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Introduction

By now it is almost conventional wisdom for us to hear how being a member of an ethnic majority group grants us “privilege” or how gender is a “social construct” invented for the sole purpose of oppressing women. It is also becoming an all too familiar consequence of these beliefs that any and every statistical disparity can be chalked up to a singular factor: an oppressive, male, ethnic majority patriarchy that constructs systems of power for personal gain. If empirical evidence is provided in order to debunk such claims, one is then labelled a bigot, homophobe or chauvinist pig. What’s worse, if one is a member of a particular grievance group, one will be cast as being guilty of transphobia, homophobia, patriarchal complicity or internalizing racist structures. The guilty party will then be presented with a mountain of critical theory literature that supposedly “prove” the bigoted epithets that have been raised against those who disbelieve social justice talking points. The feminist scholar, Helen Pluckrose, and mathematician, Dr. James Lindsay, point out in their book, ‘Cynical Theories’, “Sometimes the accusations are warranted, and we can comfort ourselves that a bigot – whom we see as entirely unlike ourselves – is receiving the censure she ‘deserves’ for her hateful views. However, increasingly often, the accusation is highly interpretive and its reasoning tortuous. It sometimes feels as though any well-intended person, even one who values universal liberty and equality, could inadvertently say something that falls foul of the new speech codes, with devastating consequences for her career and reputation.”¹ These are the tenor of the times we live in. Facts, justice, science, reason and individual autonomy are all white, male social constructions that must be deconstructed in order for the true liberation of “oppressed” grievance groups to take place. Reforms are an impossibility as they merely subvert attempts at deconstruction and further entrench ethnic majority, patriarchal power.

Social justice began with legitimate human rights grievances. Black Americans were indeed subjugated under the brutal system of chattel slavery and after its abolition were ruthlessly subordinated by segregation. Women were indeed oppressed by the patriarchy and denied the same rights as men. The LGBT community was indeed persecuted by heterosexuals and various religious groups. However, the modern world has, by and large, overcome many hurdles to eradicate these deeply entrenched sins. Indeed, some groups may have needed to wait longer than others, but for the most part in the developed world, bigoted attitudes to these social justice causes have been triumphed over. Though the modern-day social justice movements inform us that racism, the patriarchy and homophobia have infected every crevice of society, from its roots to its branches, this could not be further from the truth. It is doubtless that racism, misogyny and homophobia still exist. It is also true that many social groups still face persecution in

more totalitarian societies for certain aspects of their identity. However, this should not distract or diminish the great strides that the modern world has taken towards a society that recognizes all groups equally before the law. Black Americans were liberated by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and were provided some form of redress in the form of Affirmative Action. Though the outcomes of such policies are up for debate, it is undoubted to most rational thinkers that the institution of these policies signified the emancipation of Black Americans and a lethal stab in the heart of America’s racialized past. Women were essentially granted universal suffrage in the United States by 1920. Similarly, though the LGBT community had to endure until 2015 for marriage equality to be granted, the fact that many churches are willing to preside over gay marriage rites should indicate that backward attitudes towards gay rights are rapidly eroding. Equality before the law has largely been achieved. Individuals in persecuted groups that were once weighed down by the shackles of oppression have now been freed from their former bondage, being conferred the freedom to pursue their own conception of happiness. With many rights victories having been won in countless countries the world over, social justice has grown restless. Gone were the days of endless toil and suffering under a truly tyrannical system to gain equal rights before the law. The gay author, Douglas Murray, depicts social justice as a train heading towards a station, with the station symbolizing the liberal ideal of equality before the law. However, he notes, instead of coming to a halt upon arriving at the station, the train charges forward, overshooting its desired destination. Where once social justice fought for equal rights before the law and the right of individuals, regardless of race, gender or sexual orientation to pursue their own mode of personal happiness, agents of social justice in the modern day “not only advance their cause through revolutionary aims that openly reject liberalism as a form of oppression, but they also do so with increasingly authoritarian means seeking to establish a thoroughly dogmatic fundamentalist ideology regarding how society ought to be ordered.”

