus religious organizations and 12-step groups. The 'men in thongs horrifying children' thing is just an old anti-gay trope

In July of 2016 I was going to lead a gay pride march through Sweden's Muslim ghetto. Now ~~thatere is~~ would be a pride parade! ~~one in which you are minutes from an RPG up your ass~~ ~~and for once that isn't a sexual euphemism.~~ I had to back out because our security assessment said I would probably be killed.<sup>117</sup> When was the last time that was true at a gay pride parade in any American city?

Nietzsche is instructive here. Throughout his work, he repeatedly reminded us of the value of things we usually consider to be bad -- oppression, persecution, malice, hardship -- summed up in his now-ubiquitous motto "that which does not kill us makes us stronger." By casting ~~its~~ their disapproval on us, society once gave gays an opportunity to develop all sorts of virtues -- bravery, daring, a flair for the clandestine and the dangerous, a creative mind, and an appreciation of freedom.

But most of all, it allowed us to be *naughty*. Again, Camille Paglia noted that, in the past, whenever she met gay men, anywhere in the world, she found a "spontaneity and a spirit of fun and mischief." She's right. There's nothing gay men love more than being mischievous, but it seems mainstream gays want to take all of our opportunities for fun away from us.

<sup>117</sup><http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/07/25/milos-gay-pride-march-in-sweden-cancelled-after-threat-revealed/>



I could understand if gays somehow forgot how fun it was to piss off stuck-up schoolmarms like Tipper Gore, but I fail to grasp how gays *turned into* stuck-up schoolmarms, like Tipper.

Think back to your classroom days. How did the most mischievous members of the classroom get their kicks? Why, from testing the limits of the schoolteacher's patience, of course. Whether it was smuggling trading cards into class, cracking jokes while the teacher was speaking, or telling the good looking boys in class to reach into your pockets because you had candy (okay, maybe that was just me), there has always been an endless battle between teachers and naughty students, each constantly trying to outsmart the other.

But without the teacher, and the constant threat of discipline they represented, that age-old duel becomes meaningless. Imagine if the teachers disappeared for a week -- there would be a couple of days of anarchy, in which the naughtiest members of the class did exactly as they pleased ... And then, I suspect, they would get bored and go home. Rebellion is no fun if there's nothing to rebel against. *The Lord of the Flies* happened because they were stuck on an island without teachers.

It should be easy, now, to see the link between my degeneracy and my Catholicism. I know I'm a degenerate. I chose to be a degenerate, because I enjoy a lifestyle of violating taboos. But my lifestyle only remains degenerate and rebellious while those taboos exist -- and the teachings of the Church remain an excellent framework for them. Every time I bring home a handsome boy, I'm constantly aware that God disapproves. It's thrilling!

The Devil needs Christianity to stay in business, and so do the degenerates. The playful, teacher-student like dynamic between gays and the church has been going on for centuries, and it's produced wonderful results. By being on the fringe, gay men have been able to use their time

**Comment [A307]:** This is poorly explained or argued. If you say "I am Catholic so I can have something to rebel against," your flippancy undercuts your argument. Because then you are not Catholic at all. You can say, "I am Catholic" because I believe in [state something affirmative] and I don't consider what I do wrong -- but you need to state a better reason for being a Catholic or you lose all sympathy in the reader. PROBLEMATIC

and energy to create art and culture. Without them, whose ideas would Lady Gaga steal? To normalize gays is to end that dynamic, and end the danger and the subversion that goes with being gay. Why on earth would we do that?

I suspect it's because our political discourse is still too simple to accommodate the subtle argument I've presented here. Liberals and libertarians will balk at the suggestion that the battle between authoritarian, anti-gay religion and the gay community is something that ought to continue. Hardline conservatives and members of the extreme end of the alt right will insist that being gay ought to not just be disapproved of, but outlawed. Yet both sides need to come to terms with the fact that both need each other. Gays need rules to flout in order to fulfil our naturally mischievous anti-authoritarian nature, and natural conservatives need something to harrumph about.

**Comment [A308]:** Perhaps it is

**Comment [A309]:** "Mischievous" seems to petty for the argument you're making

The battle between gays and their persecutors, as well as the battle between trolls and troll-hunters, strict schoolteachers and unruly children, is all part of the same battle -- between chaos and order, between rules and anarchy, between mischief and seriousness, between Madonna and *the* Madonna. It's been going on since time began. That's why the Greeks had two gods to represent the opposing sides -- Dionysus, the god of irrationality, chaos and ritual madness, and Apollo, the god of reason, truth, and order. The Greeks knew that order required chaos to exist, and vice-versa.

**Comment [A310]:** You need a stronger conclusion to this argument. Suddently switching the D&A seems weak

It's a truth we need to rediscover.

**Comment [A311]:** The bottom line is that if you say that you are Catholic ONLY IN ORDER TO cause trouble, you undercut the entire book—because you are essentially admitting that you only cause trouble for trouble's sake

**The Gay Elite**

**Comment [A312]:** This section title doesn't pertain to the discussion that follows.

Evolutionary science presents us with an even more compelling reason why gays should pipe down and get back in the closet with their feather boas and glitter. It's all down to how smart gay men are, compared to the rest of the population.

**Comment [A313]:** This entire section is the most poorly thought out section in the book. If you want to make a case for gay men going back into the closet and marrying women just to have children, you're going to have to employ a lot more intellectual rigor than you use here.

**Comment [A314]:** This just doesn't any make sense here.

We're told that behind every great man is a woman. It follows that a great man with another dude behind him would do even better. And so it has been for much of the life of our species. Historically, homosexuals have been massively over-represented not just in the arts but in all the various corridors of intellect, power and influence. The British Establishment, in particular, has long relied on gay geniuses, even when it has simultaneously feared and persecuted them. Consider Alan Turing, Oscar Wilde and John Maynard Keynes. (OK, maybe not that last one).

**Comment [A315]:** That does NOT necessarily follow.

**Comment [A316]:** Unclear. Was he 'maybe not gay' or 'maybe not a genius'?

Elsewhere in the world, the story is the same. Abraham Lincoln was almost certainly at least bisexual. And then there are figures from remoter history, such as notorious bum bandit Alexander the Great. It seems that wherever you find human greatness, gays are joyfully abundant including the Hershey highway patrolman Sir Francis Bacon, that rump-thumper Leonardo Da Vinci, the peter-beter Walt Whitman, and the infamous beef-blower Hadrian.

That's at least in part because gay men are smarter: we test higher for IQ than our heterosexual counterparts. Intelligence allows us to "transcend" our evolutionary programming, according to evolutionary psychologist Satoshi Kanazawa, which may explain the correlation between homosexuality and high IQ.

But there's a problem brewing, and it has to do with evolution. In in the 1950s, gay men would "live a lie," get married and have kids. They'd let off steam in dark rooms and bathhouses. That's not happening any more: the gay rights movement has liberated queens from societal expectations, so they shack up with their boyfriends and either don't have children, or adopt.

**Comment [A317]:** Actually, a lot more of them are having children through insemination and surrogates.

The result is that an entire generation's worth of artists, playwrights, scientists, and fashion-forward gay BFFs are being mopped up by horrified housekeepers instead of being born.

**Comment [A318]:** Be clear here, don't be supercilious. Do you mean that semen is being mopped up? And that the gay men spilling their seed would have produced gay offspring? Because that isn't true.

I am a gay exceptionalist, because that is what science and history tell me to be. That's why I find it depressing that my fellow fags have stopped breeding. James I, generally regarded as a good king, had gay relationships. It's said that one of his lovers was Francis Bacon, the father of British empiricism. Bacon married twice but had no children. What might his descendants have accomplished, had old Francis bitten the bullet and shagged his missus a bit more often?

**Comment [A319]:** But they HAVEN'T stopped breeding—you've already said that they're forming families and having children.

Analogical reasoning is more strongly influenced by health, upbringing and education than genes. But overall processing speed and reaction time are almost certainly largely heritable. That's why gay sperm is precious. The medical establishment tacitly admits this by encouraging gays to be sperm donors but blocking them from donating blood.

**Comment [A320]:** This doesn't mean anything. Descendants don't inherit genius. What did Shakespeare's descendants amount to?

Since we know that IQ, an imperfect measure of lots of things but a reliable guide to genius, is 60 to 80 per cent heritable, the obvious question to ask is: did gay emancipation make the species more stupid?

**Comment [A321]:** Your theory seems to be predicated on finding genius in the children of geniuses, which is a load of hooey.

The answer is: sort of, yes. To be strictly accurate, a lack of gay reproduction wouldn't make the population "more thick." But it could, in theory, arrest the rate of increase in overall IQ. That's because if intelligence is one of the selectors for evolution, then people who are above average for intelligence will be selected more often. So even if you truncate the top tail of the distribution, the mean of the population will still increase. It just won't increase as quickly.

Intelligence isn't the only reason I think gays should reconsider the traditional family as the best possible contribution to the species. Remember, intelligence, emotional well-being and so on are only partly inherited. The rest of a child's success comes down to good parenting.

There's no end of literature on the importance of father figures and what happens to communities who don't have them.

Gay dads can be great role models for kids who want to climb the greasy pole. Google that term before you accuse me of being part of Pizzagate. Once upon a time, they had to work for it. Good daddy by day, bad daddy by night. They had to be sneakier in the days when being a Mary could get you thrown in the slammer. They had to be constantly alert and always thinking up new ways of evading detection.

**Comment [A322]:** Make this point for real not with a obscure British joke

That's why these days it's so easy for kids to choose deviant sexualities just to annoy their parents. (This is a particular problem with lesbians.) All that deception and scheming and plotting in your twenties makes for a natural writer or politician in middle age, don't you think?

**Comment [A323]:** This paragraph doesn't make sense

Today, the "beard" is a thing of the past, because being gay is no longer a taboo. In fact, in today's closely policed and aching progressive public spheres, you're more likely to be fingered as a subversive for being right-wing. It seems you can jam anything inside yourself with impunity, unless it's a copy of *Atlas Shrugged*.

Ironically, gay men in the west are in some respects getting more conservative, throwing themselves into traditional institutions like marriage that straight people are abandoning. That's one reason gay couples earn less than straights: often, one partner stays home, echoing family structures heterosexuals have left behind because women are being pressured into the workforce, whether they want to be there or not.

Why not capitalise on this new wave of gay traditionalism by bullying gay men back into heterosexual unions? Girls, as ever, are one step ahead. I'm convinced the newfound popularity of anal sex among young women is just signalling to fags that they're happy to bite the pillow if it means bagging a sensitive husband who appreciates her choice of drapes. There are plenty of

women who would be happy to have the benefits of a gay husband (just think of the interior decorating!), and plenty of gay men would like to have a wife. Marriage is about more than sexual attraction. Some women would love a man who earned a great living, was sensitive, and didn't want fuck them. I mean, it worked out fine for Kris Jenner and Princess Diana.

When I express views like this, I'm sometimes called a reactionary. People say I want to go back to the 50s. And they're right—but it's the 650s BC I want to return to, because the Spartans had the right idea about male love. You can spend all day wrestling and wanking each other off if you want to, chaps, but you still have to get married, have kids and go off to fight wars.

Forcing gays back into the closet also solves the problem of what happens to children when they have two dads or two moms. Children raised in gay households are more likely to suffer mental problems, more likely to end up gay themselves and, if raised by lesbians, almost certain to witness domestic abuse.

The good news is that gay rights are in the minority, globally speaking. China, India and most of all Russia proudly celebrate the importance of the nuclear family.

You can hardly blame them. Lurid pictures from San Francisco's notorious Folsom Street Fair of kids posing with men on all fours wearing dog collars and leashes will do nothing to dispel Vladimir Putin's hunch that the west has become a decadent mess. Frankly, I would have been less ashamed to be gay in the days when being gay was something to be ashamed of. Gays were classier when they were worried about being queer-bashed.

It's also worth considering the fact that the entire Muslim world is virulently homophobic, so men there continue to reproduce like rabbits. (Except in Iran, where they get sex

changes instead.) When Muslims move west, they bring their attitudes with them, so there's a reason Mohammed will soon be the most popular boy's name in many western countries.

Unless we want to fall behind the emerging superpowers in the east, and the Muslim world, we should follow their example and encourage gay men to keep having children and raising them in traditional nuclear family structures, whatever their private proclivities. I hate to exaggerate, but you might say that the future of the West sort of depends on us faggots leaping back in the closet and churning out a few kids.

We don't like to admit it, but gays have thrived precisely because we've been persecuted. Like Jews, the mistrust and even hatred of society made us smart, adaptive, and resourceful. We used that smartness to contribute to our societies, even though they hated us—and eventually, we became so invaluable that they accepted us.

But that very acceptance now risks killing us off. We no longer have a motivation to reproduce, and it's something we have to deal with. Maybe we don't need to turn the clock back all the way—but we certainly need to do *something* if we don't want our genes to die out. There are sperm banks and turkey basters, but there's something so unromantic about them. And Thanksgiving dinner is never really the same again.

Well, gays are smart. I'm sure we'll think of something. But let's not forget how we *became* smart.

### Return to Degeneracy

Gay men are chaos incarnate. We are gods of mirth, mischief, danger and subversion. And we should embrace it like a Hollywood celebrity embraces plastic surgery. (Hi, Renee Zellweger!) We have an energy and power over everyone else, a dark, innate perversion and

**Comment [A324]:** DELETE. She denied plastic surgery and you DON'T want to have to write about botox and other fillers

**Comment [A325]:** You're an much stronger ground arguing on a return to transgressiveness than on a return to the closet

malevolence that other would-be rebels like goths and punks would kill to have. ~~Gay sex is a dark act. It is black magic—especially the way I like it. It defies biology, and as much as I enjoy it in every room of the house, the club or the public bathroom, it belongs in the closet.~~

**Comment [A326]:** You use so much bombast here you start to sound like you're just trolling for the reader to say "That's crazy." But if you do, the reader will, and you lose.

Existing as a gay man is an apocalyptic threat to oneself, to reality, to the social order.

How can you provide a safe space to a community who put themselves in danger breakfast, lunch and dinner? When gay men exercise risk, they have an advantage - as the chosen ones on the outskirts willing to be the outlet for anyone and everyone's fantasies. As society's subversive rebels, we can go further than anyone else.

Family values are for straight people, not for us. Get married if you want, but don't pretend you won't be secretly browsing Grindr and scouting out darkened alleyways and toilet cubicles behind your husband's back. (He'll be doing the same, naturally.) ~~—and I'll be turning you both down.)~~

Christianity is not your enemy, fags. Christianity is a secret friend. The devil needs Christianity to stay in business, and naturally mischievous gay men need a book of rules to break. We need to be told that we're wrong, we need to be told that we're degenerate.

Part of the blame for all this certainly falls with gays, because we willingly accepted ~~modern-liberal Democrat~~ victim-programming for so long. To this day, many in America still think the country is a terrible place for gays, ignoring the rest of the world. Part of the problem is that gays are terminally insecure and vain, and don't fully understand that in America, it's perfectly OK for people to not like each other.

The reality is that social justice and progressivism are strangling gays, ~~and not in the fun way.~~ Even VICE editors are noticing that it's Breitbart that publishes the radical gay editorial



these days, hosts gay porn star op-eds and refers to “resident gay thots.”<sup>118119120</sup> That’s an absolutely remarkable state of affairs for the Left to find itself in.

I hope this chapter helps both the alt-right and mainstream gays understand my motivations. I do consider this part of myself to be wrong. But I also *like* being wrong. I get off on being a degenerate. And that’s why I don’t get angry when the alt-right use the phrase -- on the contrary, I encourage it! Because society needs purity, and society needs degeneracy. As an agent of chaos, I’ll defend the agents of order, because I know I need them to exist.

My advice to my fellow homosexuals is: focus on trading tips for getting blood and semen out of bedsheets and stop terrorising criticizing Christian bakeries and pizzerias. Word to the wise: I don’t take offense to much, but even I have boundaries, and homosexuals floating the idea of catering their gay wedding from an Indiana pizza joint is *beyond the fucking pale, Mary*. Stop posturing and get back to doing what you do best — each other. Oh, and stop pandering to Islam.<sup>121</sup>

What other gays can’t understand about me is how popular I am *with straight people*. They think it’s because I give heteros license to say fag and queer and get away with it. And I do! But they miss the bigger picture. It’s not about being a gay Uncle Tom. *People actually just like me*, because I’m not one of those awful hectoring, uptight lispng faggots on TV. I’m the sort of the guy you almost wouldn’t mind your son bringing home.

Sort of.

With all due modesty, I would hazard to say that I’ve done more for the image of gays in conservative America than thirty years of GLAAD all the other awful gay charities and terrible

**Comment [A327]:** Stop spreading fake news. No couple—gay or straight—has EVER wanted to serve pizza at their wedding. The O’Connors VOLUNTEERED the fact that would not make pizza for a gay wedding and the story mushroomed. But to be clear: No gay couple ever asked the O’Connors to make pizza for their wedding.

**Comment [A328]:** This is actually the unwritten topic of this chapter. Rather than waste time on a theory about gay men going back into the closet, maybe you could actually put some thought into why straight people respond to your message.

<sup>118</sup> <https://twitter.com/mitchsunderland/status/611976439546671104>

<sup>119</sup> <https://twitter.com/mitchsunderland/status/744952880843493376>

<sup>120</sup> <https://twitter.com/mitchsunderland/status/760631754944196608>

<sup>121</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xLqkizGtFo0>

celebrities. Ross Mathews was the face of homosexuality in 2016? I mean, someone kill me, please. Hopefully in 2017 things will improve. If the results of *LBGTQ Nation's* Person of the Year poll are anything to go by — I won the popular vote — maybe they will.

## 8

## WHY ESTABLISHMENT REPUBLICANS HATE ME

*"Right after liberal Democrats, the most dangerous politicians are country club Republicans."*

-- Thomas Sowell

*"I don't believe in the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. I just believe in parties."*

-- Samantha Jones, *Sex and the City*

In January 2016, I got into what I thought was a friendly Twitter spat with then-editor-at-large for *Breitbart*, Ben Shapiro. Ben is a more introverted and less professionally successful version of me who lost his audience by freaking out about Donald Trump. ~~It ended up turning nasty, and we're not friends any more.~~

Shapiro's distaste for me and his distaste for Trump are very related. They're part of a wider story of insecurity and anger on the part of the establishment right: anger that their positions of power and influence over conservative politics are slowly slipping away. Anger that they are being replaced by a new generation of young, fashionable and funny conservatives who have no time for the 1980s hangups of older conservatives. ~~We're nimble navigators who can get out to protests earlier because we're not still waiting for our hearing aids to charge.~~

**Comment [A329]:** lke what?

**Comment [A330]:** Hearing-aid joke undercuts your point

The Thomas Sowell quote at the start of this chapter isn't just a catchy saying. It's completely true. In 2016, there was only one type of political creature as upset as the left -- if not more so - at the rise of Donald Trump. That was the establishment conservative.

**Comment [A331]:** Provide more context for why he wrote that? Is Thomas Sowell one of these older establishment conservatives?

Establishment conservatives were so upset by Trump that they made a pathetic attempt to torpedo his efforts against Hillary Clinton. Calling themselves "NeverTrump," some of them threw their support behind Clinton, while others rallied around the laughable Evan McMullin, a former middle-ranking CIA operative whom no one had heard of before he became the establishment's spoiler candidate.

Naturally, as the biggest and loudest Trump fan, the establishment also came for me. After I objected to their attempts to brand every web-based Trump supporter a frothing Neo-Nazi and anti-Semite, I attracted the attention of their queen bee, a rotund chap called Glenn Beck who's about as predictable as a feminist stepping on a bathroom scale.

Alas, poor Beck! ~~He~~ was once the left's favorite punching bag, the target of all their false accusations of racism. Unlike most establishment conservatives, he even *did* things -- he once led a massive march on Washington D.C in defense of American heritage, with some estimates putting attendance at nearly 500,000.

**Comment [A332]:** To emphasize that now you are

Now, alas, he's apologized for being too conservative in the past<sup>122</sup> and descended to an internet ranter with a dwindling audience, who continues to spend his time attacking Donald Trump and brown-nosing Mark Zuckerberg<sup>123</sup>. He even pens columns for the *New York Times* these days<sup>124</sup> and has apologized for being too conservative in the past<sup>125</sup>. In the run-up to the

<sup>122</sup> [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/27/magazine/glenn-beck-is-sorry-about-all-that.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/27/magazine/glenn-beck-is-sorry-about-all-that.html?_r=0)

<sup>123</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/05/20/tucker-carlson-says-glenn-beck-sucked-mark-zuckerberg-meeting/>

<sup>124</sup> <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/11/opinion/glenn-beck-dont-move-to-canada-talk-to-the-other-side.html>

<sup>125</sup> [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/27/magazine/glenn-beck-is-sorry-about-all-that.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/27/magazine/glenn-beck-is-sorry-about-all-that.html?_r=0)

election, he threw his support behind Hillary Clinton, saying that opposing Trump was the “moral and ethical choice,” even if she were elected in his stead<sup>126</sup>.

Oh, and he’s *obsessed* with me. He has, in various episodes on his sadly declining radio show, called me a “13-year old boy<sup>127</sup>” and a “Goebbels” whose writings are “poison to the Republic.<sup>128</sup>” Poison to the Republic? I don’t know. Poison to his ratings, maybe!

There’s a reason why conservatives like Shapiro and Beck, who were once the best the movement had to offer, now represent the past, while people like me represent the future. That reason is simple -- they’ve spent the last decade losing to the **left**.

**Comment [A333]:** And conservatives were tired of losing?

I don’t mean electoral defeats, either, although Mitt Romney’s loss in 2012 could easily have been avoided by nominating a candidate that conjured up a compelling vision of America, and not a compelling vision of your high school principal. No, conservatives lost in arenas that were more important than electoral politics -- they lost academia, they lost Hollywood, they lost art, they lost music. They lost culture **itself**.

**Comment [A334]:** Move the Breitbart quote here: “Culture is upstream from politics”?

Actually, it’s worse than that. The truth is, they never even bothered to fight.

### **The Culture War That Conservatism Forgot**

Aside from beleaguered conservative student activists on campus, there has been no **serious** attempt to push back against the liberal dominance of universities. The Foundation For Individual Rights In Education (FIRE), which campus conservatives rely on to protect their free

**Comment [A335]:** “serious national” or “serious attempt from politicians”, to separate from the student activist grassroots efforts?

<sup>126</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/2016/10/11/politics/glenn-beck-hillary-clinton-moral-ethical-choice/>

<sup>127</sup> <http://www.mediaite.com/online/glenn-beck-milo-yiannopoulos-is-a-hurt-13-year-old-boy-and-a-bully/>

<sup>128</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2016/03/28/glenn-beck-breitbart-milo-yiannopoulos-goebbels-his-evil-trump-twitter-defense-poison-to-the-republic/>

speech, does an excellent job fighting the worst excesses of left-wing censorship on campus. Yet the group was set up and is run by moderate liberals.

Heterodox Academy, a group of academics pushing for more political diversity in the social sciences, is spearheaded by Steven Pinker and Jonathan Haidt -- also both liberals. It's not a bad thing that there are some liberals who still care about free speech and pluralism, but why are we letting liberals do the heavy lifting? Where are all the conservatives? It's almost as if they don't care.

**Comment [A336]:** What about Campus Reform?

Indeed, the few establishment conservatives who *do* care about campus issues -- and attract huge online followings of young people in doing so -- privately admit that their success is met with bemusement by fellow beltway conservatives who wonder what the fuss is about and why more people aren't interested in the latest appropriations bill or Russian naval maneuvers in the North Sea.

**Comment [A337]:** Go into more detail about why this is so important to young conservatives who are on the front lines of this every day.

It's the same in showbiz. Conservatives in Hollywood currently live an existence approximating dissidents in the Soviet Union -- a few brave souls are raising their voices, but most keep their heads down due to the overwhelming dominance of progressives in the industry. A conservative in showbiz is like a gazelle in a pack of lions; only the nimblest will escape unscathed. The rest have to wear lion suits and purr convincingly at feminists and Black Lives Matter activists.

**Comment [A338]:** Give an example or two.

All of this is a result of conservative laziness. For years, the only prominent right-winger who made an effort to organize the conservative Hollywood underground was Andrew Breitbart, a man despised by the beltway establishment. Isn't it funny how successful conservative culture warriors always end up making enemies of the D.C. establishment? It's almost as if they agree with leftists on everything except economics and foreign policy!

There is more hope for video games than Hollywood, but this is despite the actions of conservatives, not because of them. GamerGate, the rebellion of gamers against a politically correct, feminist-dominated games media, was primarily an uprising of moderate liberals and cultural libertarians, not conservatives.

It was a great opportunity for conservatives to extend a hand to open-minded gamers and establish a serious foothold in culture once again, but once again conservatives turned their noses up. Only *Breitbart*, myself, a handful of other dissident conservatives saw the opportunity for what it was. GamerGate won, by the way — left-wing defenders of politically correct censorship in video games now have less influence than they ever have. But conservatives, to their shame, did barely anything to help that victory come about.

**Comment [A339]:** Keep this to the Gamergate section, getting off track with Hollywood, then video games.

Stuffy beltway types really don't know what to do with me. I've introduced a brand new type of conservative to them. Listen, not everyone in the conservative movement is going to be cool and hip. But at least let's aim to attract new members who still have both of their hips.

Could it be that establishment conservatives want to lose? It's easy to see why "cuck" became such a popular ~~makes such a good insult and took off in 2016.~~<sup>129</sup> It's a byword for needlessly relinquished manliness, for selling out and caving in. The original meaning of watching your partner getting slammed by another dude ~~now~~ simply means abandoned principles and a lack of backbone. It's a ~~quick~~ way to denote a beta male or coward. (See: the Republicans running against Donald Trump in the 2016 election.)

**Comment [A340]:** has transmogrified into a word that simply connotes? To make clearer the transition of the word?

**Comment [A341]:** To avoid echo above.

As well as missing opportunities to beat the left in winnable fights, conservatives have done nothing to lay down deeper roots in high ~~culture~~. Leftist foundations fund concerts, film and comedy festivals, art shows. They provide grants and funding to eager young creators, who

**Comment [A342]:** What about David Koch?

<sup>129</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/07/28/cuckservative-is-a-gloriously-effective-insult-that-should-not-be-slurred-demonised-or-ridiculed/>

are more than happy to pander to fashionable progressive values if it means getting the money to get ahead. A search for “race,” “gender,” or “diversity” on the website of Grantmakers in the Arts, the umbrella group for private arts funding organizations in the U.S, returns opportunities that look like *Salon* articles<sup>130</sup>.

**Comment [A343]:** Give a few examples

The efforts of Lucian Wintrich, the gay Trump-supporting photographer responsible for the “Twinks for Trump” photo series and the “Daddy Will Save Us” art exhibit, show how profoundly hostile the art world has become to conservative values. As well as being fired from his job at a New York ad agency after “Twinks for Trump,” Wintrich also faced expulsion from a Pierogi art gallery and legal threats from the venue owner when he attempted to host his pro-Trump art show at the gallery. Thanks to conservative complacency, the art world today is a one-party state.<sup>131</sup>

As Andrew Breitbart said, culture is upstream from politics. The kids and teens who idolise left-wing pop stars, watch movies made by left-wing film directors and produced by left-wing film studios, and laugh at the jokes of left-wing comedians grow up to be - surprise! - left-wing voters. This cannot continue. Conservatives need to realize that they will continue to be beaten by the left if they keep ignoring the importance of culture. They need to spend less time obsessing over the Pentagon, and more on the National Endowment for the Arts. Only then will the left-wing stranglehold on culture be beaten.

**Comment [A344]:** Good

**Comment [A345]:** You're basically making an argument for representation here—that kids need visible conservative role models to become conservatives themselves. Do you also then agree that kids of color need role models on screens as well?

**Comment [A346]:** Some conservatives think this should be disbanded, that the government shouldn't be involved in the arts. Your take?

It's not as difficult as it may seem. Over the past decade, political correctness in culture has grown to the point where even left-wing creatives are feeling its stifling effect on free expression. Liberal comedians like Chris Rock and Jerry Seinfeld now refuse to perform to college audiences, who they say have become too sensitive for their comedy routines, even

**Comment [A347]:** True, good point. Even liberals like Tina Fey have derided the PC and apology culture.

**Comment [A348]:** True?

<sup>130</sup> <http://www.giarts.org/>

<sup>131</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/08/29/twinks-for-trump-photographer-fired-after-being-praised-by-milo/>



though they aren't remotely right-wing. If conservatives make a serious effort to get back into the culture wars, they will find no shortage of grateful artists and creators eager to throw off the chains of political correctness.

On the other hand, political correctness isn't just confined to the left.

### The Political Correctness of the Right

I'm an ardent Zionist, and it isn't just because I have a thing for tanned, muscular IDF men with big guns. I'm ethnically Jewish on my mother's side, and in my younger days I could be spotted on BBC appearances sporting a full-on Jewfro.

My Jewish ancestry is another reason for me to personally oppose the migration of millions of Muslims, many of whom are as anti-semitic as they are homophobic, from hellholes in the Middle East and the Pashtun mountains. Rising anti-semitism in the Muslim world (which will soon include many European countries) is another reason why I also feel strongly about the need for a strong, secure refuge for Jews in the state of Israel.

**Comment [A349]:** Make your arguments without using phrases like "hellholes."

**Comment [A350]:** This is too complex for an aside. Make it a full point or delete.

Another thing I feel strongly about is free speech and the freedom to tell jokes. Alas, some of my peers on the conservative right don't feel the same way.

I was baffled when in 2016, conservative commentators suddenly became preoccupied with the allegedly nefarious threat to the Jewish community posed by a few thousand internet nobodies who were posting offensive memes on social media. I am of course referring to the alt-right -- or at least, their shitposting battalions.

**Comment [A351]:** A few thousand sounds like a lot, actually.

**Comment [A352]:** Make more definitive. "I am of course referring to the shitposting trolls of the alt-right." You'll get into this in the alt-right chapter, but a quick disavowal of affiliation with them here would be good.

Jewish advocacy organizations, fueled by an alt-right panic ginned up by the likes of *National Review*, *The Daily Beast* and, eventually, the Clinton campaign, went so far as to

declare war on memes. I'm not joking. Two months before the election, the Anti-Defamation League, a venerable, respected name in the fight against anti-semitism, nearly torpedoed their own credibility by declaring the internet meme Pepe the Frog a "hate symbol."

Pepe, for the uninitiated, is a cartoon frog that became an object of fascination for the young architects of web culture who anonymously populate the underbelly of the internet. Initially, Pepe was just a "reaction image" -- there was sad Pepe, smug Pepe, and happy Pepe. Over time however, the frog was remixed in more subtle ways, the way all memes draw variations -- mockingly "rare" pepes in the style of glittery collectible cards, pepes themed on the Egyptian frog-god "Kek" (the word "Kek," incidentally, is another internet meme, which I won't explain here. My dictionary of memes will be released ~~later~~.)

**Comment [A353]:** Some comment here about the internet being a strange, magical place?

Then came the political Pepes -- Pepe as Donald Trump, Pepe in a MAGA hat, Pepe as Vladimir Putin, and the more provocative, alt-right Pepes in Nazi uniforms and white supremacist tattoos. These were the ones that started the media feeding frenzy, much to the delight of the trolls that used them.

I won't make excuses for anti-semitic memes, particularly when they come from genuine Neo-Nazis. These sad specimens, consigned to a few irrelevant blogs like the Daily Stormer, declared a "holy crusade" against me in late 2016. Unlike the ADL I find this laughable rather than threatening -- I don't have anything to fear from these people, especially not from the Stormer's editor, Andrew Anglin, who I am told stands a mere 5'2" tall. Anglin is, to borrow a line from Star Wars, a little short for a stormtrooper.

I will, however, defend their right to speak and post freely on the internet, even on social media, without the threat of being banned. The best antidote to silly, pathetic hatred is to defeat it publicly, not push it into the shadows where it will fester and grow. This is something that

leftists, and a worrying number of establishment conservatives, simply don't understand. They worry that the more people see Neo-Nazis, the more they'll be persuaded. I have a sunnier view of human nature, and human reason.

I have no argument with those who want to condemn the Stormers and their ilk. But I do have an argument with those who lump everyone who uses offensive memes in with them, as part of the same "basket of deplorables" (to quote Hillary Clinton's much-derided campaign term for Trump supporters). Because as Allum Bokhari and I highlighted in our widely cited article on the alt-right, many of the people using offensive memes aren't genuine Nazis at all, but **provocateurs**. They don't want to destroy multicultural societies or restore racial hierarchies. They just want to raise hell and smash taboos. From our article:

**Comment [A354]:** 'trolls'?

*Ironically, they're drawn to the alt-right for the same reason that young Baby Boomers were drawn to the New Left in the 1960s: because it promises fun, transgression, and a challenge to social norms they just don't understand.*

**Comment [A355]:** Who's they here? This last clause unclear.

*Just as the kids of the 60s shocked their parents with promiscuity, long hair and rock'n'roll, so too do the alt-right's young meme brigades shock older generations with outrageous caricatures, from the Jewish "Shlomo Shekelburg" to "Remove Kebab," an internet in-joke about the Bosnian genocide. These caricatures are often spliced together with Millennial pop culture references, from old 4chan memes like Pepe the frog, to anime and My Little Pony references.*

*Are they actually bigots? No more than death metal devotees in the 80s were actually Satanists. For them, it's simply a means to fluster their grandparents. Currently, the Grandfather-in-Chief is Republican consultant Rick Wilson, who attracted the*

attention of this group on Twitter after attacking them as “childless single men who jerk off to anime.”

Responding in kind, they proceeded to unleash all the weapons of mass trolling that anonymous subcultures are notorious for — and brilliant at. From digging up the most embarrassing parts of his family’s internet history to ordering unwanted pizzas to his house and bombarding his feed with anime and Nazi propaganda, the alt-right’s meme team, in typically juvenile but undeniably hysterical fashion, revealed their true motivations: not racism, the restoration of monarchy or traditional gender roles, but lulz.

**Comment [A356]:** Disingenuous to ignore the harm of these memes and statements

Even I will admit these kids sometimes go too far, and that not all the taboos they want to break are in need of destroying. But the response of the establishment right, chillingly familiar in tone and character to the career-destroying mobs of the SJWs, is worse. These are, after all, kids -- they don’t deserve to have their lives and careers destroyed because they posted dangerous memes or flirted with dangerous ideas on the internet.

**Comment [A357]:** Give an example?

The internet, after all, is a melting pot of wacky and beyond-the-pale personalities, norms, and memes, which naturally attracts the millennial generation’s most rebellious and adventurous souls. Indeed, it doesn’t do these young people justice to simply rebut the establishment’s misguided allegations of retrograde racism. These people aren’t just not-racists, they’re among the best and brightest of their generation -- talented, creative, and funny. Conservatives should be embracing them, not pushing them away -- and certainly not ruining their careers.

**Comment [A358]:** At the same time, do they people they target deserve to have their lives destroyed because these “kids” (some of whom are grown men) decided to swat or dox them?

**Comment [A359]:** No words for the victims?

**Comment [A360]:** Give a non-political example here of the internet’s weirdness. Or an example of something good they accomplished if possible!

**Comment [A361]:** Which of them are actively ruining any careers (other than the Ben Shapiro quote below)?

But that's the implication of the arguments of people like Ben Shapiro, who openly said that "racists ought to lose their jobs." If that sounds reasonable to you, keep in mind that he doesn't see a difference between the people I just mentioned and the likes of Andrew Anglin.

**Comment [A362]:** Needs a cite

**Comment [A363]:** Make point about the slippery slope of who determines what constitutes unacceptable racism or bigotry to the point that someone should lose their job. (E.g. Brendan Eich.)

Well I disagree. This, in my view, is nothing more than the political correctness of the right. Just like the political correctness of the left, it deliberately ignores context, treating an offensive meme posted by a Daily Stormer reader and a hellraiser from 4chan as just the same, without pausing to examine the motives and values of the individual. Like the left's political correctness, is it is collectivist and reductive in its logic. Like the left's political correctness, it will destroy the lives of innocent people if it goes unchecked. And of course, like the left's political correctness, we must fight against it until it dies.

**Comment [A364]:** Make this "Nazi" meme or "Daily Stormer Nazi", to differentiate from the comparatively harmless 4chan person

**Comment [A365]:** Do the originator's motive matter more than the result? What if the instigator "ruins someone's life"?

### Debate Club Conservatives

"Donald Trump isn't a *gentleman*." "He's so *vulgar*." "I have to cover my kids' *ears*." There's something noble about trying to preserve the standards of decorum that existed prior to the 1960s, where a single swear word at home could lead to a week of being grounded, and a boycott campaign if said on TV or the radio. And if you're a conservative over 65, that worldview is completely understandable.

If you're under 40, however, it's likely that you fall into the unfortunate, slightly laughable group that I call "debate club conservatives." And it's time to snap out of it.

Debate club conservatives are another reason why it's becoming increasingly difficult for Republicans to win. The following excerpt from an *American Conservative* article, written after the departure of Jeb Bush from the Republican contest, is revealing.

When Jeb Bush left the scene last night with an incredibly graceful, dignified farewell speech, it was probably the **thing** he said throughout this campaign that revealed the true strength of his character. I am not sorry that Jeb Bush is out of the running now, but I regret very much that what wins in American politics this year are the tactics employed by the man who conspicuously lacks what Jeb Bush plainly has: character<sup>132</sup>.

Comment [A366]: Things?

If you don't have the stomach to do what it takes to win, chances are you're going to lose. And that's exactly what Debate Club Conservatives did when faced with Donald Trump. Again and again, the Republican candidates tried to convince their base that they shouldn't vote for Trump because, well, he was just so *unkind*. And again and again, voters didn't listen.

"The man is a pathological liar ... a bully ... a narcissist at a level I don't think this country has ever seen," said Ted Cruz in May. Republicans voted for Trump.

"Seriously, what's this guy's problem?" Jeb Bush allegedly told a donor in August. "He's a buffoon... A clown... An Asshole." Republicans voted for the buffoon, the clown, the asshole.

"I will not vote for a nominee that has behaved in a manner that reflects so poorly on our country" said John Kasich, long after his inevitable primary defeat. "Our country deserves better." Republican voters didn't think so.

The *American Conservative's* lament that the "graceful, dignified" Jeb Bush had been beaten by the tactics of a man who "lacks character" sums up the attitude of Debate Club Conservatives to elections, and to contests in general: it's better to lose with dignity than to win without it. In the Republican primaries, they mostly got their wish, although Jeb Bush's entreaties for audiences to "please clap" for him were anything but dignified.

<sup>132</sup> <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/jeb-bush-good-character/>

In the general election, the obsession with winning with dignity is what gave rise to the “Never Trump” movement and their absurd candidate, former whatshisname and current nobody Evan McMullin. One could well argue that the whole purpose of Evan McMullin was to *lose* with dignity.

The conservative sense of fair play is disastrous when it comes to fighting the Democrats. Elections are not college debates, no matter how much Ted Cruz might wish it so. They are not fought with facts and opinions, but with **smear campaigns**, media spin, opposition research, and other forms of cloak-and-dagger tactics. In politics, victory goes to those with cunning, mettle and deviousness, not those who have facts and principles on their side. It *helps* to have facts and principles on your side (as conservatives usually do), but they aren’t enough to win.

**Comment [A367]:** Are you seriously telling the reader that you advocate SMEAR CAMPAGNS?

There’s another reason why the debate club attitude is so damaging to the conservative movement: most people aren’t political obsessives. They don’t care about your 14-point refutation of Obamacare. They don’t care about the intricacies of the Laffer Curve. They don’t have the time to listen to a 30-minute string of irrefutable arguments. They want to hear things that relate to their own experiences, not abstract policy **debates**.

**Comment [A368]:** Good point.

One comment from Ben Shapiro, made on the Dave Rubin Show in February 2016, sums up this conservative myopia.

“The problem with Trump is he fails to distinguish political incorrectness from just being a jackass ... There’s a difference between being rude and being politically incorrect. Being rude is telling Megyn Kelly she’s bleeding from her wherever. Being politically incorrect is saying some immigrants coming across our southern border are criminals. That’s politically incorrect but it’s not rude.”

Shapiro is thinking of a world where only politics matter. To him, political correctness is a problem because it suppresses *facts* that are relevant to current affairs -- and that's it. But for most other people, the stultifying rules of political correctness go far beyond the suppression of facts -- it's the suppression of jokes, it's the suppression of banter, and yes, it's also the suppression of rudeness. Political correctness is a problem because it interrupts everyday human experiences, threatening to turn personal matters into public ones. That's why so many people were drawn to Trump.

**Comment [A369]:** Every single personal matter into a public one? to emphasize the invasiveness? Expand along the lines of: you can no longer slip up in conversation without worrying if the person you're talking to is going to tell the world what you said and get you fired

**Comment [A370]:** This ought to be a major point and instead you leave it undeveloped and unclear

Debate club conservatives don't understand this because they think politics is, well, a debate club. In their imagined political ideal, elections would be fought issue-by-issue, with each candidate presenting their arguments on foreign and domestic policy in neat little 30 minute segments. In reality, politics doesn't work like that -- and if it did, voter turnout would be in crisis.

I understand that it must be impossibly frustrating for conservatives, who constantly lose despite (usually) having all the facts on their side. But it's time to wake up. Politics isn't won by commanding the facts, but by connecting with people's experiences. That's why it's so important for conservatives to get back into culture and entertainment, which are the commanding heights of peoples' experiences in the modern world.

**Comment [A371]:** Actually, conservatives constantly WIN: governorships, the House the Senate, state houses, etc.?

**Comment [A372]:** On the other hand, the increased value of feelings above all other things (pathos over logos) has created the safe space culture, and the backlash toward you. If you can't appeal to anyone's reason, how do you get an argument across?

**Comment [A373]:** Too vague

**Comment [A374]:** But conservatives AREN'T losing

And that's why, in a society increasingly frustrated by political correctness, conservatives need to grit their teeth and come to terms with the necessity of rude, braggadocious provocateurs like myself -- and Donald Trump.

### Bringing Conservatism Together



I'll be the first to admit that we need Debate Club conservatives. It is immensely valuable that we have people who can utterly dominate the left in an argument -- just compare the power and rigor of a George Will column with a Jessica Valenti one. The strongest mind on the left today is probably Slavoj Žižek -- and he supported Trump over Clinton! When the public ignores the left's entreaties not to watch or read or listen to conservatives because of their "bigotry," it's rare for them not to be swayed by our arguments.

But arguments aren't enough. We can't let the left continue to dominate culture, entertainment, and the norms of everyday language itself and expect to win elections. We can't hope that every member of the public will see through the left's lies and eventually discover George Will's columns at the *Washington Post*.

As Ann Coulter said, there will be a time for elegant, polite, Mitt Romney conservatives once we've saved America from the leftists. But until that happens, we need our brawlers and our fighters. Whether establishment conservatives like it or not, the culture war will be won by men like Steve Bannon and Donald Trump, who use coarse language and never apologize.

We also need all our attention focused on conservative issues, not leftist ones. We need to stop following the agenda of the Daily Beast and the New York Times. Let the left worry about insignificant "threats" like Pepe the Frog and the six-or-so remaining Klansmen in America. We need to be turning our attention to issues that the left either doesn't care about, or doesn't want us to notice -- like their domination of academia and pop culture. Until we make serious progress on those fronts, everything else is just noise.

Politics is more complicated than assembling facts and writing good arguments. It's a brutal battle for the attention of the public. That's why fabulous, irrepressible faggots like myself, so original and compelling compared to the 45339th copycat leftist celebrity in a colorful

**Comment [A375]:** Make point that this is because much of this culture is kept away from the public as much as possible, especially in institutions like high schools and colleges where young minds are learning and figuring out who they want to be.

**Comment [A376]:** Cite?

**Comment [A377]:** and always has been? Even before Donald Trump?

outfit, are so perturbing to the left. Much as it might irk debate club conservatives, politics is showbiz today -- and if we want to win, there will need to be more people like me in the future.

There is a blessing for the establishment here. ~~By focusing attention on provocateurs like me, it gives breathing space to everyone else to develop their arguments and present them to the public without censure.~~ The left would like to shut the Overton Window and push conservatives

**Comment [A378]:** Unclear—because you're the extreme, other conservative arguments look more mainstream or acceptable in comparison?

out of public view altogether. Ironically, establishment Republicans would like to do the same.

Before I arrived on the scene, they were seriously close to succeeding. Even consummate moderates like ~~Cathy Young~~ were being banned from campuses.

**Comment [A379]:** Give a little background.

That's how the left fights. They take control of culture, and use it to smear even moderate conservatives as racists, sexists, and bigots. By the time America's youth reach college-age, a significant proportion of them are frothing at the mouth, desperate to suppress conservatism, which they believe to be synonymous with ~~bigotry~~. When they reach that point, there is no hope of them listening to our arguments, no matter how good they are.

**Comment [A380]:** Good point.

That's why this civil war has to end. Conservatism needs its great thinkers and its brilliant minds, to persuade voters who are already open-minded. But we also need provocateurs and clowns, to grab the attention and challenge the biases of those who don't want to be challenged.

No movement has ever survived with just moderates and intellectuals, and no movement has ever survived with just hellraisers.

If we want to win, we need both. ~~I hope debate club conservatives, who have an unfortunate penchant for snobbishness, eventually realize this.~~

## WHY MUSLIMS HATE ME

Sometimes interviewers ask me, a bit furtively, about a guy I used to live with who had a Muslim-sounding name. They're nervous about pushing too hard because they're retards and they think questioning a gay person about his private life is somehow homophobic, even if there's obviously public interest or it might expose hypocrisy.<sup>133</sup>

**Comment [A381]:** Don't use this phrase. It distracts from your point.

It's true. I did. For a really long time!

This chapter explains why I don't any more.

**Comment [A382]:** If sleeping with black men does not constitute a defense against charges of racism, sleeping with ONE Muslim man does not work here either.

\* \* \*

I'd hate to be thrown off a roof. I mean, imagine if I landed on *this face*.

In the summer of 2015, Europe opened its doors to millions of people who would very much like to kill me -- and, most likely, you too, even if you delete your search history and don't think people know what videos you're watching. After a viral picture of a drowned Syrian refugee boy pulled at the heartstrings of liberals, elites exploited a moment of global sympathy to do what they'd been longing to do for some time -- lower the drawbridge of a continent, and welcome millions of Muslim migrants.

**Comment [A383]:** Who are these "elites" you are accusing of "wanting to do this for a long time"?

Elites told their people that the migrants were just like the drowned refugee, innocents fleeing oppression, hunger and death in war-torn Syria. In reality, fewer than half of the refugees

**Comment [A384]:** Who? This charge is unfounded.

**Comment [A385]:** This sounds like you are denying what is happening in Syria.

**Comment [A386]:** Fact check.

<sup>133</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/10/30/apple-ceo-tim-cook-comes-out-as-gay-fine-now-can-we-start-reporting-on-him-properly/>

admitted to Europe in the months following the viral photo were from Syria. Most were economic migrants, from regions of the world even more radical than the country that currently hosts the Islamic State. And they certainly weren't boys.

The press sought to extend the rare moment of pro-migrant sentiment for as long as possible. They flocked to German train stations to take pictures of teary-eyed liberals hugging the smirking new arrivals, and holding placards stating "refugees welcome."

**Comment [A387]:** ASSERTION: Why would the press "seek to"?

Over a million Muslims poured into the Mediterranean to cross into Europe, but rather than opening the gates, the EU should have airdropped soap, shampoo, and conditioner into the sea and then shipped them right back.

**Comment [A388]:** Stupid ethnic joke diminishes any authority

They would have at least returned smelling better than the French, Italians, or Greeks.

**Comment [A389]:** Gratuitous

It only took a few months for the leftist dream to turn into a nightmare. On New Year's Eve 2015<sup>6</sup>, as one current year turned into another, the new arrivals introduced Germany to Muslim misogyny. An estimated 2,000 migrants, acting in gangs, unleashed *taharrush gamea* - an Arab word meaning collective sexual harassment - on German women returning from and attending the New Year's celebrations.

The attacks took place mainly in the city of Cologne, but soon reports were heard from cities across Germany - Hamburg, Frankfurt, Dortmund, Düsseldorf, and Stuttgart were all affected in the worst night of sexual assaults in Germany since the Red Army's invasion. By the night's end, police estimated that at least 1,200 women had been groped or otherwise sexually assaulted, including at least five rapes.

**Comment [A390]:** Citation needed

You want to see a "patriarchy," by the way? Fly to Riyadh or Tehran. In the former, women can't drive. All right, fair enough, they might be on to something there.

**Comment [A391]:** This undercuts your argument here

Germany was not alone. Sweden, which welcomed more than 140,000 migrants during the crisis, also found itself beset by sexual assaults. A report from the Gatestone Institute referred to a “Summer Inferno of Sexual Assault” in Sweden which had largely been suppressed by the police and the media<sup>134</sup>. Analyzing Swedish crime data, the report found a particular surge in reports of group sexual assaults on young girls aged 14-15. Virtually all of the attackers apprehended by the police were citizens of Afghanistan, Eritrea, or Somalia ~~(Germany, Italy, and Japan were the Axis Powers; these Muslim nations are the anal powers, only without consent)~~ three of the four largest refugee groups in Sweden. Thanks to Muslim immigration, Sweden now has rape statistics that actually do come close to what feminists claim.

**Comment [A392]:** Delete. Irrelevant, off the point, and unfunny

But the rapes were just the beginning. Next came the murders.

On the 22nd of March, 2016, two bombs exploded in Brussels Airport, killing 13. An hour later, another explosion went off in the town of Maelbeek, killing 20. The attack’s mastermind, who also planned the November 2015 Paris attacks, was a man called Abdelhamid Abaaoud, a Belgian native who had travelled to Syria to fight for the Islamic State before returning to Europe at some point during the refugee crisis.