How can one not support social justice? What’s left if one chooses not to support these “righteous” causes? Isn’t the opposite of ‘social justice’, ‘social injustice’? This is of course the intended moral dilemma that the radical Left seeks to foist upon us all. If we disobey any number of social justice’s newfound dogmas, then we are perpetrators of social injustice. The only choice left, naturally, is to blindly embrace social justice in all of its glory. This is trend that is mirrored throughout social justice and its slogans. Who can deny the “Black Lives Matter”? Isn’t it true that only a sadist would go against the slogan “Make Love Not War”? Additionally, it would be extremely immoral to oppose the claim that “Women’s Rights Are Human Rights”. Most of those who oppose social justice and the ideology’s subsidiary causes understand that there is a far darker side under the altruistic surface. However, social justice and all of its slogans are semantically overloaded terms that deliberately adopt morally righteous monikers so as to cast any
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opposition, who dare go against the ideology, in the worst terms possible while simultaneously upholding their righteous façade. Social justice and their advocates, both activists and critical theorists, may be using the same medium of language to convey their message as the rest of us, but in reality they use the English language in manner that distinguishes itself from everyday usage. For instance, on the topic of “racism,” advocates of social justice are not referring to racism in the traditional sense – prejudice towards a particular ethnicity – but rather, they are referring to system that confers invisible privileges to one racial group over another. This invisible system, as social justice conceptualizes it, is noticeable only to those who have received adequate training in social justice theory (critical theory). To the vast majority of us who are not well acquainted to the World According to Social Justice, this perverse form of improvisational wordplay is meant to intentionally confuse. In our confusion, most of us get sucked into the nebulous depths of social justice, going along with causes that we would typically avoid due to a lack of understanding of what these causes truly entail. As Pluckrose and Lindsay put it, “People who have adopted this view may be physically close by, but, intellectually, they are a world away, which makes understanding and communicating with them incredibly difficult. They are obsessed with power, language, knowledge and the relationship between them. They interpret the world through a lens that detects power dynamics in every interaction, utterance, and cultural artifact – even when they aren’t obvious or real. This is a worldview that centers social and cultural grievances and aims to make everything into a zero-sum political struggle revolving around identity markers like race, sex, gender, sexuality and many others. To an outsider, this culture feels as though it originated on another planet, whose inhabitants have no knowledge of sexually reproducing species, and who interpret all our human sociological interactions in the most cynical way possible.”

How did we, as a society, get here? The simple answer is that despite capitalism winning the Cold War, far-Left ideologues, instead of submitting to their own failures, have been driven to even greater desperation to sabotage capitalism and decimate the philosophy of Enlightenment that branched out into classical liberalism and conservatism. What we deem to be newfound ideologies and epistemological standpoints are actually just recycled ideas from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’. Today, these forsaken ideologies are attempting a resurgence, slathered in attractive packaging known as social justice. The philosophy of the Enlightenment found its first foe in the Counter-Enlightenment and shortly after, Irrationalism. These countervailing philosophies were, however, easy enough to overcome as they were not tethered to ideological systems of belief. When the communist ideology began its spectacular decline, it relied upon an academic strategy to continue the struggle of undermining the Enlightenment’s posterchild: the free market. This academic strategy, now known as postmodernism,
drew heavily from the Counter-Enlightenment and Irrationalism, yet it differed greatly from its philosophical forebears in how it was driven primarily by an ideological resentment of Enlightenment beliefs and creations. Postmodernism, too, was unable to hold up against both its own innate nihilism and the massive progress that capitalism gave rise to. However, like the era of Counter-Enlightenment and Irrationalism that preceded it, the postmodern school of thought laid the groundwork for much of the social justice literature that is deemed du jour today. The academic arm of social justice, where the ideological strand of activism draws most of its moral charge, is a direct result of the teachings of postmodernism amalgamated with modern-day identity politics. The American diplomat, Kim R. Holmes observes this method of idea laundering, stating,

“Practically every radical cause in America today shows the influence of the postmodernist assault. From radical feminism to racial and sexual politics, postmodern leftists blend their unique brand of cultural criticism with the political objectives of these movements. In their intellectual laboratories – the cultural studies and humanities programs at American universities – they apply theories of structuralism, poststructuralism, and deconstructionism to achieve the political objectives of the New Left … Every cause in identity politics owes its existence to this bevy of critical theorists.”

This book serves takes a genealogical approach in exploring the bastardization of social justice, charting its course from the Enlightenment to the modern day, while also highlighting key postmodern concepts to outline the embrace of this strain of philosophical thought. In Chapter 1, we contrast the Enlightenment with the Counter-Enlightenment and Irrationalist philosophies, highlighting the philosophy that undergirds much of governance in the modern day and also setting the stage for the rise of postmodern thought. In Chapter 2, we examine the key themes of postmodernity, chart its ascendance following the collapse of communism and finally we explore its exploitation of language to achieve its ideological ambitions. In Chapter 3, we take an in-depth look at social justice literature in the form of critical theory, emphasizing its roots in postmodernism and also debunking many of the spurious claims that it makes about reality. Finally, we end of with a concluding chapter that seeks to lay bare the gruesome outcomes of allowing critical social justice to thrive unimpeded. The key questions that this book aims to answer are as follows:

1. What preceded postmodern philosophy?
2. What are the fundamental features of postmodern philosophy?
3. How do critical theorists apply postmodernism?

Chapter 1: What preceded postmodern philosophy?