European states suspected of letting him pass through their borders on his return to Belgium immediately issued flustered denials<sup>135</sup>. But the truth is, no-one was looking that closely at the streams of migrants flooding across the continent’s borders.

Abaaoud’s attacks, encouraged by the Islamic State, inspired a string of copycat strikes in Europe’s summer of terror. One month later, a police officer and his wife were stabbed in Magnanville, France, by Larossi Abballa, acting on the orders of ISIS. One month after that, on

<sup>134</sup> <https://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/8579/sweden-sexual-assaults>

<sup>135</sup> <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/reuters/article-3325789/No-evidence-Paris-attack-mastermind-Greece-Greek-official.html>

Bastille Day, a Muslim driving a 19-tonne truck ploughed through celebrating crowds on the Promenade des Anglais in Nice, France. 86 people were killed, and more than 400 were injured.

Two weeks after Nice, Germany was hit by a stabbing in Würzburg and then, a week later, a suicide bombing in the town of Ansbach, both at the hands of Islamists.

Two days after Ansbach, Islamic State terrorists stormed a Catholic church in Normandy, slitting the throat of an 86-year old priest before taking hostages before French anti-terrorism police shot both terrorists and rescued the remaining hostages. Ten days later, in Charleroi, Belgium a man attacked police officers with a machete while shouting “Allahu Akhbar.” One month after that, two police officers in Molenbreek, Belgium were stabbed by a migrant, also shouting “Allahu Akhbar.”

Three more ISIS-motivated stabbings would take place before the year’s end: in Rimini, Italy, in Scharbeek, Belgium, and in Cologne, Germany.

The United States, of course, also faced its own terror attack in 2016. The Orlando shootings, the most deadly terrorist attack on American soil since 9/11, and the deadliest act of homophobic hate in the country’s history.

I spoke outside Pulse nightclub shortly afterwards about the threat posed to women and gays by Islam, and even though the various online versions of my talk have been viewed millions of times, not a single cable or broadcast channel chose to show any of it.<sup>136</sup>

I often call myself a “warning from Europe.” I don’t want America to make the same mistakes we did, or Omar Mateen will be just the beginning. In Europe, they now have to hand out flyers to incoming migrants explaining why groping women and bashing gays is bad<sup>137</sup>.

<sup>136</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xlqkiz>

<sup>137</sup> <http://www.spiked-online.com/newsite/article/why-is-europe-giving-muslim-migrants-sex-ed-lessons/17939#.WDMUy9WLTIU>

If America opened its doors to Islamic migrants as Europe did, it would face a similar catastrophe, if not worse.

It is a uniquely American trait that your country has relied on foreigners to take the true stock of American culture. Before I was saying America can be Great Again with Trump, it took a Frenchman named Alexis de Tocqueville to document the miracle of American democracy in his 1835 book “Democracy in America.”

I share something else with de Tocqueville: he was also a critic of Islam. He was right about America, and he was right about Islam when he said “I studied the Quran a great deal. I came away from that study with the conviction there have been few religions in the world as deadly to men as that of Muhammad.” Those are not my words. Those are de Tocqueville’s.

In electing Donald Trump, America may have saved itself. I hope that he follows through on his pledge to freeze Muslim immigration as soon as possible. Naturally, he was attacked as a racist and a bigot throughout the campaign, both by Merkel-like establishment conservatives and by the American left. But such behaviour doesn’t really surprise me anymore.

The left has been selling out to Islam for years.

San Francisco has an online map of human fecal waste.<sup>138</sup> If you bring enough Muslims over, you’ll need a poop map *and* a rape zone map. Remind me again why this is a good idea?

**Comment [A393]:** Let’s leave “fecal waste” analogies out of this chapter.

### **Islam and the Left**

During my college talks, I’m often asked what arguments to use when debating with the regressive left. I always have the same answer: ---Islam.

<sup>138</sup> <http://blog.sfgate.com/stew/2015/10/05/mapping-s-f-s-human-feces-on-the-streets/>

There is nothing else which better exposes the modern left's rank hypocrisy, their disregard for the facts, and their hatred for the West and its values than their attitude to Islam. Every noble value that the left claims to uphold, from rights for women to gay liberation, even diversity itself dies on the altar of its sycophantic defense of Islam, despite many of its current the most regressive practicesideology in the world.

The twentieth century saw liberalism do battle with totalitarian ideologies of every stripe, from fascism to Bolshevik communism. Both of those ideologies inspired their own radical devotees, their own revolutions, and their own massacres, causing untold suffering around the world. Yet even those ideologies did not inspire the same kind of grim fanaticism we have seen with the rise of radical Islam, which tells its followers that the atrocities they commit are sanctioned by a higher power.

Marx once called religion the "opium of the masses," deluding its followers into abandoning their own interests in service of an otherworldly power. If you look exclusively at their attitude to Christianity, you might think that the left still believes in this message. Their comedians and columnists never miss an opportunity to belittle and denigrate the people who still cling to "bibles and guns," even though their worst offence these days is to be picky about who they bake wedding cakes and pizzas for.

Comment [A394]: Whose?

Comment [A395]: Whose?

Their critique of religion, which animated a range of brilliant thinkers from Bertrand Russell to Bill Maher, has singularly failed to tackle the problem of Islam. It's a conundrum that Maher himself, as well as Sam Harris, Richard Dawkins, and the much-missed Christopher Hitchens were all frustrated by.

Comment [A396]: WHAT'S a conundrum?



The Muslim reformer Maajid Nawaz coined the term “regressive left” to describe the identity-obsessed leftists who defend a religious minority at the expense of, well, every other minority. Sam Harris sums up the backwards attitude of this group with his characteristic clarity.

These people are part of what Maajid Nawaz has termed the “regressive Left”—pseudo-liberals who are so blinded by identity politics that they reliably take the side of a backward mob over one of its victims. Rather than protect individual women, apostates, intellectuals, cartoonists, novelists, and true liberals from the intolerance of religious imbeciles, they protect theocrats from criticism.<sup>139</sup>

Examples of this behaviour are not hard to find. Indeed, the problem is less finding examples than picking the best ones to use. Every month seems to bring a new outrage, each more eye-popping than the last.

Take the aftermath of the gruesome assault on the offices of *Charlie Hebdo* in Paris, a rare example of a leftist newspaper that understood radical Islam to be a force of the radical religious right -- actually, that’s too mild, it’s really the radical *medieval* religious right.

Now I know members of the radical Christian right in the United States, and they are scary but nowhere near as scary. They may believe I’m going to burn in eternal hellfire, but they aren’t in a rush to send me there.

*Charlie Hebdo* had the temerity to stand against religious bullies by publishing cartoons of the Prophet Muhammed. They were one of the few magazines after the Danish cartoons controversy of 2005 to stand on the side of free speech in the face of Muslim riots. They

<sup>139</sup> [http://www.salon.com/2015/11/25/harris\\_and\\_illing\\_correspondence/](http://www.salon.com/2015/11/25/harris_and_illing_correspondence/)

correctly understood that allowing people to intimidate artists and writers by setting cars on fire and threatening violence was the first step on the road to a terrified, censored society.

So they stood with *Jyllands-Posten*, the Danish newspaper that triggered the 2005 controversy with their “blasphemous” drawings, and published their own humorous cartoons of the Prophet Muhammed. On 7 January 2015, 12 employees of the newspaper paid for it with their lives, when two armed Muslim siblings forced their way into *Charlie Hebdo*’s offices in Paris and opened fire.

*Charlie Hebdo* is a leftist publication. Marxist, in fact. Their opposition to Islam flows from their opposition to the right. They are just as strident in their criticism of the National Front as they are of Islam. I may happen to think the National Front probably deserves a more nuanced approach, but unlike the rest of the left, I can’t fault *Charlie Hebdo* for lacking consistency. They say they oppose bigotry, and they do -- whether they perceive it in the European right or in Islam.

So what did other leftists do when 12 of their comrades were gunned down by religious thugs? Did the old ideal of socialist solidarity finally kick in?

No, of course it didn’t.

As most of the civilized world adopted the slogan “Je Suis Charlie,” a few leftist columnists refused to relinquish their Islamophilia, even for a moment of mourning.

It only took two days for *The New Yorker* to publish an essay entitled “Unmournable Bodies,” attacking *Charlie Hebdo* for “racist and Islamophobic provocations.”<sup>140</sup>

<sup>140</sup> <http://www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/unmournable-bodies>

Before the month was out, a number of British student unions<sup>141</sup>, including one at my alma mater, Manchester<sup>142</sup>, had banned *Charlie Hebdo* under their “safe space” policies, arguing that it made Muslims students uncomfortable.

It made Muslim students uncomfortable? Well, I’m not sure that’s quite in the same league as making non-Muslim cartoonists *dead*.

There was no collective display of solidarity from the left-wing literary class either. To an ordinary observer, the fact that the prestigious PEN America literary award for freedom of expression went to *Charlie Hebdo* in 2015 would not be particularly surprising news, much less a moral outrage. Yet 204 members of the organization, including established authors like Joyce Carol Oates, Lorrie Moore and Junot Díaz thought so. They boycotted the awards, signing an open letter condemning *Charlie Hebdo* for making a “marginalized community” feel uncomfortable.

To the section of the French population that is already marginalized, embattled, and victimized, a population that is shaped by the legacy of France’s various colonial enterprises, and that contains a large percentage of devout Muslims, Charlie Hebdo’s cartoons of the Prophet must be seen as being intended to cause further humiliation and suffering.<sup>143</sup>

What suffering! What horror! Cartoons, published in a newspaper with a minor circulation that Muslims don’t even have to buy.

<sup>141</sup> <http://www.theweek.co.uk/68699/uk-universities-are-attacking-free-speech-says-report>

<sup>142</sup> <http://mancunion.com/2015/03/05/80-per-cent-of-uk-universities-restrict-free-speech/>

<sup>143</sup> <https://theintercept.com/2015/04/30/145-pen-writers-thus-far-objected-charlie-hedbo-award-6/>

I'm sure the friends and families of the dead *Charlie Hebdo* cartoonists feel thoroughly ashamed of their loved ones' actions.

The author Salman Rushdie, who faced an Iran-backed *fatwa* (religious decree) calling on Muslims to murder him in the late 80s for the crime of writing about a forbidden area of Islamic theology, summed up the stance that the boycotters had taken.

The massacre of cartoonists, wrote Rushdie, was a

...hate crime, just as the anti-Semitic attacks sweeping Europe and almost entirely carried out by Muslims are hate crimes. This issue has nothing to do with an oppressed and disadvantaged minority. It has everything to do with the battle against fanatical Islam, which is highly organised, well funded, and which seeks to terrify us all, Muslims as well as non-Muslims, into a cowed silence.

These ... writers have made themselves the fellow travellers of that project. Now they will have the dubious satisfaction of watching PEN tear itself apart in public.<sup>144</sup>

The boycott failed, and *Charlie Hebdo* got their award, presented to them by Neil Gaiman, who stepped in after other writers pulled out<sup>145</sup>. I have to wonder how he must have felt to see so many of his peers in the left-wing literary establishment choose to attack murdered cartoonists rather than standing against the ideology that created their murderers. Embarrassed for the left, I hope.

Censorship in the name of Islam has been the norm in the west for some time.

**Comment [A397]:** Support this statement

<sup>144</sup> <http://scroll.in/article/723627/salman-rushdie-slams-fellow-writers-for-boycotting-ceremony-to-honour-charlie-hebdo>

<sup>145</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/may/05/neil-gaiman-pen-award-charlie-hebdo>

A book on the original Mohammed cartoon controversy in 2005 was published by Yale University Press in 2009. The authors' original draft of the book included images of the cartoons as well as other depictions of Mohammed. In what was criticised as an assault on academic freedom, Yale University intervened in the YUP's editorial process, submitted the cartoons out of context to external consultants, and published the book without the cartoons<sup>146</sup>.

You'd think that the massacre of cartoonists would convince some of these cowering worms to grow a backbone, but it seems that Islamic terror is having its desired effect -- frightening the West into silence.

**Comment [A398]:** The massacre was 2015. The Yale book was 2009.

The reaction to the *Charlie Hebdo* shooting is just one example among many of the left's suicidal attitude towards Islam. After every terrorist attack (and there are a lot more of those in the west these days — thanks, Merkel!), the response becomes more outrageous.

When Paris again fell victim to Islamic terrorism in November 2015, with over 100 slain in a series of attacks masterminded by the Islamic State, Salon.com published the extraordinary headline "*We Brought This On Ourselves: After Paris, It's Time To Square Our "Values" With Our History.*"<sup>147</sup>

The article blamed the West "behaving horrifically in the Middle East for decades" for the deaths in Paris. Liberals blaming the West for the terrorist attacks is like an abused wife returning from the hospital and blasting "Baby One More Time" on the stereo while her husband is sleeping.

**Comment [A399]:** Dumb joke undercuts authority

<sup>146</sup> <https://www.thefire.org/cases/yale-university-censorship-of-mohammed-cartoons-at-yale-university-press/>

<sup>147</sup> [http://www.salon.com/2015/11/15/we\\_brought\\_this\\_on\\_ourselves\\_after\\_paris\\_it\\_is\\_time\\_to\\_square\\_our\\_values\\_with\\_our\\_history/](http://www.salon.com/2015/11/15/we_brought_this_on_ourselves_after_paris_it_is_time_to_square_our_values_with_our_history/)

In March 2016, after Muslims killed 35 in Brussels, Salon.com allowed the same writer to run virtually the same article under the headline "*We Brought This On Ourselves, And We Are The Terrorists Too.*"<sup>148</sup>

In a way it's not surprising. The left has always wagged its finger at the left over its foreign policy. It's a tradition that goes back further even than Vietnam; all the way to World War One in fact, when leftist pacifists urged young men to stay home. Then, at least, they had more of an argument -- why *were* young working-class boys being sent to die for the sake of a collection of treaties in the Balkans?

**Comment [A400]:** Confusing "The left has always wagged its finger at the left?"

But somehow I doubt that Bertrand Russell, a key opponent of World War One in Britain, would have been quite so peaceable if Islam were a serious threat in his time. An ardent atheist, Russell understood the ideology of Islam far better than today's leftists.

Those who accept Bolshevism become impervious to scientific evidence, and commit intellectual suicide. Even if all the doctrines of Bolshevism were true, this would still be the case, since no unbiased examination of them is tolerated... Among religions, Bolshevism is to be reckoned with Mohammedanism rather than with Christianity and Buddhism. Christianity and Buddhism are primarily personal religions, with mystical doctrines and a love of contemplation. Mohammedanism and Bolshevism are practical, social, unspiritual, concerned to win the empire of the world.<sup>149</sup>

What really cements the left's betrayal of its own values over Islam isn't so much its opposition to wars in the Middle East, but its opposition to liberal Muslim reformers. Perhaps the

<sup>148</sup> [http://www.salon.com/2016/03/27/we\\_brought\\_this\\_on\\_ourselves\\_and\\_we\\_are\\_the\\_terrorists\\_too/](http://www.salon.com/2016/03/27/we_brought_this_on_ourselves_and_we_are_the_terrorists_too/)

<sup>149</sup> [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The\\_Practice\\_and\\_Theory\\_of\\_Bolshevism/Chapter\\_I\\_9](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Practice_and_Theory_of_Bolshevism/Chapter_I_9)

best example of this is Maajid Nawaz, one of the few moderate Muslims actually making an effort to drag his religion into the modern age. For his work combating extremism, supporting interfaith tolerance, and challenging bigotry in the Muslim community, he is rewarded with polite silence from the left at best, and scornful disdain at worst.

The height of ridiculousness was reached when the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) added Nawaz to a list of 15 “anti-Muslim extremists.” The entire list was absurd, including FGM survivor and women’s rights activist Ayaan Hirsi Ali, and Islam critics Daniel Pipes, Pamela Geller, and David Horowitz. But the addition of Nawaz, precisely the sort of moderate Muslim that purportedly anti-bigotry, anti-intolerance groups like the SPLC ought to be encouraging, summed up just how morally bankrupt the left’s attitude to Islam has become.<sup>150</sup>

Nothing should be off-limits for humor, but you can’t even laugh at Islamic terrorists any more without being accused of “Islamophobia.” ~~Of all the groups the Left desperately protects, Islam is the most inherently hilarious. I mean, even their outfits are hilarious. Ridiculous. Is there anything more comically sinister than the sight of a herd of women swathed in black bedsheets?~~

**Comment [A401]:** This isn't funny enough to be used here

~~Anything more unintentionally ironic about a religion that hates gays that gets its men in a room together 5 times a day to stick their asses in the air? Anything more richly amusing than the crybully faux-victimhood of those who worry about “islamophobia” and hijab-pulling in the wake of terror attacks that leave dozens dead?~~

Is there -- and perhaps this is just my gallows humour -- anything more darkly funny than a religion so thin-skinned that cartoons designed to provoke it give rise to deadly shootings, as though to prove the point of those French cartoonists? Is there anything more preposterous than the phrase “The Religion of Peace”?

<sup>150</sup> <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/10/maajid-nawaz-splc-anti-muslim-extremist/505685/>

I'm not trying particularly hard here. Because I don't need to. What an indictment of America's supposedly "brave" comedians that not a single one dares to tell a decent joke about Islam on prime-time television.

### How to Really Fight Bigotry

The left claims it opposes bigotry. Yet Islam, ~~which is arguably contains some of the most bigoted ideology-religious practices that exists today,~~ is given a pass. Here are a few things that Muslims in Britain - who are often portrayed as one of the more integrated western Muslim communities - believe.

**Comment [A402]:** Let's NOT issue statements like "the most bigoted"—all they do is make YOU the issue rather than your statement

A Gallup poll of Muslims in the UK found that *not a single one* of the 1,001 people polled thought that homosexuality was morally acceptable. That is compared to 58% of the overall British population who think homos are OK.

The same poll found that just 35% of French Muslims and 19% of German Muslims thought homosexuals were morally acceptable.

In my opinion those percentages have probably cratered following Europe's importation of hordes of young Muslim radicals affectionately known as "rapefugees" on the continent. Here are some more stats specific to British Muslims from poll carried out by Channel 4 in Britain.

- ‡ 52% believe homosexuality should be illegal
- ‡ 23% would like to see Sharia law in England
- ‡ 39% believe a woman should always obey her husband, as opposed to 5% of English overall
- ‡ 31% consider it acceptable for a man to have multiple wives



When it comes to Islamic immigration, assimilation doesn't seem to be isn't an option. At least not yet. It's, "When in Rome, rape and kill everyone and then claim welfare."

Andrew Bolt on Sky News Australia, whose show I go on regularly because they get the lighting just right, perfectly encapsulated Islam's integration problem in the west.

He recalled the case of Dr. Ibrahim Abu Mohammed, the grand mufti of Australia, who gave a speech to explain to Australians that they are wrong to think Muslims can't integrate into Australian culture. There's just one problem. The Grand Mufti, one of the foremost Islamic scholars in Australia, delivered the speech in Arabic. He has lived in Australia for 19 years, and his integration speech is in Arabic.

That's what I call chutzpah.

~~Islam is more bigoted, insular and hostile to outside thinking than a gender studies department. So it gives us a clear answer to the paradox of tolerance: no, you cannot tolerate the truly intolerant.~~

**Comment [A403]:** Delete this paragraph and stick to the facts

There were 1.6 billion Muslims in the world as of 2010 – roughly 23 per cent of the global population – according to a Pew Research Center estimate. But while Islam is currently the world's second-largest religion after Christianity, it is the fastest-growing one.

~~The growth of Islam ought to be concerning should be one of the most disturbing things in the world for liberals. Here is a religion that sanctions forcings women into submission, a religion that sanctions the executions of gays, a religion that sanctions the tries-to-killing of non-believers.~~

**Comment [A404]:** Do you see how 'ought to be concerning' makes your point without the bombast of 'should be one of the most disturbing things in the world'?

They're the Westboro Baptist Church on steroids, except they're not mental trolls from Kansas. They *mean* it.

And they're spreading. Islam preys on the most vulnerable in society, offering them a sense of higher purpose. ~~It's no wonder that gingers convert to Islam in such high numbers<sup>151</sup>~~ and it might explain Lindsay Lohan, too.<sup>152</sup> They have especially high conversion rates in jails, which should be especially concerning to the left but is not. ~~making Islam and black dick the two things most likely to penetrate new inmates.~~

**Comment [A405]:** These abrupt changes in tone in this particularly chapter do NOT lighten your message with humor. They simply diminish your authority.

**Comment [A406]:** This is not the time or place for another black-dick joke.

For years, the left has been tormenting the right with tales of bigotry. We're supposed to consider frat boys singing lewd songs about women as an example of "rape culture."

We're supposed to look at critics of Black Lives Matter as racists.

~~And we're supposed to consider Christian bakeries uncomfortable with gay weddings as the leading example of homophobia in society today.~~

**Comment [A407]:** Tiresome and off the point.

Well, there is a *real* rape culture in the west. And there is real homophobia in the west. And there is real out-group intolerance in the west. But barely any of it comes from frat boys or Christian bakeries -- it all comes from Islam.

~~So, the next time a leftist asks you what you're doing to fight rape culture, or intolerance, or homophobia, take a Qu'ran and burn it in front of their face.~~

Of course, if you were to do so in Europe, you might be arrested for hate speech, so don't. And if you were to post a picture of your deed on social media, you'd probably be banned. Before I was banned from Twitter, I had my account locked for posting a picture of a dead child, one of the victims of the Nice terrorist attacks. The same iconic picture had been shared by

<sup>151</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/09/09/ginger-jihadie-why-redheads-are-attracted-to-radical-islam/>

<sup>152</sup> <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/tvshowbiz/article-3548919/Lindsay-Lohan-confirms-s-considering-converting-islam-hasn-t-finished-Koran.html>

dozens of journalistic outlets, yet Twitter was too sensitive for it. Facebook, as we already mentioned above, responded to the Orlando shootings by banning one of the west's leading critics of Islam from its platform.

So never again let the left tell you that they are the ones fighting bigotry. They are, in fact, its greatest defenders. They are the ones standing in the way of Pamela Geller, Geert Wilders, Donald Trump, Nigel Farage, Douglas Murray, Maajid Nawaz, Sam Harris, Ayaan Hirsi Ali, and me. A—all the people who are *actually* doing something to fight what we see as the most intolerant, bigoted ideology in the world today face a constant pushback from the very same people who, if they were true to their own values, would be on our side.

But it's no matter. With Daddy elected in the United States, and Brexit underway in the United Kingdom, I'm confident we can win without the left.

### **Defeating Islam**

Islam today is like communism in the early stages of the Cold War. They're presenting young, disaffected people with an idealistic, tribal, utopian vision that is drawing in millions. And like communism, it's inspiring violence all around the world.

If there's one thing we learned from the battle with communism, it's that the West can't compromise on its values. It can't apologize for itself, like the left constantly wants us to do.

It was no accident that the Berlin Wall collapsed at the end of the 1980s. It was the end of a decade when America and, to a lesser extent, Britain had shaken off the malaise of the 1970s and recovered their national sense of self-confidence. Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan proudly walked the world stage, aggressively asserting the superiority, and, well, the greatness of

their respective nations. In the increasingly backwards, increasingly poor Warsaw pact, the choice between the ~~w~~West and communism quickly became a no-brainer.

At the same time, western governments poured money into programs designed to undermine the idea of communism. With state funding, Radio Free Europe and Voice of America ceaselessly broadcast news of anti-communist activities — as well as jazz and rock music — across the Iron Curtain. The propaganda campaign was so successful that KGB memos asserted that up to 80 percent of Soviet youth were listening to western radio broadcasts.

As Reagan and Thatcher were boldly asserting the superiority of western capitalism to communism, western radio broadcasts, offering tantalising glimpses of life and culture in the west, proved it.

That's a long way from western leaders' attitudes to Islam, isn't it? Far from asserting the superiority of western liberalism to the theocratic east, they're wearing headscarves, bowing to Saudi monarchs, and grinning stupidly in mosques. In the Cold War, there were some western leaders who advocated peaceful coexistence with the Soviet bloc, sure, but I don't think any of them ever donned Mao suits or sang "The Internationale."

Instead of drawing attention to the problems with the Islamic way of life – and the superiority of the west's – our leaders harp on about "the religion of peace," seeking to present the increasing violence of the religion's followers — against gays, nonbelievers, and women — as the actions of a tiny minority who will soon be defeated.

But they won't be defeated. The Islamic State may be crumbling in Syria, but it represents a world view that is attracting swathes of young people. Because the west has done nothing to stand up for its own, superior values, an entire generation of young Muslims came to view muftis as their rock stars and mosques as their concert halls. Western leaders talk about

challenging the radicalization of young people, and then turn around and talk about how wonderful Islam is.

The results are inevitable and devastating.

It's theoretically possible to peacefully coexist with Muslims, ~~much like it's possible to coexist with a Christian bakery that refuses to bake cakes for gay weddings. But~~ that's only possible if they ~~can find a way to remove the radical element from contemporary Islam, keep themselves to themselves, and Muslims don't.~~ Too many of the current generation, regardless of whether they're Indonesian, Pashtun, or Arab, are attracted to an ideology that insists on imposing their way of life on everyone else — or killing us, if we refuse.

**Comment [A408]:** Delete. Another drive-by reference to somethings you need to explain fully

And the Muslims who don't actively identify with the most poisonous end of their ideology are perfectly happy to turn a blind eye to its horrors, as poll after poll have demonstrated — to say nothing of the horrendously socially regressive attitudes of Muslims living in the west.

Like communism, we are dealing with a viral meme that needs to be fought head-on.

The old talking points about “violent extremists” are no longer working. Indeed, they never worked to begin with.

We're fighting an idea, and the only way to beat it is to show that the west is the best. Western leaders need to talk about what makes our society great: freedom, tolerance, equality of opportunity. Like Reagan and Thatcher, they need to tirelessly assert their country's greatness.

When ~~America landed on the moon, the Cold War essentially ended.~~ Russia gave up and ended its space program. We can't yet know what the West vs Islam version of the mMoon landings will be, but it is moments in culture like Neil Armstrong's first steps which turn the tide of history and create the conditions for popular rebellion.

**Comment [A409]:** Moon landing was 1969. Berlin Wall didn't fall till 1990. Russia quitting the space race was NOT the end of the Cold War

Islam has to be made uncool.

~~They also need to champion the greatness of western culture and ask more strongly why there isn't a single world-class university in the Muslim world and why there is no Muslim Shakespeare, Picasso, Mozart or Nietzsche — or Milo!~~

**Comment [A410]:** Who?

**Comment [A411]:** There is Rumi—and Rushdie—and Naguib Mahfouz—and...

This is a war of culture as much as it is a war of politics or faith, and we have to start fighting it now, in music, books, journalism, art and with every other means of creativity at our disposal, demonstrating as we do so what is possible with the free expression we so cherish in the west and which made America the greatest country in the history of human civilization.

But more than that — and this is what they really don't want to do — our leaders need to talk about what makes Islamic societies *bad*.

### So Why DO Muslims Hate Me?

As you might expect, I frequently receive all manner of death threats. Most of them, I don't take seriously. As for some of the more poetic ones, which describe my tortuous demise in particularly exquisite detail -- well, I treat those as free erotic fiction.

~~Alas, as my stature has grown, I have to deal with people who are more serious than the graphic, but ultimately unthreatening demizens of anime message boards and feminist circle jerks. Along with Neo-Nazis, who we will get to later in the book, it is death threats from Muslims that who my security detail insists that I ought to take seriously. No matter how many times I tell them that being savagely murdered by an angry muscular brown man is one of my top ten sexual fantasies, they just won't listen!~~

**Comment [A412]:** Dumb

And, to be fair, it's not *exactly* how I'd want to die. I've already decided how I want to die — naked, in my bed, with three Panamanian rent boys, one Ghanaian, a Nigerian, and Anita Sarkeesian's boyfriend, while she watches from a corner.

**Comment [A413]:** Delete this one.

So, last summer, I annoyingly had to resign myself to the fact that I could not lead a gay pride march through the gay district of Stockholm, as I had been planning for some months. By that point, I had given my speech at Ground Zero of Omar Mateen's brutal attack on the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, and my security team informed me that the risks were too great. By that time, I had already been subject to a deluge of Arabic death threats (and one bomb threat) on Twitter (which promptly suspended me for a day). — like the metaphorical rape victim, it seems Twitter thought I was asking for it!

I have little love for western feminists and leftists, not least for their relentless denial of everyday realities. But at least their willful ignorance rarely comes with a body-count, at least not directly (indirectly, in the form of their immigration policies, it certainly does). It is only Muslims who are so fanatically devoted to their 6th-century delusions that they will murder anyone who dares challenge them.

"Islam is a religion of peace" we are told -- and yet so many ~~their~~ AK-47s dare us to deny it.

It's little wonder that I'm well on my way to becoming a hate figure for Muslims, then, given that my mission is to tell the truth no matter how offensive it may be. (All right, I'll be honest -- offensive truths are my favorite kind). What they really can't stand is that I tell the truth about *them* -- their brutal treatment of women, gays, and Christians; their rape-sprees in European cities, their fanatical willingness to kill and die in the name of a 6th-century pedophile warlord.

**Comment [A414]:** Don't undercut your argument with the 'pedophile' label.

The gap between what Muslims believe Islam to be, and how what it is actually practiced in many Islamic nations is, is so wide that hard to imagine an Islamic Reformation it's little wonder that they're angry all the time.

**Comment [A415]:** Who's 'they'? End this sentence so that you're talking about the actual terrorists and NOT my friend Kamal or my friend Famed.

Well, there's a little phrase I like to say that Muslims had better be prepared to hear more often: *Sorry, no offense, but it's true.* With so much of the western media determined to play the ostrich on Islam, don't be surprised when the public turn to Dangerous Faggots to give them the real story.

Because unless you happen to be in the service of a fanatical, murderous religion, most people still love the truth.



## 10

**WHY UGLY PEOPLE HATE ME**

**Comment [A416]:** Delete entire chapter. The book is better overall without hitting these "ugly people" notes in the other chapters and better overall by deleting this one.

In April 2016, I was on a panel at UMass Amherst with Steven Crowder and Christina Hoff Sommers, discussing political correctness. By then it was a matter of course that any campus event at which I spoke would have left-wing agitators scattered throughout the audience, who would attempt to disrupt proceedings by engaging in shouting matches with my fans. Unbeknownst to all of us, one of these protesters was about to become an unfortunate viral celebrity.

**Comment [A417]:** Beauty regime moved to box at end of chapter, after Nietzsche section.

Her name is Cora, but the internet now knows her as "Trigglypuff." She was caught on camera erupting into a fit after Professor Sommers described third-wave campus feminism as "madness." Waving her arms about her head like the coastal tide, Trigglypuff can be heard in the video repeatedly shouting at Sommers to "f\*\*k off" and shrieking "keep your hate speech off campus!"

All standard fare for Milo events. But what made Trigglypuff stand out was her physical appearance. She was morbidly obese. Her arms were wider than my face. To state it bluntly, she was unforgivably ugly. She burnt more calories screaming at my speech than she had in the previous eleven years.

**Comment [A418]:** The whole chapter is a problem in tone. Your usual style NEGATES any value your information might have. The presence of this chapter in the book destroys the rest of the book.

**Comment [A419]:** Phrases like this don't work in a book.

The internet immediately descended into mockery of the poor woman, but I felt nothing but pity. How had she allowed herself to get into such a sorry physical situation? And why wasn't she trying to get out of it?

**Comment [A420]:** In a book like this, the personal attacks backfire on you.

**Comment [A421]:** No, not the entire internet.

I was particularly confused because the last time I'd shown signs of becoming overweight, I was so horrified I immediately hired a personal trainer. If "Trigglypuff" could

afford to waste tens of thousands of dollars on a gender studies course, surely she could do the same. So why didn't she? Do feminists consider mirrors a microaggression?

**Comment [A422]:** Likely she's not paying for college herself.

**Comment [A423]:** Not funny

The answer is that she was swallowing lies as well as hamburgers. Sweet, comforting lies telling her it was okay to abuse her body, that she was still beautiful, that everything was all right. Lies that told her it was society's fault, not hers, that she was overweight.

I'm hot. Women wish I wasn't gay, and straight men breathe a sigh of relief when they find out that I am. Indeed, if I were straight, most feminists would probably renounce their beliefs immediately, just for a chance to shag me. As for gay men, well, I'm fast becoming the number one threat to the harmony and stability of state-endorsed gay marriages, as if anyone believes they're monogamous to begin with.

**Comment [A424]:** Ego and self-aggrandizement backfire in book

This isn't just a chapter about why I'm hot, although as you know, I could quite easily write an entire chapter just about that. Okay, let's be honest, it would be a whole book. Published in 20 volumes like an encyclopedia, or one giant ebook that takes up your entire Kindle's memory. (Thanks, by the way, to my buddy Roger Stone for including me on his best-dressed list for 2016.<sup>153</sup> Finally, some recognition for the hours I put in.)

It's also about why being hot is a political act, one of the most violent fashion statements you can make today. It's the story of how the politics of righteous victimhood reached their final, terrifying conclusion -- in an ideology of ugliness. Known as the "fat acceptance movement," this is the ideology that poisoned Trigglypuff and many others, ruining her life and consigning her to decades, possibly even an entire life of bitter misery and humiliation.

**Comment [A425]:** Being against "fat acceptance" don't belong in a book in which you're making serious political points, certainly not the way you do it in this manuscript

### **The Fat Acceptance Movement**

<sup>153</sup> <http://stoneonstyle.com/style-etiquette-101/best-worst-dressed/mr-stones-11th-annual-best-worst-dressed-list-2016/>

The fat acceptance movement isn't what you think -- it isn't about obese people accepting fat into their system by downing a milkshake every chance they get. Fat acceptance holds that overweight people are, like gays, "born that way" -- that is, genetically predisposed to be fat. There may be some truth to that. But the fat acceptance movement also bridges the fact-value gap, arguing that fat people should not be encouraged to improve their weight, and that any attempt to tell them the truth—about their health and romantic prospects—constitutes "fat-shaming." Having nearly exhausted the causes of anti-racism, anti-sexism, and anti-homophobia, the left now hopes to turn the war against fat-shaming into one of their next great causes. Having spent decades trying to feminize men, they're now pushing women to try and look as unattractive as possible. Apparently, the goal is to look homely even by lesbian standards. If you ever got the impression that the cultural left is running out of ideas, you'd be right.

**Comment [A426]:** How do you know

**Comment [A427]:** Meaning?

**Comment [A428]:** This is not true. No one argues against the health issues

**Comment [A429]:** Don't use 'lesbian' as a slur

There is only one serious study, from University College London, that suggests fat-shaming doesn't work, and it's hopelessly flawed.<sup>154</sup> Firstly, it's based on survey data -- in other words, relying on fat people to be honest about their weight and dietary choices and exercise.<sup>155</sup> Pardon the pun, but: fat chance.

**Comment [A430]:** Give more detail about what it says, and counter with some evidence that it does work.

Daniel Callahan, president emeritus of America's oldest bioethics research institute, agrees with me. "Safe and slow incrementalism that strives never to stigmatise obesity has not and cannot do the necessary work," wrote Callahan, a former smoker, in 2014. "The force of being shamed and beat upon socially was as persuasive for me to stop smoking as the threats to my health."<sup>156</sup>

**Comment [A431]:** Society already shames fat people. No point in bringing up this study to prove that we must do individual shaming

<sup>154</sup> <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/news-articles/0914/110914-Fat-shaming-does-not-encourage-weight-loss>

<sup>155</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/07/05/fat-shaming-is-good-science/>

<sup>156</sup> <http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2013/01/a-case-for-shaming-obese-people-tastefully/267446/>

With a little effort, we can help fat people help themselves. But first we have to make sure that “fat acceptance,” perhaps the most alarming and irresponsible idea to come out of leftist victimhood and grievance politics, is given the heart attack it deserves.

Let’s be clear. Fat acceptance, or “body positivity” as some call it, is not empowering. It’s cruel. Fat acceptance activists like Lindy West are not only causing, but actively encouraging young, impressionable girls to lead a life of gloomy loneliness, isolation, and misery. The people pushing this stuff on young women are evil. They have to be stopped.

Fat people are not healthy, not sexy, and certainly not clever. They die young, live an unfit life, and usually fail to attract normal partners. So why are we teaching our children that this is a lifestyle that’s perfectly okay? I mean, I understand your arteries are hardened, but are the logic centers of your brain shut down as well?

**Comment [A432]:** Unclear, are people saying they’re smarter than non-fat people? Or do you mean clever in the British sense, as in, doing the smart thing with their lives?

**Comment [A433]:** To you but maybe to others

**Comment [A434]:** Not necessary and goes against your earlier profession not to be cruel.

**Comment [A435]:** Not necessarily true

Sometimes I suspect that the body positivity movement is in fact secretly funded by Big Chocolate. Maybe it’s Kraft behind all those idiotic feminists telling women to love the skin they’re in? (Incidentally, Healthy At Any Size is going to be the name of my new highly profitably private sector chain of Type-2 Diabetes Treatment Centers.) In the future children will learn how to count by using their unwed aunt’s fat rolls and stretch marks.

**Comment [A436]:** Not necessarily a feminist message

**Comment [A437]:** Not funny

More than a third of adults are obese in the United States alone, with nearly 70% classified as overweight in some way. Furthermore, health problems caused by obesity are also one of the biggest drains on the US healthcare system. Despite these facts and statistics, we live in an age where fatness is not only accepted, but celebrated.

**Comment [A438]:** Need more statistics on this point, your argument is best when supported.

**Comment [A439]:** These are all straw-men arguments.

Plus-sized “models” like Tess Holliday are promoted in the press as natural and normal and beautiful. Meanwhile, feminist victimhood-mongers like Lindy West make sure to spread the

**Comment [A440]:** Worth it to distinguish between plus-size (which can be a size 8) and obese (Tess Holliday is a size 26)?

lifestyle of jigglyness to their young insecure teenage audience, when they aren't trying to convince them to "shout about their periods."

**Comment [A441]:** Is this a quote from Lindy West, or someone else? Use more specific examples from Lindy West if you're naming her, rather than a vague attribution.

A conspiracy-minded person might look at this obsession with fatness and periods and see some sort of warped mating strategy: those born on the unsexy-side of genetics are doing their level best to convince other women to make themselves appear repulsive as well.

**Comment [A442]:** "Unsexy" and "repulsive" don't win your argument.

This certainly isn't the first time we've seen the logic of "lowering the bar for all" instead of raising oneself up to make the grade. And let's be honest—the bar has to be extremely low for the typical body-positive advocate to make it over. Unfunny.

There are even subgroups of fat positivity, including "Fat Feminism", which incorporates fat activism with feminism and looks at how misogyny intersects with a popular anti-fat bias. In their worldview, misogyny is presumably when men find attractive women attractive.

**Comment [A443]:** Unconvincing

Largely because of women like Tess Holliday and Lindy West, fat positivity has actually made headway in youth culture. Sure, the movement can be traced back as far as the 1960's, but it was never serious. They were a laughing stock. An oddity.

**Comment [A444]:** To whom?

Today it is seen as normal, and no different to the other identity-political subcultures and movements such as transgenderism, feminism, and race equality.

**Comment [A445]:** Why? What changed? Does this stem from a minority view being disseminated on social media, and detractors shamed into agreeing or staying silent on the topic?

The social-justice minded youth spread the wisdom of "body positivity" among their equally young and impressionable peers, who suck it up for fear of being branded a bigot. As Daddy might say, they're bigly biased.

**Comment [A446]:** Are you saying they lie? Proof?

**Comment [A447]:** Who are?

We now have a wave of youth that believes that dangerous levels of obesity are an acceptable, beautiful, and legitimate identity, and all those who criticize it are "oppressing them." Meanwhile, obesity is rapidly rising, with even children becoming hospitalized for their reckless

**Comment [A448]:** Evidence

**Comment [A449]:** Is this even true

eating. If fat acceptance campaigners had their way, school hallways would have to be enlarged to accommodate students no longer physically able to walk between classes.

**Comment [A450]:** Provide some hard evidence here, otherwise you're just repeating yourself

The fat positivity culture has become particularly popular on Tumblr: the micro-blogging service for angsty, wrist-cutting, blue-haired teens in that awkward stage of rebellion and understanding their identities. This is where you will find blogs that take the movement even deeper with niche ideologies like "Fat People of Color".

"This is a blog dedicated to encouraging and showcasing media of fat (and non-"straight sized") people of color. We are anti-racist, anti-ableist, anti-classist, anti-queer hatred, anti-transphobic, and generally an all inclusive space" states the blog's about page, which appears to have more entry requirements than an old-world secret society.

**Comment [A451]:** 'the Illuminati' or 'the Skull and Bones society'?

The blog generates hundreds of interactions from other young Tumblr users who are literally being brainwashed into this bizarre and obscure movement, which risks condemning them to lives of social misery and unhealthiness. And guess who's most at risk? Black Americans, who are 1.5 times more likely to be obese than white Americans. Once again, the left's victim politics risks hurting those it claims to protect.

**Comment [A452]:** How? Absurd charge

Sorry, ladies, but these short-haired, plump women Not all are who keep telling you to love your body even if you're fat are condemning you to a sad and lonely life, and it's not your fault. You are being brainwashed by people who are bitter at the world for their own unattractiveness. Not only are they deluded and miserable with themselves (notice how loudly, how desperately, they proclaim themselves to be "proud" and "happy") but they're also trying to pull you into the flames with them.

**Comment [A453]:** Again, absurd charge

**Comment [A454]:** Name calling

**Comment [A455]:** Attacking speakers as ugly diminishes your credibility. Actually—it ERASES it

What's *really* surprising, not to mention sinister, is how this stuff has seeped out of colleges and journalism and infected the private sector. JC Penney is now commissioning ads to

tell young girls it's okay to be a landwhale.<sup>157</sup> (They don't phrase it like that, obviously.) You can see the commercial logic. America's obese population is growing -- both numerically and horizontally -- and JC Penney sells boat covers that they call clothes. That they would turn to pandering to obesity is a sign of desperation.

**Comment [A456]:** No

Someone has made the brilliant decision to market this once-respected brand to women who think Cool Ranch Doritos are a food group. But JC Penney is joining the ranks of consumer products companies following a bizarrely quixotic business model: help your customers feel good about themselves until they drop dead from obesity-related illnesses. The problem? When they die, they stop buying your XXXL clothing. What JC Penney has failed to realize, apparently, is that the gravy train is an analogy for a successful business, not an actual vehicle coated in gravy.

**Comment [A457]:** This entire argument is ridiculous

What's next? A line of tea biscuits from Walmart called "Virtuous Snacks" with inspirational quotes on the boxes, such as, "You're amazing even though you ate the whole pizza," and, "Don't worry that your left arm is numb, that's just your FIERCE shining through!"

**Comment [A458]:** This would never happen

### **How Ugly People Vote**

Sigmund Freud is seen as a little outdated in modern psychology departments, who think of themselves as more scientific and methodical than the old cigar-smoker. They're right, to an extent -- many of Freud's ideas were wacky. But in one important regard, he was correct: sex is the hidden agent behind a great deal many of our beliefs and motivations.

No teenage boy ever picked up a guitar for any reason beyond getting laid. And no teenage girl ever dreamt of being a celebrity for any other reason than to flaunt her beauty and

**Comment [A459]:** This is not true

**Comment [A460]:** This is not true either

<sup>157</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/06/26/no-jc-penney-fat-people-absolutely-hate/>

attract suitors. Whenever we make a big life decision: a career change, a new car, a holiday destination—you can guarantee that “will this increase my chances of getting laid pulling?” is not far from our minds.

**Comment [A461]:** You cannot say this is true of everyone.

It also reveals itself in subtler ways. Men are obsessed with winning and in competition in a way that most women are not -- because they know that nothing is less attractive to a woman than a loser. Nerds hate jocks because they're insecure about their physique; they know that without some jock-type athleticism, they'll never get a girl. And jocks hate nerds for similar reasons: they know that without some nerd-type achievement and ambition, they'll never hang on to one. As for the unfortunate kids who lack both looks *and* brains—well, they become school shooters. Or leftists!

**Comment [A462]:** Not necessarily true

**Comment [A463]:** Not true

Every nannying, authoritarian, fun-hating movement in history has attracted the ugliest, most miserable members of society. In this, modern progressives have much in common with the movement of the same name that emerged at the end of the 19th century. Given that the earlier progressives emerged before the development of mass media, when political movements learned the art of masking their most unappealing elements, their fun-hating doctrine was plain for all to see.

**Comment [A464]:** Don't make fun of school shooters—and certainly don't compare them to liberals.

**Comment [A465]:** Elements—and people? Is this a comment on spokespeople having to become telegenic? Be clearer.

Also plain to see was the ugliness. I mean, have you ever seen a picture of temperance activists? They weren't lookers. They couldn't get a date to the alternative prom. You have to take my opinion with a grain of salt, obviously, but the battle axes who comprised the backbone of the movement were the type that couldn't be helped even by beer goggles.

**Comment [A466]:** It does you no good to say that people who disagree with you are ugly

The progressives were notable for their hatred of both the top and the bottom of society. The British progressives had a particular loathing for what they saw as the excesses of the Edwardian era, a time when the nobility and upper classes flaunted their wealth and glamor. In



the United States, progressives coined the term “Gilded Age” to refer to a similar period of excess lorded over by wealthy elites.

**Comment [A467]:** What's wrong with the phrase "Gilded Age"?

Progressives were not socialists. They were animated not by Marxist ideology but by moral fervor: they were often staunch Protestants. Their reasons for championing women's suffrage are revealing: the historian Paige Meltzer describes how the cause of women's suffrage was taken up by progressives who believed that women were a force of moral purification.

**Comment [A468]:** But Susan B Anthony was a Republican, and the party championed their right to vote. Republicans were the progressives before the Depression and Roosevelt.

“Puritanism,” wrote H.L. Mencken, whose lifetime spanned the first progressive era, is the “haunting fear that someone, somewhere, might be happy.” And who could possibly hate happiness? Why, those who are denied it themselves. Authoritarian movements draw ugly, miserable people like moths to a flame for precisely this reason.

**Comment [A469]:** Summarize the next two paragraphs in a sentence about wanting women to clean up government and wanting to civilize the working class.

It's also no surprise that the early progressive movement was driven by the middle class, which has always tended to produce a worrying number of killjoys. More than any other economic group, it's the middle class that tends to worry the most about social propriety and often-stifling standards of behavior.

This, then, is the recipe for attracting joyless, dour, sexless people to your movement. All you have to do is start telling other people what to do. Anyone who feels resentful at their lack of ability to have a good time will come running to modern progressivism, because it's just as controlling and nannying as its 19th-century predecessor. And who feels most resentful? Why, the ugly of course.

**Comment [A470]:** No basis to say this

That explains why ugly people are drawn to the left. But why is the left increasingly drawn to ugly people? That's a far more intriguing question -- and it has a far more troubling answer.

**Comment [A471]:** All this pop psychology is hogwash. You can't say ugly people are drawn to the left. Have you ever seen the people at a Trump rally?

## The Slave Morality

It's time for the return of Professor Milo, like the occasional classroom scenes in an *Indiana Jones* movie. We are going to get intellectual again, but I promise it's worth it.

**Comment [A472]:** This loses the reader

Historically, the left has championed the powerless, and feared—even hated—the powerful. This has achieved good results, in the past. It meant that the left fought for workers' rights, winning basic protections for workers in the 19th and early 20th century. Much of the basic luxuries we take for granted today—two-day weekend, 8-hour average workdays, and basic occupational health & safety—were won by leftist workers' rights movements. Other important achievements, such as the end of lynching in the American South, and the outlawing of marital rape, were won by left-wing activists who instinctively defend perceived underclasses.

**Comment [A473]:** This paragraph of praise for the left might be useful elsewhere when you need to show some impartiality but the rest of this section goes off the rails.

On the other hand, particularly when it starts to run out of legitimate victims to champion, the left goes off the rails. That's how we arrived at the fat acceptance movement, which is surely one of the most absurd (yet, on closer examination of the left's instincts, terrifyingly logical) ideological developments in western history.

Perhaps the person who best understood the instincts of the left was the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. Although he did not use the terms "left" and "right," the idea of an ideology of victims and an ideology of non-victims was central to his philosophy. He called it the *master-slave morality*.

Stay with me, class. I know you're surrounded by leftists who love to spout the Nietzsche quote, "God is dead". It's the only thing they know about Nietzsche, just like they know that Che Guevara looks handsome on a shirt but not that he was a cold-blooded murderer.

Nietzsche characterised the slave morality as responsive to that of the master morality. Underclasses, tired of watching the success and happiness of elites, turned on the very notion of success and all the values that accompanied it. Where the master morality valued strength, the slave morality valued weakness. Where the master morality values nobility, the slave morality values humility. Masters value wealth, slaves value poverty, masters value cunningness, slaves value simple-mindedness, and so on. According to Nietzsche, the slave morality was born from the underclasses' hatred of the rich, powerful and successful — everything they had was deemed bad, while the condition of the underclass, though wretched on the face of it, was actually virtuous — like a kind of society-wide sour grapes.

Does the slave morality sound familiar to you yet? Consider how the grey, drab, deliberately spartan architecture of the 1960s and 70s flowed from the utopian socialist thinking of Marxist architects like Emő Goldfinger. Or how the left has always hated and feared powerful actors (first the British Empire and later America and Israel) on the world stage, while being oddly enamoured of the underdog guerrillas who fight them — even when they're conservative theocrats like Hamas. And consider also how the left hates extravagance in art, always championing the abstract and the minimalistic. It's not very far off from the puritan disdain for the ostentatiousness of the nobility — and it shouldn't be, because it is its direct ideological descendant.

Comment [A474]: NO IT HAS NOT

Nietzsche actually traced the slave morality all the way back to Roman times, when early Christianity became an ideology primarily embraced by the subject classes of the Roman Empire, persecuted and downtrodden as they were by the wealthy, powerful, and famously fun-loving Roman elites. According to Nietzsche, asceticism became popular among Christians in Roman Syria (such as Simeon Stylites, who spent 37 years praying on a small platform atop a

pillar) as a means of contrast with the extravagance of Roman elites. In Nietzschean philosophy, early Christianity also emphasised values of humility, frugality, and patience for the same reason. The German philosopher then connected the early slave morality to 19th-century liberals, democrats and egalitarians—the left wing of their day—who wanted to tear down the wealth and privilege of social elites.

Nietzsche's argument has real historical weight. Early Christianity was indeed an incredibly ascetic, anti-elitist religion. This wasn't necessarily a bad thing at the time, (although Nietzsche clearly thought it was), as Roman elites were marvelously wasteful and more than occasionally tyrannical. As European society evolved, the Catholic Church grew to be more comfortable with the existence of the wealthy and powerful, and rather less ascetic. Catholic parades, Catholic cathedrals and Catholic art are wonderfully extravagant—one of the reasons I love the religion.

And, of course, one of the reasons the puritanical Calvinists hated it. The puritans rose in response to a Catholic Church they deemed to be overly hierarchical, overly extravagant, and overly friendly to wealth and power. Some protestant sects, like the levellers, were essentially proto-communists, who wanted a year-zero like abolition of all social and economic distinctions between people. Leftist historians still hark back to the levellers as the progenitors of Marx and Engels' ideas.

And so they should. The modern progressive and leftist movement is directly descended from the ascetic, puritan, fun-hating strands of Christianity. The more radical protestant traditions, like the levellers, went on to sow the seeds of socialism, Marxism, and Communism. The puritans of the 18th century became the progressives of the late 19th-century, who became the modern-day progressives—sharing their religious predecessors' penchant for ideological

fervor, punishment and purges. As Lex Corvus, one of the more brilliant anonymous alt-right Twitter accounts put it “Harvard was founded to train Puritan ministers, and it never stopped.”

**Comment [A475]:** I'm not sure this is true.

We're in the home stretch now, you've all been apt pupils. You're well on your way to graduating with honors from the University of Milo, and you didn't even need to take out a student loan to buy this book — even if you got the hardcover. (Honestly, you'll learn more true and useful things from this book than most American college courses.)

**Comment [A476]:** Are you kidding? You would have lost them pages and pages ago!

The important thing to note here is not just the fact that the left has historically been drawn to the underclasses — it's that they have also utterly hated the upper echelons of society. Indeed, in my short experience, I've found that hating other people for having more is often a far more powerful source of motivation than pitying other people for having less, even if it sometimes drives you toward the same ends.

**Comment [A477]:** Interesting point. Place elsewhere

This is important to understand, because it explains why the left is so vicious to their opponents, and how it uses hatred as a source of motivation. Even as they occupy the halls of power in academia, the media, and entertainment, the left still behave like slave rebels fighting Roman tyrants. Everything perceived to be powerful, from “the patriarchy” to the American military must be torn down and humiliated. The first must be last, and the last first.

But eventually, the left must seek out new targets — as rising standards of living render class differences increasingly irrelevant, the left must find other groups to hate. Luckily for them, the modern world, with all its opportunities to become unequal and distinct from one another (something that would have horrified the levellers), offers them ample targets. The advent of sexual liberation in the 1960s, and the subsequent collapse of marriage threw the divide between hot people and ugly people into stark contrast.

Given that feminism was already attracting man-hating lesbians in the 1970s, it was only a matter of time before it morphed into the fat-acceptance movement. Just as ascetic Christianity, with its disdain for Roman extravagance, attracted provincial underclasses who hated their Imperial masters, so too did feminism, with its hatred of sex and its hatred of men become a natural breeding ground for fat-acceptance and all its attendant hatred of the beautiful and the loved.

**Comment [A478]:** Slur

**Comment [A479]:** This gets way, way away from the theme of this chapter and needs to be deleted. It doesn't aid your point.

### Nietzsche's Answer

Nietzsche was a proto-Milo; he wanted to turn the world on its head. Although his philosophy is sometimes extreme in its condemnation of values like humility and empathy, he was correct insofar that the western moral tradition is tinged with envy, and often underappreciated the value of strength, wealth, cunning, triumph and power. Nietzsche wanted to restore those values to their proper place, and to encourage people to take some pride in their success, and the values that led to it.

**Comment [A480]:** If you cut the above section, you will have to introduce Nietzsche here

**Comment [A481]:** Trey of Nietzsche?

Ayn Rand, a strong admirer of the German philosopher, analysed wealth through a Nietzschean lens. At a time when socialists and social democrats were on a tear across the western world, dominating elections and embedding their economic paradigms at the heart of official thinking, Rand - alongside Friedrich Hayek and other Austrian-school economists - boldly proclaimed the value of wealth, and humanity's quest for riches.

Championing the fortunate, the successful, and the able has never been particularly popular. People are naturally inclined to sympathize with underdogs, and to take pity on the less fortunate. But you occasionally need a Nietzsche or a Rand, to remind society why striving for greatness -- be it power, fame or wealth - is important. They remind us that sometimes, the best

way to help the less fortunate is not to weep or proclaim their superior virtue, but to help them to improve their condition -- and that maybe, just maybe, you need the extravagance of elites to motivate the less fortunate. After all, what's the point of making it to the top if you can't have any fun?

I see myself as the heir to Nietzsche and Rand. The former reminded the world that it was OK to strive for victory and achievement. The latter reminded the world that it was OK to strive for wealth and self-interest. I'm going to remind the world that it's OK, and indeed a virtue, to strive for hotness.

**Comment [A482]:** Grandiosity backfires on you

Does no one else realise why aspirational glamor matters? The reason I want mainstream culture to continue selling depictions of unachievable sexual power and preserving all-American 1950s archetypes is that it challenges people who don't agree with them and, yes, punishes those who don't conform. If Kurt Cobain had never felt like a skinny fag because of all the popular muscleheads of the 1980s, would he have hated himself enough to become a genius? We need self-loathing and alienation. They drive us to succeed. Sex is the ultimate motivating factor and beauty always wins -- or at least creates artists out of those left behind, who have to carve out their own thing. Keep the geniuses ugly and the celebrities hot.

**Comment [A483]:** This makes you seem petty

**Comment [A484]:** This is much more a way to close out this chapter. Make this last section about the benefits of aspirational glamor.

**Comment [A485]:** Don't say you want to return to the 50s

**Comment [A486]:** Did he really?

**Comment [A487]:** How can you know he felt this?

**Comment [A488]:** This is similar to the twisted reasoning you make in the gay chapter on Catholicism. It doesn't make sense or pass intellectual muster. It's just trolling on an issue that many readers will might take seriously

In today's feelings-focused, offense-shy culture, being hot is becoming rather like disagreement -- its mere presence is enough to disturb the left. I sometimes wonder if the reason so many leftists retreat into safe spaces when they hear I'm coming to campus is because of my supposedly offensive views, or because they simply can't bear to gaze on such Adonis-like beauty. Hotties of the world, tear off your chains!

**Comment [A489]:** This is a stupid way to end a terrible chapter. Not worth keeping in.  
DELETE

## START BOX

## MILO'S PERSONAL BEAUTY REGIME

I wake at 8.30am. My personal trainer, Will, brings me 4 eggs, scrambled, and either two rashers of bacon or a sausage with a plate of raw spinach, a cup of black coffee and chilled San Pellegrino or Perrier. I have not drunk tap water since 2005.

My figure has improved dramatically from a year ago. I have started to look excellent in clothes. Though I have lost five inches off my waist in the last six months and over fifty pounds, I still have my bubble butt. Often I will remove my pajamas and examine myself for a few minutes in the mirror, appreciating the subtle curves of my upper body and the more obvious shapes of my lower body.

Push-ups and curls are making my arms bigger. Every other day I do military presses to ensure my shoulders and back grow in proportion to my biceps. It's important not to exercise just one muscle group if you want an attractive physique. I burn between 400 and 600 calories a day on the treadmill walking for 45 minutes at an incline of 13.5 degrees. I walk instead of running because I am usually in the Eastern time zone and I often take calls with my European staff early in the morning.

Will stands on my feet and we do crunches. I don't really need him to stand on my feet any more but I enjoy the human contact. It is not sexual. Now my body fat percentage is dropping, my abs are starting to come through. I can imagine finding myself attractive in a nightclub or bar.

In the shower I use a menthol and eucalyptus foaming gel, because I like to start my day feeling fresh and alert. I wash my body carefully and thoroughly. Because soap can be drying, I apply body butter or Kiehl's moisturising cream to my arms, chest and back. I use La Mer hand lotion.

I shave twice a week. I use a mid-priced green shave gel because I prefer to see the hair as I remove it. I use an aftershave balm with tea tree oil, even though I have never had a pimple.

Every day I use La Prairie skin cream, which is expensive but the best I have found. Sometimes I apply it over a serum if I will be outside in low temperatures. I enjoy kissing my boyfriend often, so I ensure my lips are plump and soft with a mint or mango lip balm.

I blow-dry my hair enough to apply a moisturising base texturiser followed by a harder wax, usually one from Aveda. I use softer finishing cream from the same brand to add shine and glossiness, and a new hair-spray I found in a boutique salon in East London. It is called Bumble and Bumble and it holds the hair in place without residue.

**Comment [A490]:** This feels like a Patrick Bateman joke. If so, not worth making. If you intend it sincerely, this is not that kind of book.

## END BOX

**Comment [A491]:** DELETE ENTIRE CHAPTER



**WHY GAMERS DON'T HATE ME**

A syringe filled with a mysterious clear liquid, unsheathed and tossed into a Jiffy bag. A poorly-spelled letter, laced with profanity and smeared with what I presume was excrement inside an envelope that read: "MILO YOU C\*\*T." 90 rolls of aloe vera-infused toilet paper—the fancy stuff, three-ply! These are just some of the gifts that arrived through my front door after I started reporting on GamerGate, a bitter bust-up in the video game industry I was involved with back in 2014. The conflict was between ordinary gamers who wanted to be left alone to enjoy their digital playgrounds and a coalition of well-connected bloggers and feminist activists who said video games are misogynistic and dangerous.

It's been a crazy ride. Perhaps the tragicomic highlight of my early chronicling of GamerGate was sitting in a friend's living room in Berlin late in 2014 on a business trip, trying to focus on our conversation as I received ever-more panicky and hysterical messages from my cleaning lady in London, who had opened the mail in my absence to discover a dead creature with a knife in its neck. It was a field mouse, probably roadkill, with a razor blade poking theatrically out from under its nose. They knew where I lived; and they lived nearby. The postmark said London.

The mailed threats stopped after a while, as their perpetrators saw their work having the opposite effect of what they intended. Each threat galvanized my will to continue reporting on the industry and its feminist foibles, and my publicizing the threats brought fresh attention to the issue from gamers who were previously uninvolved. As that tactic became ineffective, new tactics emerged.

**Comment [A492]:** This chapter is a mess of low-context writing, in which you assume the reader shares your previous knowledge and point-of-view, and muddled thinking. Given the complexity of the topic, you need to make this chapter the MOST CLEARLY WRITTEN in the book.

**Comment [A493]:** Right at the outset, this chapter must clearly explain Gamergate for non-Gamers. See comments page 210.

**Comment [A494]:** Don't assume prior knowledge on part of reader and ease into the background more clearly.

**Comment [A495]:** Do they identify as such?

**Comment [A496]:** Okay... so what you've got to do is similar to what you have to do with Leslie Jones. You have to CLEARLY set forth what happened INCLUDING an honest recap of the charges AGAINST you. Only after acknowledging that harassment occurred—and acknowledging that you are accused of staking it—can you then offer your defense.

I suggest you look again at articles like the Washington Post's "The Only Guide to Gamergate You Will Ever Need" and Gawker's "What Is Gamergate and Why?" and some others that are considered "mainstream," so that you can respond to ALL the criticism. This gives you the opportunity to put a DEFINITIVE statement on Gamergate into this book. As is, this chapter is just a muddle.

**Comment [A497]:** Foibles wrong word

2015 saw the rise of bomb threats made towards GamerGate related events, several of which I attended. The first incident was at a GamerGate meetup in Washington D.C. attended by more than 300 gamers from all walks of life, and the second was at a daylong discussion of GamerGate organized by the Society of Professional Journalists in Miami, Florida. Although some individuals thought to be responsible for the threats have been interviewed by federal authorities, as of this writing neither of these crimes have been solved.

This was the climate surrounding GamerGate, a bitter war involving gamers, anonymous internet trolls, hectoring feminist scolds, and left-wing journalists. For over two years, it raged across all corners of the internet, involving every young subculture that had emerged with the rise of social media, and every dirty web-based harassment tactic thought of by anonymous trolls and unscrupulous activists. Predictably, only the complaints (real and imagined) of one side – the left-wing, anti-GamerGate side – were ever acknowledged by the mainstream media.

**Comment [A498]:** Many would call you one of those things

It was the greatest and most bitter battle in the millennial culture wars, in which hundreds of thousands of gamers took to the internet to demand an end to an out-of-control, left-wing gaming press that lacked any semblance of professionalism and sought to turn a freewheeling, creative hobby into a neutered, feminist safe space. But gamers, many of them veterans of struggles against the conservative right's attempts to censor violent video games in the 1990s, proved to be a far more formidable opponent than the left, and perhaps even gamers themselves, predicted.

**Comment [A499]:** Overaching

No one was more amazed than me. I once described gamers as dorky weirdos in yellowing underpants. And, let's be fair, some of them are. Probably perfectly nice people. Yet here were these dorky weirdos, taking on the fury of the leftist media-activist complex without flinching. Unpaid, undisciplined, and in some cases, yes, unhygienic – but they were doing what

billion-dollar conservative PACs and even the Tea Party had failed to do. Today, if I had to choose one ally to fight the left, I'd choose a gamer over a Ben Shapiro in a heartbeat.

**Comment [A500]:** Gratuitous

GamerGate was enormously significant. It was the first time that consumers of a major entertainment medium staged a mass resistance to the influence of the political left. Hollywood, music, literature, the arts, and virtually every other cultural arena had fallen prey to the relentless co-option machine of the cultural left. In Hollywood, deviation from politically correct norms triggers instant outrage -- just look at Kaley Cuoco, who was cowed into an apology by buying left-wing culture warriors simply for saying that she did not identify with feminism<sup>158</sup>. Thanks to the heroic efforts of their consumers, video games would not suffer the same fate -- and in the process, they showed frightened, isolated dissidents that it was possible to fight the cultural left and win.

**Comment [A501]:** Identify

### Ethics in Games Journalism

So how did GamerGate come about? Well, I'll start by saying that if you're going to wage a culture war against a web-savvy, relentlessly determined audience, you'd better make sure your professional standards are spotless. Unfortunately for the left-wing games bloggers who decided to mount a political crusade on the industry they purported to love, professionalism is an alien concept.

**Comment [A502]:** This should be moved to first page.

**Comment [A503]:** This is going to be hard for a person outside of the gaming community or unfamiliar with the controversy to follow. Make this as clear and straight-forward as you can—don't be vague or circle around the events. It's easier to follow from a specific event, so start with the Zoe Quinn reveal and fill in the background details about gamer frustration after that.

**Comment [A504]:** Over-arguing without demonstrating WHY you're saying that.

--Like the mainstream media, games journalists had become a biased, elitist tribe, riddled with undisclosed connections to their favored feminist reporting subjects, committed to distorting the truth in favor of their pet political narratives, and contemptuous of anyone outside their progressive clique.

**Comment [A505]:** Unbear

<sup>158</sup> <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/kaley-cuoco-sweeting-apologizes-saying-761019>

Not by coincidence, all the critics, commentators and games developers promoted by this social justice circlejerk all seemed to share similar politics. They were against games that allegedly promoted “rape culture” and appealed to “bros,” like the wildly popular *Grand Theft Auto* series (one gaming SIW, Alex Lifschitz, was recorded in a now-infamous video in which he breaks a copy of the game before a cheering audience of games journalists<sup>159</sup>). They were for abstract, soulless games like  *Gone Home*  and *Depression Quest*, which substituted dreary pseudo-intellectual point-scoring about minorities and social justice causes for good graphics and exciting gameplay. They were determined to end “rape culture” in video games, which in their view involved puritanical crusades against sexy female characters.

By the summer of 2014, when GamerGate began, gamers had been treated to years of games journalists parroting the same messages. Video games were marred by sexist tropes, from “sexualization” to “violence against women.” Gaming culture, particularly the “trash talk” popular amongst online gamers, was hostile to women and minorities. Games contributed to “rape culture.”

At the same time, the games press was beginning to select a number of feminist icons to push on an unwilling audience. Commentators like Anita Sarkeesian, and games developers like Anna Anthropy and Zoe Quinn, developer of *Depression Quest*, were lauded with praise and attention. They received glowing article after glowing article, no matter how terrible their products or feeble their analysis. Any criticism of them was met with a wave of copycat articles across the games press, labeling the critics misogynist trolls.

**Comment [A506]:** By whom?

**Comment [A507]:** This needs specific examples or feels like bombast

**Comment [A508]:** Simplify/trim and use as fill-in background information after describing the Zoe Quinn incident

<sup>159</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vWw7LwiYHbA>

Before long, gamers began to suspect that games journalists and feminist progressives were working together. **They** all repeated the same messages, after all. So **they** began looking for clues and connections.

**Comment [A509]:** Who?

**Comment [A510]:** Who?

In August 2014, they found a big one. Zoe Quinn, one of the feminist games press' favorite games designers, wasn't just metaphorically in bed with journalists. She was *literally* in bed with them. An **expose** from one of Quinn's ex-boyfriends, who claimed to have been emotionally abused by the games developer (he was an **SJW**, as you might guess), revealed that **Quinn had enjoyed romantic relationships with a number of games journalists**. One of them, Nathan Grayson of Kotaku, had gone on to favorably highlight one of games without disclosing their relationship.

**Comment [A511]:** Start here.

**Comment [A512]:** Published where?

**Comment [A513]:** Self-professed or your description—explain.

**Comment [A514]:** Do you have a good enough source for this accusation? Otherwise, it starts to seem that whenever there's a woman involved on the opposite side to you, you accuse her of sexual behavior.

I will be bold and say that few people beyond journalism professors really care if a reporter is friends, or even romantically connected to, one of their reporting subjects. Given the private nature of these relationships, disclosure is sometimes difficult. So I have some sympathy for Quinn and Grayson. Sure, what Grayson did wasn't really ethical, but in normal circumstances it shouldn't lead to a culture-war cataclysm. But thanks to **the dreadful professional track record of the games press, and their appalling response to gamers' concerns**, it did.

**Comment [A515]:** Too vague for such a blanket condemnation.

Following the discovery of the Grayson-Quinn connection, gamers across the web embarked on one of the greatest acts of collective internet-sleuthing in history. In **IRC channels, Twitter hashtags, and hundreds of threads on 4chan and Reddit**, gamers conducted a relentless investigation of virtually every prominent games journalist and their connections. After years of foolishly prodding a sleeping dragon, games journalists were about to be sent to the burn unit.

**Comment [A516]:** This is crucial. Explain for non-Gamers how this spread through IRC, 4Chan and Reddit—and what those things are?

Gamers quickly uncovered a web of connections between games journalists and their reporting subjects. Games journalists had reported on their friends, **political allies**, and lovers without disclosure, and in some cases had even donated money to their reporting subjects.

**Comment [A517]:** Meaning what?

Critical Distance, a hub of social justice-oriented games **critics, repeatedly gave favorable coverage to reporting subjects who had given them monthly donations** through the crowdfunding site Patreon, including Rami Ismail of Vlambeer studios, games produced by the leftist creative consultancy Silverstring Media, and former Polygon games editor Ben Kuchera<sup>160</sup>. Others, like former Gamasutra editor-at-large Leigh Alexander, published dozens of articles lauding their personal friends<sup>161</sup>. The other leading feminists and SJWs of the games media all had similar track records.

**Comment [A518]:** Is this really evil or just capitalistic niceties?

**During** the 2016 general elections, observers were shocked as WikiLeaks revealed the extent of the connections between the Clinton Campaign and the mainstream media. CNN, one of the worst offenders, asked the Clinton campaign to help the draft questions for anchors Jake Tapper and Wolf Blitzer to interview Donald Trump and Senator Ted Cruz during the Republican primaries<sup>162</sup>. CNN contributor Donna Brazile fed CNN debate questions to Hillary Clinton ahead of her primary debates with Senator Bernie Sanders<sup>163</sup>. WikiLeaks revealed that even the *Wall Street Journal*, ostensibly a conservative publication, held secret off-the-record meetings with the Democratic National Committee<sup>164</sup>.

**Comment [A519]:** Preface this with "An analogy that might help put this in context" or similar, to acknowledge niche-ness of this subject. Give us more reasons to be invested in this even if we're not gamers or don't know the story.

<sup>160</sup> [http://www.deepfreeze.it/outlet.php?o=critical\\_distance](http://www.deepfreeze.it/outlet.php?o=critical_distance)

<sup>161</sup> [http://www.deepfreeze.it/journo.php?i=leigh\\_alexander](http://www.deepfreeze.it/journo.php?i=leigh_alexander)

<sup>162</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2016/11/07/wikileaks-cnn-asked-democrats-to-draft-questions-for-republican-candidate-interviews/>

<sup>163</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/10/31/wikileaks-dnc-chair-donna-brazile-fed-debate-questions-clinton/>

<sup>164</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/07/22/wikileaks-democratic-national-committee-had-off-record-meeting-wall-street-journal/>

None of this, I suspect, came as any surprise to gamers, who got a close-up look at the corruption of the media during GamerGate. A month after the gamers and games journalists went to war, I was handed the most explosive story of the entire controversy: a series of leaks from the “Game Journo Pros,” a secret email list used by journalists from gaming and tech publications including Kotaku, Polygon, Ars Technica, Rock Paper Shotgun, WIRED, PC Gamer and The Verge. I knew when I read the logs that GamerGate would not be over for a very, very long time.

**Comment [A520]:** Why is this so explosive?

I'm not sure why I was chosen to deliver these logs to the public. Am I perhaps more charismatic, witty, compelling, and humble than other journalists? I hadn't the foggiest – but I did know exactly what to do with the logs: publish them all on *Breitbart*, gently recline on my throne built of dispatched feminist careers, and watch as the flames of the greatest lulz-fire on the internet leaped ever higher into the sky.

**Comment [A521]:** You were covering games for Breitbart, right? Trusted voice?

**Comment [A522]:** Ego gets in the way of authority here

**Comment [A523]:** Logs do not prove collusion

The logs confirmed the gamers' worst suspicions. It gave them an insight into the depth of collusion in the games media. Not only were journalists from competing publications in constant communication with each other, but they also appeared to be in cahoots, making decisions about what to cover and how to cover it.

**Comment [A524]:** Why is this bad?

**Comment [A525]:** Need a specific example.

The games press was revealed to be biased beyond belief. Editors were frantically encouraging each other to censor feedback from angry readers across their publications. One games editor – Kyle Orland of Ars Technica, the very founder of the Game Journo Pros – was encouraging other journalists to contribute to a whip-round for Zoe Quinn. At this point, Kotaku journalist Jason Schreier wisely pointed out that a fund-raising campaign for a feminist games developer might not be the best idea at a time when games journalist were facing mass allegations of collusion and political bias. For gamers, even the fact that such a thing had even been suggested, by a games editor at a major tech publication, said it all.

**Comment [A526]:** Need a specific example

**Comment [A527]:** Britishism.

GamerGate started with a hunt for unethical games journalists, but it was quickly becoming apparent that the real hunt was for ethical ones. Did any even exist? In the games media, it seemed that politics, not professionalism was king.

Gamers didn't really care about ethics or professional standards, said games journalists -- they were just a bunch of misogynists who hated feminism and were trying to turn video games into a "boys club."<sup>165</sup> Any gamers who hoped that the mainstream media would prove more objective than the games press were quickly disappointed, as the controversy gathered steam, publications and outlets from *The Guardian* to ABC News parroted the panic about the "sexist" and "misogynist" crusaders of GamerGate.

They hoped that the public shaming would cow gamers into silence, as it had done to so many others before. But it backfired. Over the next year, gamers would organize a relentless boycott campaign against the games media and their associated publications. Gamers were used to repeating tasks again and again, to beat a level, to defeat an antagonist, or to achieve a high score. To them, the games press was just another final boss in an epic real-life video game.

The biggest, baddest boss of them all was Gawker Media, owners of Kotaku. In 2015, Kotaku was by far and away gamers' most hated publication. It even gave its name to GamerGate's primary hub on Reddit, the subreddit "KotakuInAction" -- the primary purpose of which is to track unethical journalism. Kotaku was the home to articles such as "Straight White Male: The Easiest Difficulty Setting There Is," a third-rate attempt to convert the inanities of the progressive privilege pyramid into a metaphor about video games. More seriously, Kotaku was also responsible for the near-destruction of the reputation of acclaimed games developer Brad Wardell, CEO of Stardock Corporation, after it published bogus allegations of sexual harassment from a disgruntled ex-employee without giving him sufficient time to comment.

**Comment [A528]:** Trim the rest of the GamerGate recap down and tell us why this is important in the mainstream culture, not just the gaming one.

**Comment [A529]:** Where and who?

**Comment [A530]:** Address specifically what feminists were saying about the video game community, and say why you disagree with their side. Otherwise you're leaving your readers without the tools to argue against the left's criticisms on this issue.

**Comment [A531]:** Against reading their articles? Or, as below, their advertisers? They stopped buying?

**Comment [A532]:** It didn't "give name"--- gamers named it

**Comment [A533]:** You keep using image of a pyramid but never explain it.

**Comment [A534]:** Then why are YOU the one accused of hate action in Gamergate?

<sup>165</sup> <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-anita-sarkeesian-gamergate-20141017-story.html>



Gawker, the parent company of Kotaku, had an even worse reputation. It was singled out in Jon Ronson's book, *So You've Been Publicly Shamed*, for its gleeful persecution of ordinary citizens over offenses as minor as telling insensitive jokes on the internet. If I'm the chief heretic of the politically correct age, Gawker was once its High Inquisitor. ~~Much more passive-aggressive and whiny, and much less well-dressed as an actual medieval inquisitor, yes, but an inquisitor nonetheless.~~

**Comment [A535]:** Heretic Number One?

The publication also had a shameful reputation for gratuitously violating the privacy of private citizens, for no particular reason. Fatally, this included the outing of PayPal co-founder Peter Thiel as gay in 2007 – a decision that would come back to haunt Gawker, as Thiel would embark on a 10-year vendetta to bring down the company, including the funding of a financially crippling lawsuit from wrestler Hulk Hogan. This lawsuit would result in the company filing for bankruptcy, and to its founder and editor-in-chief Nick Denton resigning. A shadow of its former self, the company was later sold to Univision.

Thiel and Hogan were formidable enemies. But according to Gawker's former editor-in-chief, Max Read, it was the humble gamer that proved to be the publication's toughest foe.

“Of all the enemies Gawker had made over the years — in New York media, in Silicon Valley, in Hollywood — none were more effective than the Gamergaters,” wrote Read in a 2016 op-ed following the Univision sale. “Gamergate proved the power of well-organized reactionaries to threaten Gawker’s well-being. And when Gawker really went too far — far enough that even our regular defenders in the media wouldn’t step up to speak for us — Gamergate was there, in the background, turning every crisis up a notch or two and making continued existence impossible.”

**Comment [A536]:** Cite

By the end of their boycott campaign against Gawker's advertisers, the publication admitted that GamerGate had cost the company "seven figures" in lost revenue<sup>166</sup>:

**Comment [A537]:** Needs better citation

Gawker and the games press, and later the mainstream media, threw their full weight against gamers, who were repeatedly and slanderously portrayed as sexists and misogynists who trafficked in death and rape threats against innocent women in video games. Gamers endured.

**Comment [A538]:** Be more clear here: the GamerGaters staged a boycott against the companies advertising on Gawker and those advertisers pulled their ads, thus resulting in the seven-figure loss.

**Comment [A539]:** Are the charges invalid? Explain

Mysterious, anonymous forces on the internet waged ceaseless war against gamers, revealing their personal information on the web and sending anonymous bomb threats to their meetups. Gamers endured.

And gradually, painstakingly, gamers started to do what no other group who tangled with the cultural left had ever done before -- they started to win. What began as a minor spat over one games journalist's unwise affair would turn into an example for the whole world: a guide on how to beat back the shaming and the smears and the new inquisitions of the cultural left. And, in true millennial style, the people leading the way were a bunch of web-savvy nerds in their basements.

**Comment [A540]:** Is this portrayal accurate?

### **The New Moral Panic**

**Comment [A541]:** This section needs to include the material from pages 34-37 in the Progressive Left chapter on the #NotYourShield women

For most of the 20th century, entertainment was subject to a creeping takeover by the cultural left. Literature, theater, high art, music, and of course Hollywood all gradually came to be dominated by a politically correct progressive elite who forced political dissenters into the shadows. Just look at the outpouring of anger and grief from pop-culture icons like Miley Cyrus and Lady Gaga, and celebrity actors in the wake of Donald Trump's victory. Trump supporters

<sup>166</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/12/11/gamergate-anti-bullying-campaign-cost-gawker-over-a-million-dollars/>

in Hollywood -- many of whom I know personally -- kept quiet, even though their candidate had won.

Video games, a far younger medium that only seriously began to take off in the 1980s, managed to escape the first wave of the left's cultural takeover. Because of their battles over violence in games with the conservative right in the 1990s and early 2000s, they developed a resistance to politicization of any kind. "I just wanted to play video games" was one of the slogans of GamerGate, who took pride in their hobby's resistance in the face of an increasingly politicised world. Gamers just wanted to be left alone.

There's a reason for this. Whenever the medium has attracted attention from either side of the political spectrum, it has been negative. Political commentators are universally critical of the past-time: those on the left accusing video games of being sexist and bigoted, and those on the right declaring them unwholesome and anti-family.

Nor are games shown much love by researchers, who find no evidence that games make anyone violent or sexist,<sup>167</sup> but who nonetheless hedge their bets to appease the activists, saying the evidence is "inconclusive."<sup>168</sup> And then of course there are mothers from every walk of life resentful of losing their children to the video screen.

A lack of evidence never gets in the way of a good storyline. You may remember Elliot Rodgers, the "killer virgin" who went on a shooting rampage in May 2014.<sup>169</sup> Naturally, the fact that he played video games was invoked. No evidence that the games had anything to do with his killing was ever presented, but no evidence was needed. The storyline that video games must be involved in bad behavior was simply too compelling to pass up for the media.

**Comment [A542]:** Rephrase to acknowledge that some researchers DO find that games make violence acceptable. You can't cite ONLY the one study that proves your point. You have to offer it as a counter to the studies that DISPROVE your point.

**Comment [A543]:** Cite one of these studies in the main print.

**Comment [A544]:** If they 'hedge' their bet, how do you know they agree with you?

**Comment [A545]:** Or did they just state the fact that he played them?

<sup>167</sup> Ferguson, C.J. and J. Kilburn. "Much ado about nothing: the misestimation and overinterpretation of violent video game effects in eastern and western nations: comment on Anderson et al. (2010)," [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov, March 2010, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20192554](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20192554) (accessed March 25, 2015).

<sup>168</sup> American Enterprise Institute, "Are video games sexist?" [youtube.com, September 16, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9MxqSwzFySw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9MxqSwzFySw) (accessed March 25, 2015).

<sup>169</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/05/27/virgin-killer-was-not-a-misogynist-but-a-madman/>

The only place you might have imagined would stick up for video games is the games press itself: those outlets and writers dedicated to reviewing games and exploring every detail of the entertainment genre that, after all, evokes intense passion in its ardent fans. And for a while the games press played exactly this role: applauding their virtues, and defending them from charges that they make players violent. In the 2000s, Jack Thompson, a conservative lawyer, who filed a lawsuit against Take Two Interactive, then publishers of the *Grand Theft Auto* series, on the grounds that it inspired murder. He was mercilessly ridiculed in the games press, which then appeared to be performing its function as the defenders of creative freedom against absurd political crusades.

**Comment [A546]:** Something like "That's the right attitude"?

**Comment [A547]:** This starts to sound like you're saying attacks from the right are okay but not from the left

But something went wrong about a decade ago, when feminist critics began taking steps into the sphere of games criticism. The new allegation was now that, even if games can't make you violent, they can make you sexist. These were not psychologists or researchers who had data to back their claims. They were "gender activists and hipsters with degrees in cultural studies," according to feminist scholar Christina Hoff Sommers. They didn't know much about video games, they didn't have degrees in psychology... but they knew heteropatriarchal capitalist oppression when they saw it. And they saw it in video games.

**Comment [A548]:** Give a few examples of games they criticized or articles they wrote

This was no accident. What I call the left-wing war on fun has a long academic pedigree, stretching back to the rise of "critical studies" in the late 60s and 70s. Critical studies viewed art, literature, and entertainment through only one lens -- how it critiqued, or failed to critique, dominant "power structures (capitalism, Christianity, patriarchy and all the rest). No longer were these forms to be criticized on their ability to inspire, awe, shock, fascinate, illustrate, or depict: all that mattered was how well (or how poorly) they critiqued the bogeymen of gender studies departments.

**Comment [A549]:** Explain 'forms'

**Comment [A550]:** "revealed"?

**Comment [A551]:** Good

The hunt for culture-war implications in every expression of culture led one writer at the Chronicle of Higher Education to compare the culture critics of academia to “detectives” on the hunt for hidden meanings<sup>170</sup>. Like overzealous Freudian psychologists who manage to link virtually every human experience back to childhood sexual trauma, culture critics find a way to interpret every artistic expression through their own particular lens.

Lisa Ruddick, an English professor at the University of Chicago (an institution in the running for the smartest and most forward-looking university of modern times) is one of a growing number of dissidents challenging this orthodoxy. In her influential essay, “When Nothing Is Cool,” she describes how one scholar bizarrely used critical studies to turn Buffalo Bill, the sadistic antagonist of *Silence of The Lambs*, into a gender-defying feminist hero.

By removing and wearing women’s skin, Bill refutes the idea that maleness and femaleness are carried within us. “Gender,” Halberstam explains, is “always posthuman, always a sewing job which stitches identity into a body bag.” The corpse, once flayed, “is no woman”; “it has been degendered, it is postgender, skinned and fleshed.” Halberstam blends her perspective uncritically with the hero-villain’s posthuman sensibility, which she sees as registering “a historical shift” to an era marked by the destruction of gender binaries and “of the boundary between inside and outside.”<sup>171</sup>

The lunacy here isn’t just that a serial killer who targets only women could in any way be a feminist hero, it’s that the scholar who wrote it actually thought his interpretation was believable. To most people, *The Silence Of The Lambs* is simply a masterly example of a

<sup>170</sup> <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Whats-Wrong-With-Literary/238480>

<sup>171</sup> <https://thepointmag.com/2015/criticism/when-nothing-is-cool>

psychological thriller, full of compelling characters, emotionally impactful moments, and no deeper meaning beyond the protagonist's terrifying and engrossing journey through a world of cannibals and serial killers.

To a left-wing culture critic like this author, however, it's unacceptable that a movie could simply be intended to entertain, shock, or amuse. It *must* say something about sexism, racism, homophobia, or transphobia, even if its creator didn't intend it to be so. And if a piece of art or entertainment *really* seems designed with no hidden political message? Well then, that means its creator and those who enjoy it must be just fine with the status quo. To a culture critic, everything is political, even when it's deliberately trying not to be.

**Comment [A552]:** Actually, it can't have NO message

**Comment [A553]:** Which makes them blind, or the enemy, for not including diversity

**Comment [A554]:** See <http://www.vox.com/culture/2017/11/4/14045076/nostalgia-2016-trump>

Little wonder that they hated video games then, many of which are clearly designed for no purpose other than fun. Imagine the fury of Anita Sarkeesian and her dour male assistant Jonathan McIntosh, as they scour games like *Team Fortress 2* and *Pong* for hidden political messages. Imagine as it dawns on them that the millions of people who log into *World of Warcraft* every day are doing so primarily to have fun with their friends, and not to consider how well Illidan Stormrage symbolizes the patriarchy. To a leftist, where everything is political and nothing is fun, gamers were a nightmare.

**Comment [A555]:** You haven't yet mentioned anything specific about Anita or what she wrote; tell us more of her opinions earlier, like you did with the excerpt from the Ruddick essay above.

Another problem for the feminists and left-wingers trying to attack gaming culture was that it was naturally resistant to political correctness. Online video games were the original social networks: gamers were socializing and chatting on games like *World of Warcraft* and *Runescape* years before Facebook and Twitter came into their own. And, crucially, communication in these games tended to be anonymous. Like 4chan and Reddit, the furthest most people would come to identifying another player was via their pseudonym -- and there's not much you can do to track

someone down when the only lead you have is a username, called "FagDestroyer\_6969."

**Comment [A556]:** This joke is not worth making

~~OK, even loosely moderated online games would probably ban that username.~~

Anonymity, mixed with the competitive nature of many online games, led to a culture of “trash talk” amongst gamers.

Keemstar, a popular YouTuber, explained how alien and shocking gamer culture must seem to polite society. “People have given me death threats, I’ve received many death threats. I’ve been told that I’m going to be raped. People have said they were going to do sexual things to me while I was playing these games, because it’s part of gaming culture. Now, I’m not saying it’s right. I’m not saying it’s right, but any real gamer has experienced this, and they know it to be somewhat normal. From the outside looking in, this must sound crazy. But if you’re a gamer, you know this is normal stuff. This is what people say online to each other while they are gaming. [...] And these media outlets that don’t know gaming, that don’t understand gaming, are eating it up.”<sup>172</sup>

If you’re not familiar with gaming culture, the whole idea that this kind of talk is “normal” seems very **strange**. Even stranger are the examples of insults, jokes and banter that the media has held up as “gamer behaviour” from social media and message boards on the web. But this is merely the kind of joshing that goes on between best friends, especially in young and especially in male communities. **Nobody feels threatened because they know the rules of the game**; it’s a friendly kind of banter that is not to be taken seriously, expressed within a close-knit community.

**Comment [A557]:** This is good because it dismantles some of the criticism against the gamer community. More of this earlier during the GamerGate recap.

**Comment [A558]:** Everyone knows

For example: “Hey filthy fucking dickwaffle,” might be used as a friendly greeting. Some of the most common topics for casual jokes include rape, pedophilia, necrophilia, and Nazism. If someone thinks you’re behaving stupidly or disagrees with you, “go kill yourself” will be a

<sup>172</sup> "Anita Sarkeesian: #GamerGate A call to Boycott Sponsors of News Media," Youtube video posted by FaZe Keemstar, January 20, 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KcMBr8yHeEw> (accessed January 25, 2015)

common, almost automatic, offhand remark. But the biggest mistake you can make—and the mistake that the mainstream media has been far too eager to make—is to take any of this language at face value.

Mainstream society finds it impossible to reconcile this language with the reality that most gamers are actually left-wing, and completely comfortable with diverse, tolerant societies.

To leftists, rejecting their language codes is the same as being racist, sexist, or homophobic.

Gamers know it isn't. And that made them the perfect enemies for an increasingly progressive movement hellbent on shaming ordinary people for even the tiniest violations of their self-written rules.

**Comment [A559]:** Do people write it to others who not invite it?

**Comment [A560]:** Address the complaint that this makes people feel the gaming community is unwelcoming?

**Comment [A561]:** No wonder so many women feel it's an inhospitable environment

**Comment [A562]:** OK, to avoid repeat?

**Comment [A563]:** You can't use "tiny" when talking about telling someone to die. The rules Gamers play by are also self-written

### Gamers vs. Shamers

In the years preceding GamerGate, left-wing social justice warriors had turned social media into their personal playground. With the aid of web-savvy outlets like BuzzFeed, Gawker and *The Guardian*, they engaged in relentless public shaming campaigns to terrorize individuals, businesses and organizations that failed to abide by their increasingly restrictive set of politically correct norms. Justine Sacco, a communications executive whose life was upended after she tweeted a joke about white people not being able to catch AIDS (she was, believe it or not, trying to make a point about white privilege) is the most well-known example, but there were dozens more.

**Comment [A564]:** Too convoluted. Be clearer.

Video games did not escape the rise of public shaming. In May 2014, a small-time video games developer, Russ Roegner, discovered his career was in jeopardy. No fewer than three editors from major gaming publications had told him that if he didn't shut up, his future in the industry was over.



“Be careful with me,” warned Gamasutra’s Leigh Alexander. “I am a megaphone... I wouldn’t mind making an example out of you.”

“Watching someone burn down the beginnings of their career on social media,” remarked Ben Kuchera.

“Really. Just. Stop.” said the editor-in-chief of GameRanx. “You’re not helping your case.”

What had Roegner said to attract such warnings?

His offense was disagreeing with another developer, Rami Ismail, about sexism in the gaming industry. “There’s no issue with gender equality in the game industry. I wish people would stop saying there is,” said Roegner. “Everyone has the same opportunities ... there’s nothing in their way of realizing their dreams.”

Expressing such anodyne views was apparently career-endangering in the video game industry of 2014. One games journalist condemned Roegner with a single word:

“#hasjustinelandedyet?” This was a reference to Justine Sacco.

A year and a half later, there are signs of a turnaround. One of the editors who joined the pile-on against Roegner apologised, acknowledging that he “contributed to an atmosphere of intolerance and aggression.”<sup>173</sup> An industry figure who threatened Roegner admitted that her comments represented a different era, one where public Twitter comments were a “big deal.”<sup>174</sup>

What had changed in these eighteen months? GamerGate, of course.

Public shaming relies on isolating its victims, who are made to believe that they are alone against an overwhelming tide of majority opinion. In reality, the shamers are usually part of a vocal minority, allowed to dominate the conversation by terrifying others into silence. But

**Comment [A565]:** You cannot talk about the public shaming of the Gamers without acknowledging the public shaming **DONE** by the Gamers. The same goes for the public shaming of Leslie Jones. Unless you acknowledge these two harassments, your defense falls flat.

**Comment [A566]:** Make the larger point about the silent Donald Trump voters here.

<sup>173</sup> <https://archive.is/7uQYm>

<sup>174</sup> <https://archive.is/r3lRQ>

gamers are hard to frighten. During GamerGate, they came out in droves to show the world how small and hysterical the public shamers really were.

A brief comparison between their online communities is all it takes to reveal the truth. KotakuInAction, the leading Reddit community for GamerGate supporters, has more than 70,000 subscribers, whereasGamerGhazi, the hub for feminists and social justice warriors in gaming, has a mere 11,000. Feminist hashtags like #YesAllWomen and #BringBackOurGirls were lucky if they maintained activity on Twitter for more than a month. The #GamerGate hashtag retained high levels of activity over a year after its creation.

Through numbers and tenacity, gamers broke the fear of social justice warriors. The months following the controversy saw a full-scale backlash against social justice warriors. Before GamerGate, victims of public shaming like Justine Sacco had virtually no allies in the press. Many disagreed, but did not want to get on the wrong side of the social justice mobs. After GamerGate, victims like Dr. Matt Taylor, the British astrophysicist who was driven to tears after he was attacked for wearing a shirt featuring allegedly “sexualized” drawings of sci-fi women could rely on an increasingly confident community of moderate liberals and conservatives who loudly and sternly condemned their persecutors. The silence had been broken.

### **Unlikely Heroes**

After GamerGate, never again will I mock gamers as awkward losers. Well I mean, they might be awkward (except that one with the chiseled jaw and wavy brown hair that I met in D.C), but they're definitely not losers. In a *Breitbart* column on the movement's one-year anniversary, I compared them to Hobbits – unlikely heroes who just wanted to be left alone, but

ended up saving the world<sup>175</sup>. In retrospect, it's perhaps not so surprising that a bunch of people who spend all their spare time conquering kingdoms, killing dragons, and racking up high scores knew how to win. After all, isn't that the end goal of all video games?

The left didn't know what they were getting themselves into when they went after video games. This was the hobby of the millennial generation, enjoyed by millions around the world – often together. What chance did the left have, with their usual allegations of bigotry, against such a naturally diverse hobby? The sight of the left attacking innocent gamers as a menacing force of intolerance was laughable.

Social justice warriors still haven't learned their lesson years later, by the way. When the character Tracer from the popular multiplayer game *Overwatch* was unveiled as a lesbian, SJWs en masse gloated over what they anticipated would be a gamer outcry against a gay character. In fact the only outrage was from SJWs who were upset that the gamemakers had picked the girl with the hot ass to be the dyke. Gamer reaction ranged from not caring since it didn't affect the game to reposting lesbian porn they had made of Tracer months previously.

But perhaps the fears of the left weren't so hysterical. After all, gamers were the first group of people to beat the left in the millennial culture wars. Their tactics helped inspire the cultural libertarians, the sad puppies, and was the first coming-together of the movement that put Trump in the White House. When *The Washington Post* called Donald Trump the “GamerGate of American Politics,” they weren't entirely wrong<sup>176</sup>.

---

<sup>175</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/09/01/sneaky-little-hobbitses-how-gamers-transformed-the-culture-wars/>

<sup>176</sup> <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/act-four/wp/2015/12/07/donald-trump-is-the-gamergate-of-republican-politics/>

While most of the hard work was conducted by tireless, relentless, and often anonymous gamers who received no thanks for it beyond smears from the mainstream media, I was proud to be a part of the movement as well.

**Comment [A567]:** Call it your origin story?

It was the first time we took on a major narrative of the left and comprehensively beat it, in what would be a blueprint for the battles to come. Gamers taught me that with humor, memes, and a little bit of autistic single-mindedness, no battle is unwinnable.

Thank you, gamers.

## 12

**WHY MY COLLEGE TOUR IS SO AWESOME**

It was humiliating. Vile. I was in the middle of a speech at Rutgers University in New Jersey, and three hysterical young ladies in the audience had stood up and smeared what looked like ~~period~~ blood on their faces, before hysterically shrieking “BLACK LIVES MATTER” over and over.

None of the students, incidentally, were black. ~~Perhaps they had been inspired by Shaun King?~~

I later discovered that the “blood” was fake, but that didn’t make it any less absurd, or any less troublesome for the janitors, who had to deal with the trail of red paint left by the protesters after their two minutes of fame were up. Peaceful attendees who had come to hear a speech instead found themselves splashed with fake blood, while at least one attendee was assaulted by a protester who deliberately smeared him with the stuff.

More surprising to me than the protests at Rutgers, which was par for the course on college campuses, was what happened the following morning.

I awoke to a stream of messages about the fact that administrators at Rutgers were offering a therapy session to students who had been shaken by my presence on campus. Yes, you heard that correctly - students at Rutgers University were so traumatized by my visit that the administration held a group therapy session.

Those who attended the event reported that students described “feeling scared, hurt, and discriminated against,” as a result of my innocent lecture about the importance of free speech on campuses.

It’s really pretty flabbergasting when you think about it -- if a few comments from me about the free and open exchange of ideas are enough to put college students in a therapy session, what’s going to happen to them when they encounter someone who’s *actually* intolerant and bigoted? Have a heart attack, I presume. Thank God it’s the Kurds fighting ISIS, and not American millennials.

When my tour started, I’d spent almost a year in the spotlight as a rising star of the online right, fighting battles against the whiny, spoiled social justice warriors of the internet. Having grappled some of their more absurd web-based campaigns, like the fight against “online harassment” (read: anything they disagree with), I was now prepared to break out of tech journalism and take the fight to them in meatspace. It sure was fun triggering them on the internet, but as I’d discovered during my protest of the 2015 Los Angeles Slutwalk, it was a lot more fun to hear their banshee-like shrieks of distress when encountering a challenge to their worldview in real life.

**Comment [A568]:** Acknowledge that online harassment can be real not just disagreement

~~More importantly, I’d fat-shamed myself into hiring a personal trainer by that point, and I was eager to let the world see some of the results. (I mean, I’d *like* people to think my tour was mainly about promoting the noble, bedrock political values of the west, and not about showing everyone how hot I’ve become — but who’s really going to buy that?)~~

I knew my opponents were prone to emotional hysterics. I called my jaunt across college campuses the “Dangerous Faggot” tour for that very reason -- to mock the students who seriously believed that a flouncing queer from across the pond really posed some kind of “threat”

to students. But nothing quite prepared me for the howling, frenzied madness that is the coddled American college student of 2016.

Rutgers was the first stop on my tour where I saw the madness first-hand (*therapy sessions*, for god's sake!) but it certainly wasn't the last.

**Comment [A569]:** Add something about the puppy and coloring book sessions some universities held after the election?

Soon after Rutgers, I arrived at Bucknell University, a small liberal arts college located in the sleepy rural town of Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. The chaos at my previous stop brought me the attention of the administrators there, who booted me from the on-campus guest residence over concerns that I presented a safety threat to the community. As if I might corrupt the basketball team or something. I was relocated to an unassuming hotel that was located right next to a high-security penitentiary. I wasn't upset, but that doesn't mean I wasn't alarmed by the paranoia of Bucknell's administration.

By Thursday evening, Bucknell administrators had decided that students wouldn't be permitted to speak to me directly, but rather that they'd have to write their questions down on an index card, with my host Tom Ciccotta reading them aloud to me. Furthermore, the Bucknell University Conservatives Club wouldn't be permitted to film the event. Instead, the administration would film the lecture and then release the footage to Tom in the event that the proceedings didn't reflect poorly upon the university.

Shortly after I left Bucknell, *Tom was removed from his position as class president for the grave sin of being a conservative on campus.* To me, this was just another in a long list of incidents in which the social justice leftists who run the modern American university were revealed to be a nasty and toxic influence on the lives of young students all around the country.

**Comment [A570]:** Do you have proof that was the reason?

But what really struck me was the fear of Bucknell's administrators: they really believed that I was such a threat; such a corrupting influence on young minds that I couldn't be allowed to

speak to students directly. Clearly, Bucknell believed my mocking, tongue-in-cheek moniker. They thought I actually *was* dangerous!

Rutgers and Bucknell weren't oddities, either. As the first leg of my tour progressed, it quickly became apparent that lunacy was the norm, not the exception, on American college campuses. At the University of Pittsburgh, the Student Government Board held a meeting to discuss my appearance on campus the previous evening. The student government president told college reporters that he "teared up" when he heard the stories of traumatized students. Another board member argued that my words constituted "real violence" and that left-wingers at the event felt they were in "literal physical danger."

"Free speech should not trump safety," she said.

Protesters were also in the crowd at Pittsburgh, although they were less rowdy than the ones at Rutgers. ~~(It's hard to be louder than people from New Jersey.)~~ Even the placards were quiet! They used tiny signs printed on dorm ink jet printers making them ~~were~~ too small for me to see. I had to have them read aloud because I couldn't ~~fucking~~ see them. Really, Pittsburgh protesters -- you were a disappointment.

The tour as whole though, was anything but a disappointment. I mean, it involves me - OF COURSE it was a success! Videos of my talks, filmed on a shoestring, were attracting millions of views on YouTube. ~~I'm attractive even in poor quality phone camera footage, who knew?~~ Stories on *Breitbart News* about the chaos and hysterics at my events were getting tens of thousands of comments and shares. I was exposing the angry, and incredibly poorly dressed underbelly of American campus politics, and the world was rapt with attention.

By the time I reached Pittsburgh, it was only February 2016. I was not a month into my tour, and had performed at fewer than six colleges -- yet it was already clear that I'd tapped into



something potentially massive. And so, after a brief interlude at *Breitbart's* Los Angeles offices, I was told to go out, double down, and be more outrageous than ever. ~~And that I did.~~

By then, word had spread to other colleges that there was a dangerous faggot on the loose. This upped the quality of protesters significantly. I've already told you earlier in this book, what happened at DePaul, where I was almost punched in the face by a black man (~~non-consensually, which is a first!~~). I've also explained the creature known as Trigglypuff, who graced the auditorium at Amherst just a short month earlier. These were just two of the highlights on a tour that was met with protest after protest. The fury and rage was building all around me, and I happily ~~did~~ **MILG bathed in the tears of my his enemies.** (~~Sorry, I occasionally lapse into third person these days~~).

**Comment [A571]:** You use 'bathe in the tears' on page 72

Now, I find it difficult to understand how anyone could hate me. But such was the anger that I was confronted with at every event, that I came up with some theories. And those theories all boil down to one very simple fact: I'm just incredible.

I'm not just incredible for the fact of my existence: a gay right-winger. That's becoming increasingly common these days. Indeed, Peter Thiel, who I like to call "one of the sane gays" is now one of Donald Trump's foremost advisers.

No, I'm incredible because I almost single-handedly flummoxed the campus censors. In the years before my arrival, they had been on a roll, stopping even mild-mannered conservative columnists like George Will from speaking on their campuses.<sup>177</sup> Yet here I was, ~~a magnificent blond bastard who told rape jokes and compared *Ghostbusters* actresses to men,~~ freely romping into their cherished safe spaces. And there was nothing they could do to stop me. I had endless resources, I had the backing of *Breitbart*, the most fearless news organization in America, and I

<sup>177</sup> <http://claremontindependent.com/george-will-uninvited-from-scripps-college/>

was riding a wave I helped create -- a new movement of young, politically dissident troublemakers.

Just as I was attracting fanatical hatred, I was also attracting a devoted fanbase. The shouts and shrieks of my protesters were loud, yes, but not as loud as the chants of “MILO! MILO!” and “USA! USA!” from my eager audiences. At UC Santa Barbara, my fans even started the tradition of carrying me into the lecture hall on a golden throne. “Finally,” I thought. “I’m getting the welcome I deserve.”

As my college tour progressed, it was clear that conservatives, libertarians, and other political dissidents on campus were becoming bolder and more mischievous with every passing day. The old order of political correctness was crumbling around us -- we could all sense it. This was, after all, the glorious summer of Donald Trump’s presidential campaign, when all it took to generate some campus hysteria was a pro-Daddy slogan scrawled in chalk on a campus sidewalk. At the University of Michigan, college crybabies went so far as to call the police due to pro-Trump slogans on campus<sup>178</sup>. Other students went further with their triggering pranks, even constructing mock “Trump walls” on campus<sup>179</sup>. If George Will were to arrive on a campus that summer, leftists would have been too busy protesting a dozen other outrages to notice. It was clear that the ~~era of giving a fuck~~ was coming to an end.

Comment [A572]: What is this?

Comment [A573]: Unclear

### **You Can’t Stop The Dangerous Faggot**

Typical behavior of the power-mad, leftists on campus made desperate attempts to reassert control. Their primary hope was university administrations, which were often full

<sup>178</sup> <https://www.truthrevolt.org/news/u-michigan-students-call-police-over-trump-2016-stop-islam-chalk-markings-0>

<sup>179</sup> <http://www.spokesman.com/stories/2016/sep/09/wsu-students-plan-to-raise-a-controversial-trump-w/>

to bursting with leftists themselves, or so terrified of controversy that they'd pull any trick, no matter how dirty, to stop me appearing on campus.

At UC Irvine, administrators initially allowed our event to proceed. After I left, however, the College Republicans were slapped with a one-year ban by the university for having the temerity to invite me back. Their justification for the ban was that the College Republicans had failed to provide a certificate of insurance for the security hired for my initial event on campus. Although, given that the college administrators issued their ban just one hour after a meeting with College Republican president Ariana Rowlands, the excuse was suspect from the start.

Comment [A574]: Unclear

After heavy coverage in *Breitbart* and the conservative media, as well as a terrific show of force by Ariana Rowlands, who refused to compromise with the administration by submitting to an appeals process, UC Irvine eventually engaged in a grovelling turnabout, lifting the suspension on the College Republicans and allowing me to return.

Comment [A575]: Good

As my tour has gathered steam, the tactics used by frightened administrators to stop me have gotten slimier and slimier. At the University of Alabama, administrators lulled my student hosts into a false sense of security before hitting them with a \$7,000 security fee at the last minute. Again, after negative coverage in the conservative media and some stern lawyering, the university said that the College Republicans would not face any expense for security, and that they had really been "trying all along" to help them host a successful event.

Other universities tried similarly slippery methods. The University of Miami cancelled over "security concerns," which mysteriously arose mere days before my event was scheduled to take place. The University of Maryland unwisely decided to copy the University of Alabama, slapping student organizers with a \$6,500 security fee a few days before my event. Their defiance won't last. I'm coming for them, and they know it. We will hold an event at the

University of Maryland, come hell or high water, because they are a public institution and they are not allowed to do that to their students.

**Comment [A576]:** Really? By whom?

**Comment [A577]:** What?

**Comment [A578]:** Compliment the student hosts brave enough to invite and have you there?

Despite the road bumps, I could tell that we were already starting to make a difference. The groundswell of attention that the Rutgers incident brought to my tour forced organizers to move my lectures to bigger venues. The 400 seat venue at Bucknell University filled to capacity in just 15 minutes and another 50 students were turned away at the door. Were these students simply seduced by the controversy and mystery surrounding me and my lectures, or was I actually seeing the beginning of a revolution led by disenfranchised young folks who had been fed up with political correctness, safe spaces, trigger warnings, and social justice?

I wasn't sure then, but I am now. This is a movement, and it's going to take back American college campuses. And we're going to have fun doing it.

### **The Fagbus Rolls In**

Imagine, if you would, a tour bus. You know, like the ones rock stars and rappers have. Hold the image in your mind -- a beautiful, sleek steel beast, coated in black. Only, the picture on the side isn't of a singer or a supermodel -- it's a giant picture of my face, staring directly at you, beside giant bold text that reads "DANGEROUS FAGGOT TOUR."

Well, the good thing is, you don't have to imagine it, because it's real. You can see a picture of it in the insert. Go on. Take a look. Treat yourself.

By the time the second leg of my tour rolled around in September 2016, I was a superstar. So naturally, I got my own tour bus. I decided to call it "Anita," on the grounds that the bus

would certainly be more famous than Anita Sakka ...Sanka ... Say, who *is* that other Anita? Does anyone remember her last name?

I once thought I was hot enough that nothing would make it easier for me to pick up dates. It turns out I was wrong, having a tour bus with my face and name on it helps tremendously. Driven by our grumpy but loveable bus driver Rich, Anita the Fagbus was soon to be spotted on dozens upon dozens of college campuses. After my early successes in triggering America's college crybabies, the invitations had come pouring in. We would start in Texas, wind our way through Louisiana's coastline down into Florida, and then drive up through Georgia, Alabama, and the Carolinas to the east coast, leaving a trail of furious college lefties and jubilant college conservatives in our wake.

This time, we were doing it properly. I had a full camera crew with me, a creative director, two speechwriters, a personal trainer, and some guy I kept around to carry my bags and manage my ever-accumulating wardrobe. We had a disciplined and organized tour manager who booked us the finest Courtyard by Marriotts in all the land. We had some of the finest memesters in history, like Mike Ma and "@Sadieisonfire," who prefers to be known only by his Twitter handle. We had the creative, resourceful, and devilishly handsome Allum Bokhari. We were prepared for anything.

At first, protests were surprisingly disappointing. Then again, we were travelling across the south, which is pure MILO country. Many was the time in Texas we were stopped by a burly, aviator-clad biker or a cowboy-hat wearing pickup truck driver for autographs. Exactly the sort of people that Democrats call bigots and homophobes were stopping by the Dangerous Faggot's bus to get his autograph.

**Comment [A579]:** Add a sentence to emphasize that point that your audiences are open-minded.

This leg of the tour contained magical moments beyond count. At the first new stop, in Houston, Texas, a military veteran gifted me his dog-tags. A few stops later, in Baton Rouge, I appeared on stage in full drag as “Ivana Wall” to deliver a speech on the alt-right. (Is there anything more subversive than me talking about the alt-right dressed in drag? What is the left to think? What, for that matter, is the *right* to think?). By the end of the tour I’d gone all-out on the theatrics, and submitted myself to a college “hazing” live on-stage. (OK, OK, I admit it -- the yellow liquid I’m drinking in the video recording wasn’t *actually* urine, but it was, if anything, worse for my low-carb diet.)

Sometimes, and even I must admit it, some of the audience members stole the show. At the University of South Florida, an Arab girl called Sarah Torrent, who fled a Muslim marriage in her home country, called on leftists and feminists to meet her outside “for an ass-kicking” if they still insisted on bringing her persecutors into the west.

Comment [A580]: Confirm

In Clemson, South Carolina, where the school banned references to the deceased gorilla Harambe and the internet meme Pepe the Frog over racism concerns (no, really, they did), we discovered a budding James O’Keefe. Conservative student Caleb Ecarma spent months infiltrating an anti-Milo group on campus ahead of my visit, mapping out their connections to faculty members and monitoring their attempts to block my visit. I was amazed by the passion and devotion that my tour was inspiring.

As Anita the Fagbus headed up the east coast, we began to encounter more protesters. At Western Virginia University, masked “anti-fascists” (they call themselves that, yet they seem awfully keen on political violence) appeared in ski-masks carrying placards. One of these said “MILO SUCKS.” Given that the statement was, frankly, true (~~I do suck, thank you very much, and I do it very well~~) I decided that I must possess the placard, and a helpful fan was able to

obtain it for me during the rather cramped grapple going on between protesters, attendees, and campus security in the hallway. I made good use of it soon after.

During a particularly bitter winter stop at Michigan State University, members of my crew and I thought it would be good fun to don ski masks and join the protesters ourselves. It was a daring operation, which we made all the more exciting by deliberately misspelling our placards. (~~"FUCK RACISM,"~~ said one.) Would anyone notice? Would our cover be blown? Thankfully, our tactic worked -- the placards were so badly spelled that they must have assumed we were on their level of intelligence -- even though, frankly, our placards were far more well designed than theirs.

As I write, there are more adventures planned in the months ahead. The fagbus's next port of call in the west coast, the very center of progressive lunacy. We'll be in Seattle, in Berkeley, in UCLA. Will we survive? Will one of the lefties finally work up the courage to Molotov Cocktail the bus? I guess we'll find out.

### **Happy Warriors**

Despite the hellraising, my campus tour is about more than just causing a ruckus. There's method to our madness. For too long, the American campus has been the preserve of leftists, who funnel funding into crackpot Gender Studies courses and radicalize students against political tolerance, openness to opposing ideas, and ultimately against reason itself. For too long, they've gone unchallenged.

So how do we fight back? How did we fight back against an American educational system where Karl Marx's *The Communist Manifesto* is the most assigned textbook<sup>180</sup>? How do we fight back against an American educational system that provides coloring books, warm cookies, and emotional support puppies to students who can't handle my lovely, unthreatening friend Christina Hoff Sommers stepping onto their campuses?

A big part of why I've been so successful is that I know how to have fun, and so do my fans. Conservatives typically don't have fun. When I think of an American conservative, I think of intelligent and stuffy politicians like Ted Cruz, who, while brilliant, puts me to sleep ~~faster than an online video of a Shaun King college lecture.~~

My brand of conservatism is marked by three things absent from the tired "suit & tie conservatism" of which the American college campus is so familiar. I've injected a humor, mischief, and sex appeal into right-wing politics, and as a result along my tour we've developed a new and growing coalition of young conservatives.

My appearances at schools across the country began to garner more attention at the tour went on. My managers were inundated with calls and emails from students who were looking to plan Milo events of their own. My inbox was constantly overflowing with messages from students who resonated with the message that I was bringing around the country.

My Dangerous Faggot Tour has made great strides in the battle that is being waged on the American college campus. Despite the setbacks and punishments laid out by regressive administrators who want nothing more than to halt our progress, we have earned several significant victories along the way. After my visit to Rutgers, university president Robert Bachi

---

<sup>180</sup> <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/communist-manifesto-among-top-three-books-assigned-in-college-2016-01-27>



released a statement<sup>181</sup> in which he reaffirmed the institution's commitment to free speech and academic freedom:

“Both academic freedom and our First Amendment rights are at the core of what we do. Our University policy on speech is clear. All members of our community enjoy the rights of free expression guaranteed by the First Amendment. Faculty members, as private citizens, enjoy the same freedoms of speech and expression as any private citizen and shall be free from institutional discipline in the exercise of these rights. In addition, they also enjoy academic freedom of expression when functioning in their roles as faculty members...While I will not defend the content of every opinion expressed by every member of our academic community, or of speakers who we invite to our campus, I will defend their right to speak freely. That freedom is fundamental to our University, our society, and our nation.”

At Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, students protested and rallied outside of the office of the president after students took to the campus sidewalks with chalk to express pro-Trump sentiments. The special snowflakes at Emory University told reporters that they felt threatened by the pro-Trump students, and that the campus was no longer a safe space for them.

I knew immediately that I had to make a trip to Atlanta. When I finally made it to Emory, there was a significant amount of anxiety from students concerned over my impending arrival. Although they spent time preparing signs and chants, their protest efforts were largely ignored. The event was so well-attended that students filled the hall around the venue, listening to the event and hoping to get a chance to peek in. At the end of my typical lecture, I led the Emory students out onto a center quad, and encouraged them all to express themselves on the sidewalk.

---

<sup>181</sup> <http://president.rutgers.edu/public-remarks/speeches-and-writings/rutgers-president-free-speech-and-academic-freedom>

Students surrounded me as I started things off. I took a piece of chalk and wrote “Dangerous Faggot” in the middle of the quad. After I finished, I took the bucket of chalk and passed it around to the students in attendance. Students wrote everything from “Fuck Milo” to “Build the Wall.” It was a glorious example of what the American university should be!

This wasn’t our only victory at Emory. Shortly after my visit, Emory University president James W. Wagner took a piece of chalk himself to the sidewalk right next to where I had laid down my own message, and wrote in big letters “EMORY STANDS FOR FREE EXPRESSION.”

It turns out that Wagner attended Emory for his undergraduate studies. In a statement that he released, he spoke about the importance of viewpoint diversity on college campuses and the role that it played in his own education:

“It was always [a] great, friendly, challenging discussion that really taught you to critically think,” Wagner said, noting the discussions helped to both hone his political opinions and prepare him for his career as an attorney. “I took that with me to law school where I was challenged more on my viewpoints. It’s really important to understand the opposing side and their arguments, where they’re coming from, and to form your own opinions. It’s formative. And it’s absolutely required, in my opinion, at the university level.”

So there you have it. With a few pieces of chalk, what started off as a light-hearted prank to trigger leftists on campus gradually morphed into a symbol of political free speech that was endorsed by none other than the president of the university. We started off having fun, and we ended up winning a major ideological victory. That’s the beauty of being a happy warrior -- you achieve victories without even realizing you’ve been fighting.

### All Roads Lead to Chicago

At a high school in Des Moines, Iowa in September 2015, an ageing, soon-to-be-unemployed man addressed a room full of students to challenge the idea that they ought to be protected from competing points of view.

“I don’t agree that you, when you become students at colleges, have to be coddled and protected from different points of view,” he said. “Anybody who comes to speak to you and you disagree with, you should have an argument with ‘em. But you shouldn’t silence them by saying, “You can’t come because I’m too sensitive to hear what you have to say.” That’s not the way we learn either.

The man in question was Barack Obama, then still president of the United States.

It says a lot that even Obama, well to the left and far more supportive of identity politics than many moderate Democrats, thinks there’s a problem on America’s college campuses. But he’s not alone. Many of the voices now joining conservatives in their critique of coddled students are moderate liberal ones: Jonathan Chait, Judith Shulevitz, and Jonathan Haidt to name a few.

Comment [A581]: Confirm

In May 2016, Nicholas Kristof, a *New York Times* columnist who once published an article titled “When Whites Just Don’t Get It,” and, more recently “Trump Embarrasses Himself And Our Country,” released a rare admission that progressive intolerance had gone too far on college campuses.

We progressives believe in diversity, and we want women, blacks, Latinos, gays and Muslims at the table — er, so long as they aren’t conservatives.

Universities are the bedrock of progressive values, but the one kind of diversity that universities disregard is ideological and religious. We're fine with people who don't look like us, as long as they think like us.

**Comment [A582]:** Is this a quote from Kristof? Offset. Or if it's you, make clear this is what you think progressive are saying

Although he moderated his opening by saying that it might be a “little harsh” Kristof went on to conclude that:

“Universities should be a hubbub of the full range of political perspectives from A to Z, not just from V to Z. So maybe we progressives could take a brief break from attacking the other side and more broadly incorporate values that we supposedly cherish — like diversity — in our own dominions.”

**Comment [A583]:** Needs citation

If Nicholas Kristof and Donald Trump (who called student protesters at the University of Missouri “babies” and criticized the college’s “weak, ineffective leadership” for caving in to their demands) agree that there’s a problem with out-of-control lefties on college campuses, then we truly have a broad consensus. The question is, what next?

Putting pressure on colleges to follow the University of Chicago’s lead would be a good start.

The college told its 2016 intake of students point-blank not to expect any trigger warnings or safe spaces at their educational establishment.

“Fostering a free exchange of ideas reinforces a related University priority -- building a campus that welcomes people of all backgrounds,” wrote the Dean of Students, Jay Ellison, in a letter to freshmen. “Diversity of opinion and background is a fundamental strength of our community. The members of our community must have the freedom to espouse and explore a wide range of ideas.”

If college administrators really want to stop me, then all they need to do is follow their example. When colleges start to take intellectual and political diversity as seriously as they take the more superficial forms of diversity, then there will no longer be a need for me.

Until then, look for the Dangerous Faggot at a campus near you. In America and beyond, I will continue to fight for my vision of campus life -- one of constant intellectual and political simulation, where dangerous ideas are welcomed rather than shunned. Where violating some great taboo will lead to spirited debate, not a trip to the office of an Orwellian "Bias Task Force."

During my college tour, I learned that not all millennial students are pampered, sheltered snowflakes. There are thousands upon thousands of students up and down the country ready to fight back against the intellectually stifling environment that surrounds them. Dissident professors who want to follow the example of the University of Chicago should suffer in silence no longer; now is the perfect time for them to start a resistance movement. There will be pushbacks and reprisals in the beginning, sure, but in the long run it'll pay off. The defenders of the status quo are too few and unpopular to cling on to power for very long. Dissident faculty members, I've given you an army -- use it!

**Comment [A584]:** More detail about the people you met and were impressed by.

There is no better time than the present to achieve a revolution on college campuses. Potential allies are starting to multiply. Everywhere we look, there are moderate liberals conceding defeat to conservatives and admitting that the insanity of political correctness has gone too far<sup>182</sup>. A new coalition is waiting to be built.

<sup>182</sup> <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/20/opinion/sunday/the-end-of-identity-liberalism.html>  
<https://theamericanscholar.org/low-definition-in-higher-education/#.WGgP3VWLTIV>  
<http://www.vox.com/2015/6/3/8706323/college-professor-afraid>  
[http://www.salon.com/2015/10/28/i\\_wanted\\_to\\_be\\_a\\_supporter\\_of\\_survivors\\_on\\_campus\\_and\\_a\\_good\\_teacher\\_i\\_didnt\\_realize\\_just\\_how\\_impossible\\_this\\_would\\_be/](http://www.salon.com/2015/10/28/i_wanted_to_be_a_supporter_of_survivors_on_campus_and_a_good_teacher_i_didnt_realize_just_how_impossible_this_would_be/)  
<http://heatst.com/culture-wars/elite-college-professor-calls-academia-a-mad-house-and-safe-spaces-an-existential-error/>  
<https://www.washingtonian.com/2016/09/15/jamie-raskin-american-university-political-correctness/>

Look at what I've already accomplished. Universities backing down over security fee-shenanigans, faculty committees penning letters in defense of free speech,<sup>183</sup> and a host of moderate liberals who are now prepared to defend free speech again just as long as it means I'll go away.

I've also become ever-more notorious -- the most disinvented campus speaker of 2016.<sup>184</sup>

But that's just a bonus! There's a revolution brewing on college campuses. My tour is one the ~~most~~ important component. Two million dollars later, we've effected absolutely colossal change in American higher education, achieving more than two generations of conservatives and libertarians before us. And we're just getting started.

Every time they try to ban me, I get more powerful -- because I don't back down sheepishly and run away. I find another way to do what I wanted, often even more attention-seeking. You could say I'm only theatrical because they force me to be. Would there be a market for MILO if conservative and libertarian opinions were treated just as fairly as everyone else's? You'll know I've won when no one comes to my shows any more. In the meantime, as everyone knows, there are lines out the door everywhere I show up. That tells you all you need to know about the state of free thought on college campuses.

Administrators should have learned the lesson by now. If you think I'm crass and boorish and a cancer on your school's intellectual life, how about you start hiring more conservative academics? Because if you leave it just to the students, you're going to end up with people like me.

---

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/12022041/How-political-correctness-rules-in-Americas-student-safe-spaces.html>

<sup>183</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/03/12/university-of-minnesota-faculty-embraces-free-speech-following-milo-visit/>

<sup>184</sup> <http://www.forbes.com/sites/maureen-sullivan/2016/12/30/provocateur-milo-yiannopoulos-was-the-speaker-most-likely-to-be-disinvited-to-colleges-in-2016/>

### 13EPILOGUE

#### HOW TO BE A DANGEROUS FAGGOT

##### (EVEN IF YOU'RE NOT GAY)

~~I don't want to be doing this. It's so low-rent, so boring, so easy.~~ Sometimes you can tell how bored I am in interviews, when I chew my fingernails or look absent-mindedly out of the window or stare into the middle distance. That's why I occasionally give vague answers or have to ask them to repeat the question. It's impossibly dull lowering myself to all this.

I'm sick of these odious blue-haired fucks on college campuses. I'd rather be at home watching Netflix, sucking off my boyfriend, or spending thousands of dollars in Louis Vuitton, or just being left alone. I do it because I have to, because no one else can or will right now. Until, perhaps, this book gets out there and inspires the next generation of culture warriors.

I have to go through the motions, day after day, absorbing the vitriol from the media and idiotic protectors, because every other conservative and libertarian figurehead has utterly failed you. I'm like Cincinnatus, the Roman general who dropped his plough to lead an army to victory and secure the safety of his homeland, before immediately returning to the farm and his slave girls. In my case it would be a harem of Nubian catamites, but otherwise the picture is the same. In my heart of hearts I want to declare victory, or at least to pass the baton on, so I can go back to the *chaise-longue* and indulge myself in silk and champagne.

But I know that will never happen in my lifetime, so I am resigned to the fight. I will wage war as long as there are dykes in gender studies departments telling lies about innocent young boys, as long as Black Lives Matter activists are attacking people for their skin color and as long as Britney has to withhold music videos because her managers are worried they aren't

**Comment [A585]:** This is a lazy way to begin a manifesto. The world-weary pose evokes nothing but a bored response. This chapter has to have an exciting opening.

~~feminist enough. I will fight so long as free expression and creativity are at risk from thick-as-pigshit New York bloggers and social justice activists.~~

~~I've always felt an acute sense of personal ordainment—as though my life was meant for something greater. It's why I always related to *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Hopefully it's the achievement of the perfect blowjob or an imitable pompadour, rather than triggering campus feminists. But for so long as America needs me, I am yours.~~

~~At least for now, I am rejoicing. Because together, we have struck the first blow in what I know will be a decades-long fight to reclaim creative freedom and freedom of speech from the political Left. I'm talking, of course, about Daddy.~~

\* \* \*

It was 1.40am on November 9, 2016, and I was in New York, giggling uncontrollably. I was giggling because the Associated Press had just called Pennsylvania for Donald Trump, pushing him over 270 electoral votes and giving him the presidency. I was giggling because I could imagine the looks of bewilderment, despair and outrage on the faces of mainstream reporters covering the results just a few hallways away from me. I was giggling because the west was not doomed to die an ignominious death at the hands of open border-obsessed globalists. I was giggling because we had won.

**Comment [A586]:** Don't start here—the chapter needs a better opening.

The earthquake heralded by the election of Donald J. Trump had been a long time coming. It was the culmination of nearly thirty years of hectoring from both the mainstream left and the mainstream right; about how we should shut up if we knew what's good for us, about how we need to make up for a history of racism, sexism, and every “phobia” under the sun,



about how entertaining this dangerous thought or making that dangerous joke would be the end of our careers.

Well, it turns out that the real danger lies in *not* daring to be dangerous. The Republicans didn't dare to be dangerous in 2012, and they lost. Donald Trump dared to be dangerous in 2016, and he won.

I dare to be dangerous every day, and, well, I can't *stop* winning.

My ascendancy has marked the overturning of an old order. GamerGate dealt a mortal blow to the leftist vigilante squads on social media and their friends in the press. Brexit put a stake through the heart of the bureaucratic, globalist European Union. And then Donald Trump came, to put an end to thirty years of politically correct consensus in the United States.

Leftists of course think 2016 was The Worst Year Ever, and not just because so many of their favorite celebrities died. Given the scale of their political defeats, they have some justification, but they are also pessimistic by nature. ~~Some of these are the people, after all, who believe that racism is worse than it's ever been, that rates of sexual assault on college campuses approximate the Congo, and that Brexit will herald World War III.~~

**Comment [A587]:** Not all leftists think this

Steven Pinker, a sensible liberal, reminds us that this is not the case. The world is getting better, and has been for some time. As he ceaselessly reminds a pessimistic public, "Extreme poverty, child mortality, illiteracy, and global inequality are at historic lows; vaccinations, basic education, including girls, and democracy are at all-time highs." Rates of murder, violence, sexual assault and other crimes in the west also continue, by and large, to fall.<sup>185</sup> Socially, the millennial generation is the most tolerant ever<sup>186</sup>, ~~and the incoming president is also likely to be the most gay-friendly Republican ever elected to the Presidency.~~ And now that leftists are out of

**Comment [A588]:** Except for his vice president and every proposed member of his cabinet.

<sup>185</sup> <http://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2016/12/22/14042506/steven-pinker-optimistic-future-2016>

<sup>186</sup> <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/02/24/millennials-confident-connected-open-to-change/>

power, America is on track to be less divided, safer, and more stable than ever before. By the time the next election rolls around, I predict Democrats will struggle to downplay the nation's success.

Leftists are curious as to why they lost in 2016. I can think of no better explanation than an anonymous comment that did the rounds on Twitter and Reddit in early 2015, just as the backlash against the regressive left was starting in earnest. It's a long read, but worth here are the best parts.

**Comment [A589]:** It's always a mistake for an author to say "I can think of no better explanation." It's your job to think of a better explanation. It's what we paid you an advance for. THINK HARDER and replace this long anghnymus Internet post with prose of your own.

***"We are fighting to end hate, to unite as one and love each other. We are fighting to be treated right without discrimination and for everyone to have equal opportunities."***

*~~.....Bullshit. You have no quantifiable metrics for injustice, so you have no victory conditions (for a very simplified example, when blacks hold X% of all engineering jobs and are only Y% of all prisoners, racism is ended). That would be fine by itself, but you believe in fighting injustice with injustice (gays have historically been denied gay marriage? let's get random CEOs fired for opinions they held six years ago). You don't seek converts, you seek to punish and bully.....straight white males who disagree with you must be purged and publicly humiliated. Even the jihadists will spare you if you convert; no apology or future correction will satisfy a SJW.~~*

*~~I could forgive that too if you weren't all hypocrites and liars. Your treatment of women and minority dissenters is appalling; if they don't want you acting on their behalf, that's their choice, not "internalized patriarchy" or whatever. You rob them of moral~~*

agency. When called out for these behaviors (as you always insist on calling out others), you lie. You strawman your opponents (criticized a woman? misogynist!), you group them with the worst (you're a gamer? you're as bad as the anonymous rape threateners!) and when confronted with your own flaws, you restate them less threateningly (motte and bailey argument). You phrase all arguments as kaffkatraps (disagreeing with your assertion that we are evil is taken as proof that we're evil). You publish manipulated and misleading statistics, then lambast anyone who questions them.

You insist on vigilante justice against random acts of the week for your two-minute hate. Why is it the NFL's business to punish domestic violence? And, if it is their business, why isn't Hope Solo receiving the same attention from your side?

Then you claim to be arguing for equality, but you've taken the idea of racism (hatred based on skin color is bad) and replaced it with a new concept where only one race can be guilty of racism. You excuse racial prejudice and hatred based on what I've already explained are arbitrary, unmeasured states of being. Your solution for the unequal treatment of whites and blacks is to hold whites to a higher standard. Your side lobbied the FBI to redefine rape so more women victims would be counted, but also so that "made to penetrate" does not count, leaving male victims in the cold. Because male privilege, apparently.

Historically ignorant SJWs think whites hold collective guilt for the awful things our ancestors have done. But they don't care about the unspeakable atrocities by other races. The only difference between whites and others was that whites had the social and technological prowess to do evil efficiently; Africans, Asians, Indians, and everyone else practiced genocide and slavery, they were just less adept at doing it right. Given the

*means, they would have done the same. But nope, only whites are guilty; Arab oppression of blacks and caucasians never happened, not to us, nope.*

*I've been lucky enough to grow up in America, so this shit is new to me. But I'm descended from puritans, and I know my history; I know how they treated dissent. I also know how commies treated dissent; I grew up next door to a grizzled old Russian who barely avoided the gulag by smuggling himself out of the country. I know what you petty tyrants have turned into every time you gained enough power.*

*Worst of all, you turn the very principles of freedom against us. We tolerate you because we believe in free speech and civil discourse, not bullying and violence. But that means we have to watch you advocate against that very freedom. We don't believe in ruining a stranger's professional life over an opinion, but that means that we can't punish your actions.*

*We believe that the rightness of our actions should speak for itself. You believe in bullying, even as you claim to love the oppressed.*

*Funny how the evil and all-powerful patriarchy has seen fit to act according to SJW whims for all of recent memory, punishing those they hate and protecting those they love. Funny how the evil oppressor males have to speak anonymously, while the SJWs fighting the power can use their real names and get mainstream media coverage for fun and profit. How when a million straight white male nerds get bullied, no one cares, but the minute one fag hangs himself, suddenly bullying matters—and the solution, of course, is more bullying, but by the “right” people.*

*That's the arrogant core of it. You do the same evil, in the same pattern, as so many before you, because mob justice, punishing dissent, and repression of others is just fine and dandy so long as the "right" people are doing it to the "wrong" people.*

*Eat shit and die. All I ever asked was to be left alone.*

Any political movement that inspires a comment like that, from an anonymous stranger on the internet, is surely on the brink of defeat. And so it was with the left in the mid-2010s. Perhaps if they'd read the comments section instead of banning it, they might have averted disaster.

But we should not grow complacent in our victories. In truth, our fight is just beginning, and the most difficult battles still lie ahead.

Politics is downstream from culture, and given the left's stranglehold on culture, it's a miracle that we've managed to achieve so much in politics. Our irreverent, provocative rebellion of shitlords has come a long way in the past few years, but it still has a great deal further to go. We must admit that much of our victories so far are owed to the stupidity of our opponents as much as the genius and charisma of, well, me.

Just look at the downfall of Gawker. Just how stupid do you have to be to allow one of your reporters to tweet "bring back bullying" on national anti-bullying day, when thousands of angry, motivated gamers were looking for an excuse to complain to the company's advertisers? And how stupid do you have to be to oust Peter Thiel — one of Silicon Valley's wealthiest, smartest, and most resourceful billionaires? And how stupid do you have to be, in a \$140-million trial about privacy rights, to put A.J. Daulerio, the most loathed Gawker editor on the stand,

**Comment [A590]:** But didn't you out Jack Dorsey of Twitter on Breitbart?

where he can smirkingly tell a jury that he would only draw the line at publishing a 4-year-old's sex tape?

The Democratic party, also, has been a whirlwind of stupidity over the past few years. This is a party that had the banks, the media (new and old), and Silicon Valley on their side, yet they managed to lose the House, the Senate, and then the Presidency. They could have seized the populist moment with the nomination of Bernie Sanders, someone who could challenge Trump for channeling the electorate's righteous fury, yet they instead chose to choose Hillary Clinton, the most corrupt establishment stooge to emerge in American politics since the days of city machine politics in the late 19th century.

Then there are the social justice warriors, who are beyond stupid—they're *mental*. From denouncing eggplant emojis as symbols of the sexist patriarchy to banning copies of *Charlie Hebdo* in the wake of Islamic terrorist attacks, there is perhaps no force in the west that has done more to help the political fortunes of the right than the social justice warriors of the regressive left. We really ought to thank them, you know.

The big political battles are over, at least for the moment, but we still have a culture war to win. The left is still in control of Hollywood, literature, music, comedy, the media, Silicon Valley, and most American universities. We mustn't be seduced by the false song of political power, for without cultural power, it is meaningless.

So then, we must consider not only what our opponents are doing wrong (an entire book could be written just on that subject) but also what we are doing right. That's why this entire book has been about me—I'm a model for how to successfully prosecute a culture war against the left. Well, that's not the *only* reason this book has been about me. I do have an ego to appease, in case you hadn't noticed!

MILOs are hard to replicate. And I'm not just talking human reproduction either! While I admire the Ottoman Sultans for murdering every potential rival to the throne, including their own siblings, I've tried to be pragmatic and find successors. But it's impossible! I mean, how can you replicate *this*?

Still, even if I can't be replicated, I can at least be imitated. You may never be as handsome or as clever as me, but by following a few simple rules I've developed, you too can beat the left—and have a great time while doing so. Saul Alinsky has his “Rules for Radicals”—well, here are the Rules for Dangerous Faggots. The best thing about them is, you don't even have to be gay to use them!

I talk about myself in mock-messianic terms because to at least a decent slice of young Americans I have become exactly that: a Messiah. That doesn't say as much about me as it does the environment these young consumers and voters are growing up in—a world of suffocating political correctness and enforced lying that makes them want to disobey their betters and smash the status quo. And it's not just young people, by the way. Even their parents' generation are feeling it. And that's why they voted for Donald Trump.

Journalists don't understand this, partly because they are themselves exactly the problem, but also because they don't know their own country. They haven't stepped outside of New York City. They don't know that the owners of Memories Pizza aren't violent, backward bigots but good, decent people with whom they simply disagree. Pampered, flattered and divorced from real life, the media, entertainment industries and academia live in a fantasy land. And now there are enough of us brave enough to tell them so, and to bring their worst nightmare into being: A Trump presidency!

The funny thing is, Trump is the least bad thing that could have happened. Progressives should be thanking their lucky stars voters didn't go for someone actually on the far Right. (Trump isn't.) They should be waking up every day grateful that someone like David Duke isn't President. Because that's what they deserve after three decades of lying and bullying. Of course, the American people are too decent to ever countenance such a thing. But they didn't mind sticking it to Hollywood and the New York Times putting Daddy in the White House. And the 2016 election was just the start.

Over the next decade, social justice warriors and busybodies are going to be beaten into submission by the forces of freedom and fun. We are going to win. And it's not thanks to a ferocious conservative press, or killer political candidates or great Republican authors and thinkers. It's you, buying this book, laughing at the idiots on Twitter and Facebook, finally throwing your hands up in disgust and saying, "Enough."

**Comment [A591]:** This is a better place to start this chapter—unless you can think of something more exciting

### Never Apologize

The left delights in extracting apologies from the victims of public shaming. From Jack "The Southern Avenger" Hunter to Justine Sacco, one of the first signs of leftist victory is the sight of someone verbally flogging themselves in public. Like prisoner's emerging from Big Brother's torture chamber in room 101, you can expect to see the phrases that mark a broken spirit: "I'm sorry." "I'll try to do better." "I'm learning to be a better person every day." "Thank you, mob of faceless internet vigilantes, for educating me."

If you want to win, the first step is not to admit defeat.

Never apologize.



### **Be Twice As Funny As You Are Outrageous**

Does anyone remember how the alt-right died? Many reading this book will, but here's a refresher: a colossal idiot called Richard Spencer was allowed to take control of the movement. An out-and-out white nationalist, Spencer was offensive without being funny. He did his best to emulate the wittier elements of the movement, cringingly referencing Pöpepe and "meme magic" in his speeches, but it just wasn't convincing. You see, they were having fun with forbidden ideas. He was having forbidden ideas and trying to transplant the fun in afterwards.

The fact that he had barmy ideas about "peaceful ethnic cleansing" (his quote) didn't really matter, at least not as much as the people giving Nazi salutes at his meetings. He later called them "Roman salutes" and claimed they were just trolling, but the damage was done. Spencer's little post-election stunt, a meeting of less than 200 people in which just a few engaged in the "Roman salute" spread all across the media, and the next day Donald Trump disavowed the entire alt-right. It was the first victory of the mainstream since his election.

I want people to be allowed to make jokes about, and discuss anything that they want. I don't think people should be ostracized for doing so. I don't fear the ideas of people like Spencer, not do I feel a need to hide them from view, because I have enough trust in ordinary people to examine and reject them on their own. Sunlight is the best disinfectant.

Nevertheless, if you find yourself in a position where even Mike Cernovich and Paul Joseph Watson are disavowing you, you've screwed ~~fucked~~ up on an epic scale. I will still defend the right of people to make jokes about whatever they choose, and mercilessly attack people who want to destroy the lives of 20-somethings over alt-right memes and 4chan trolling campaigns. But they are not Spencer. If Spencer *was* just trolling, as he said, he would have gotten away with it. But he wasn't, and it showed.

He wasn't being funny, he was just being outrageous.

Know the difference.

Be twice as funny as you are outrageous.

### **“Not an Argument”**

This one doesn't come from me, but from Canadianthe philosopher Stefan Molyneux, ~~one of the few OK Canadians.~~ Molyneux, who frequently dabbles in dangerous topics like race, intelligence, anarchism and religion, has said this so often on his YouTube channel that it has become a meme.

Simply put, when someone calls you names, ~~as the left is so fond of doing,~~ there is no need to be upset, ruffled, or apologetic. These are just outbursts of moral rage, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. If you make a point, or reveal a fact, and someone responds with cries of “Racist!,” “Sexist!” “Homophobe!” or any other ways that the left now spells “heretic,” just coolly respond with that now-immortal phrase:<sup>22</sup>

“Not an argument!”

**Comment [A592]:** And, as you do too!

**Comment [A593]:** But what about when you call others names? AS you have throughout the book—except where I have deleted?

### **Facts Over Feelings**

In this book, you will have encountered several excellent examples of what I like to call “hate facts.” You now know, for instance, that black gang violence eclipses police violence as a threat to black lives ~~several dozen times over.~~ You will now know that the fabled “rape culture” on college campuses doesn't exist, ~~that men and women are biologically different,~~ and that there ~~is no~~ “gender pay gap.” ~~you hear about is not what it is portrayed as being.~~ You will know that being fat isn't healthy, although quite frankly, I think most of you are smart enough to figure that last one out on your own.

**Comment [A594]:** We didn't learn this from your book

You should never miss an opportunity to spread these facts around, especially if you're at college. Your blue-pilled peers are currently living in one of the most brainwashed eras of our history. The media, academia, and pop culture are all working overtime to get them to believe falsehoods. They are naturally offended when this fragile worldview is faced with reality, which is one of the reasons why so many of the younger generation retreats into safe spaces. However, you cannot spare their feelings.

**Comment [A595]:** Provide more context for non-Matrix people

The only way to beat propaganda is to spread the truth faster than the machine spreads lies.

Facts over feelings.

And that brings me to my favorite rule of all ...

### **Seek Attention**

People often accuse me of being an attention-seeker. They're partly right.

Well ok, they're *mostly* right, 90 percent right. But the other 10 per cent is important.

You see, I may be a flamboyant egotistical attention whoring diva faggot, but all my flouncing, Valley-girl craving for attention also serves a noble purpose -- it draws attention to my arguments, my values, and the causes I champion *as well as* my impeccable sense of style and Adonis-like good looks. Think of me as 90 per cent Kim Kardashian, 10 per cent Mother Theresa.

Being, I presume, a somewhat normal and mentally stable individual, you might opt for a different combination. Maybe 60 percent serious and 40 per cent attention-seeking. But don't forget about the attention-seeking! One of the mistakes that libertarians make endlessly is that

they assume people actually *read* their brilliant essays on why roads should be privatized. I mean, they're probably flawless -- but that doesn't mean anything if *no-one's paying attention*.

I've galvanised a movement because I know how to throw a good show. I don't turn up on stage and reel off a list of paid talking points like Ben Shapiro. I turn up on stage dressed as Marilyn Monroe, have my deputy slap me in the face with whipped cream, throw up a slideshow of the hottest and spiciest memes of the moment... and *then* I reel off a list of talking points. After I've got everyone's attention, and ensured no-one at the back is falling asleep.

We live in age where the competition for attention is getting tougher and tougher. Half a century ago, everyone watched more or less the same channels on TV because, well, there wasn't much else. Now there are thousands upon thousands of channels, shows, YouTube feeds, and websites competing for the public's eyeballs. If what you have to say is important, you have to know how to get people listening.

~~We're all Kim Kardashian now, really. Isn't it wonderful?~~

### **Be Hot**

This sounds difficult, but it's very important. You have *got* to be hotter than your opponents. We live in an age of "fat acceptance" and the celebration of the mediocre. A high school sports day where everyone gets a prize. No! Don't settle for second-best. Hit the gym, go on a diet, go to a tanning salon. Don't waste money on McDonald's...waste it on Gucci sunglasses instead!

Keep in mind that it's not hard to be hotter than many of your opponents, ~~are mostly feminists, trannies, white leftist cucks from the coastal cities, and fat acceptance activists.~~ It's really not hard to be hotter than them, so you don't even have a good excuse.

Be hot.

### **Have Fun**

This is one of the most important requirements of being a Dangerous Faggot, and probably the most important reason behind my repeated victories.

What do leftists do when they get together? Well, if college safe spaces are any guide, they sit in a circle and share their feelings with each other. They'll talk about how unsafe they feel, and gently pat each other on the shoulders. In public, they'll get angry, yell slogans, and whine about how offended they are by our side's words.

They don't look like they're having much fun, do they?

Establishment conservatives do a little better on the "sense of humor" scale, but you can never escape the feeling that they'd rather be at a college debate club meet, or at a Heritage Foundation speaker event. Like the leftists, they can be dreadfully serious sometimes.

My followers win because they know that politics isn't everything. That's why they mistrust overly-serious establishment conservatives, and that's why they're so at odds with the left, who wish to politicize everything from video games to pop songs.

No-one wants to hang out with squares. They want to go to the party with blackjack and hookers, not the one with Scrabble and a ballpit.

**Comment [A596]:** What is ballpit?

And right now, I'm throwing the best party in town.

Have fun.

### **Be Dangerous**

We live in an age where one side of the political spectrum would like all debate, all challenge to their viewpoints, all diversity of thought to be snuffed out. Why? Because they're scared. Scared that their political, social and cultural consensus, carefully constructed and nurtured over the past few years, with its secular religions of feminism, enforced diversity, multiculturalism, and casual hatred for straight white males, is built on a foundation of sand.

They have watched as the threats to their order, and the worldview it represents, multiply. They have watched the dream of multiculturalism die at the hands of Islam, despite all their attempts to downplay and cover up the atrocities.

They have watched as the idea of "socially constructed" genders and races, once dogma in the academy, slowly fades into irrelevancy, swept away by a new wave of research on the innate roots of our identities, despite all attempts to suppress it.

They have seen their stranglehold on culture, once so steely and strong, slip away. Comedians grow tired of language codes. Movie directors and video game designers grow tired of the demands for diversity quotas, of attacks over the representation of women and minorities, and long to taste creative freedom once more. Artists, ever longing to provoke and challenge, slowly wake up and realize that to be left-wing today is to be the establishment.

It's a scary time to be a leftist. So it's little wonder that even I'm considered to be dangerous, with my mild demands for free speech on campuses, my fact-based objections to feminism and black lives matter, and my wariness of the sexism and homophobia that drifts slowly westward from the swamp of modern Islam.

Those who are frightened of free speech, whether it's ideas and facts that challenge their side, or jokes that prod at their carefully-constructed social taboos, are almost always frightened of something else. It's not the speech, or even the so-called "hurt feelings" that bother them. It's

that nagging concern, that plagues all defenders of fact-free dogma, that they might be wrong.

**Comment [A597]:** Or that they won't convince others

~~That if they open their ears and their eyes and their minds to their opponents even for a little, that~~

~~their worldview will be completely overcome.~~ And they just can't handle that.

**Comment [A598]:** This is not actually a fear of them—it's what you imagine them to feel

Well, no matter. You don't need to convince them. You're responsible for your own minds, after all, not theirs. And your minds are clearly in a good state, because you're reading this book.

So use them. Be dangerous. Read all the books that your college is too afraid to stock in their library. Find the thinkers and the writers and the artists who have been shamed out of the mainstream, and find out why. Get together with your friends and pledge to be as dangerous as possible.

~~Maybe call it the Dead @Nero society!~~

You're already reading a book you're not supposed to. Go watch a movie you're not supposed to.

Or better yet, go *make* a movie you're not supposed to.

Or write a song you're not supposed to.

Or design a video game you're not supposed to.

Start a blog you're not supposed to.

Discuss ideas you're not supposed to.

Get on social media and tell a joke you're not supposed to.

Share a meme you're not supposed to. Find some facts you're not supposed to.

Be dangerous.

Like that hot guy on the cover.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

If you're looking for someone to blame for the whole Milo thing, here are a few people who ought to be in your crosshairs. My editor at Breitbart, Alex Marlow, has perhaps the best news judgment of any journalist working today and has saved me from plenty of near-misses. I wouldn't be where I am without him. My deputy, Allum Bokhari, without whom this book would never have got off the ground, is a major journalistic talent and will, I'm sure, eclipse me when I finally collapse unconscious onto a pile of Nigerian rent boys.

My chief of staff Colin Madine executes the most difficult job in media -- keeping Milo Yiannopoulos on the straight and narrow -- flawlessly. My assistants Marc and Marc make sure I show up within an hour or two of the advertised time. My lawyer Brian and his team do a lot of heavy lifting and never complain when I demand ridiculous things. Thanks to the squad for keeping the travelling Dangerous Faggot circus fed, watered and looking fabulous -- Mike, Hayden, Hunter, Seabass, Blake and of course Jeff the wildman Johnson and my long-suffering tour manager Andrew Greider. Thanks Gabe, for keeping the lights on. Will Ross -- we miss you.

A few friends gave me a leg up. Thank you to my dark angel Lexica for helping me to produce the best pop album of 2017. You shaped my thinking and I am forever grateful. One day we will be free at a Snetm party in the hills. James Cook: as always, wise counsel. Scott Walter and Rachel Fulton Brown provided constant intellectual nourishment. Based Mom, Christina Hoff Sommers, kept me kind. Drake Bell kept a smile on my face. Thanks to Pizza Party Ben for keeping the meme tank full. I could have been a better friend while on tour and while writing this



book to Alicia and to Colette and Sascha for the past three years. But I know they will forgive me eventually.

~~My publisher Mitch~~~~Everyone~~ at Simon & Schuster ~~who~~ took a chance on me, ~~and~~ moved Heaven and Earth to get this book out quickly. I'm grateful. And of course I couldn't have done it without my agent Tom Flannery, who was indulgent when able and strict when necessary.

THANK YOU TO ALL THE HATERS -- WITHOUT YOU I'D BE NOWHERE.  
~~THANKS FOR MAKING THE BOOK NUMBER ONE!~~ TO ALL THE HUNGRY TIGERS WHO TRIED IT - STAY MAD! TO EVERYONE WHO SAID I COULDN'T MAKE IT, LOOK AT ME NOW! IN PARTICULAR: Anita Sarkeesian! Couldn't have done it without you, babe. Leslie Jones, for making me even more famous. And Jack Dorsey, who did so much to get Daddy elected.

Finally, of course, thanks to Steve Bannon -- for everything else.