The Era of Enlightenment

Currently, and this has been the case for well over two centuries, the world has relied on what is known as the philosophy of enlightenment. The formative figures of this modernist movement come in the form of Francis Bacon (1561-1626) and René Descartes (1596-1650), for their contributions to epistemology, and John Locke (1632-1704) for his major influence on furthering the use of science, individual autonomy and rationality. This trio are deemed modernists due to their profound confidence in reason and (especially in Locke’s case) individualism. Unlike pre-modern (medieval) philosophers who championed faith and the supernatural (in the form of divinity), Locke and co advocated for the use of perception and reason as the basis for knowledge creation. As Professor Stephen Hicks describes,

“Modern thinkers stress human autonomy and the human capacity for forming one’s own character – in contrast to the pre-modern emphasis upon dependence and original sin. Modern thinkers emphasize the individual, seeing the individual as the unit of reality, holding that the individual’s mind is sovereign, and that the individual is the unit of value – in contrast to the pre-modernist, feudal subordination of the individual to higher political, social, or religious realities and authorities.”

The philosophy of enlightenment is responsible for laying the principle foundations for science and what is now known as the scientific method. The influence that modernism/enlightenment had on the development of the scientific and mathematical fields cannot be understated. The use of reason as the primary faculty for understanding nature and the world led to Newton and Leibniz both developing calculus. Furthermore, reason applied in the sciences led to Carolus Linnaeus’ ‘Systema Naturae’ and ‘Philosophia Botanica’ which provided what was, at that point in time, the most comprehensive biological taxonomy. Similarly, the philosophy of enlightenment also resulted in the discovery of Antoine Lavoisier’s ‘Traité élémentaire de chimie’ (Treatise on Chemical Elements), the monumental text which laid the groundwork for chemistry. Furthermore, science when applied to material production yielded engineering and technology. When applied to the understanding of humans, science yielded medicine, increasing human longevity drastically.

When applied to politics, the enlightenment vision bore fruit to liberal democracies, where individual freedom and the decentralizing of political structures were handed over
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to the individual. As liberalism charged forth, feudalism declined. This weakening of feudal, monarchical rule gave rise to the push for individualism to be made universal and applied to all individuals. Racism and sexism, obvious affronts to individualist ideals, went on the defensive. Consequently, societies increasingly began the gradual process of abolition. America began abolishing slavery in 1784, England in 1787 and France in 1788. In 1791, Olympe de Gouges published the 'Declaration of the Rights of Women' and in 1792, Mary Wollstonecraft published 'A Vindication of the Rights of Women', both of which served as landmark pushes for female liberty and gender equality.

The U.S.’ Declaration of Independence is the most striking example of the Enlightenment's vision of a unified political landscape. The ex-slave and second founding father of America, Frederick Douglass, though initially opposed to the founding document, later found that it was indeed the idyllic call to freedom that the original founding fathers had intended it to be. Douglass endorsed the document for its “great principles of political freedom and natural justice” – and a devastating rebuke to the toleration of slavery in the United States. Abraham Lincoln, likewise saw the monumental document as the pillar of American liberty, stating,

“Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, or none but white men, were entitled to life liberty and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began – so that truth, and justice, and mercy, and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built.”

Enlightenment in the economic arena yielded free markets and capitalism. The founding principle of capitalism, that individuals should be left free to make their own decisions on consumption, production and trade, saw the retardation of protectionism and other forms of restrictive economic regulations. Adam Smith captured the insights that enlightenment provided economic understanding in his 1776 ‘Wealth of Nations’.
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increasing dramatically. John Locke, one of the Enlightenment’s founding fathers, argued that man had certain inalienable rights that preceded the existence of government, stating, “The natural liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth, and not to be under the will or legislative authority of man, but to have only the law of nature for his rule.”\(^9\) Locke outlined, that under the law of nature, man had a right to life, liberty and private property. That human beings had a right to self-defense in their quest for survival; they had a right to liberty of thought and action as long as they did not impugn upon the rights of others; and they had a right to the property and material wealth they accumulated through the fruits of their individual labor.\(^10\) Adam Smith, the father of free markets, concurred,

“[T]he obvious and simple system of natural liberty establishes itself of its own accord. Every man, as long as he does not violate the laws of justice, is left perfectly free to pursue his own interest his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man, or order of men ...”\(^11\)

These were the pillars upon which the enlightenment vision was built: reason, logic, individualism, science and math. The philosophers who theorized this, concluded that with these intertwined elements, not only would we be able to eliminate unwanted social pathologies, we would also be able to make greater strides towards progress. The fathers of the Enlightenment saw the wonders of Being in the faculty of individual reason and thus individual rights and liberties. Man’s innate nature was an appeal to reason (logos); man’s use of this faculty necessitated the rights to life, liberty and the ownership of private property. Human nature was fixed and could not be altered without precipitating devastating consequences – in fact, to the founders of the Enlightenment, man’s unchangeable nature was his greatest source of strength. Man was rational in his cognition and thus his rights could not be tampered with. Human nature provided the boundaries for human interactions and transactions, with natural law symbolizing those boundaries. The Enlightenment philosophers recognized the perils of relying on pathos and hence reified reason as man’s strongest faculty. In the face of adversity, the Enlightenment saw the pursuit of reason as the vanquisher of great evils.

**Kant, Counter-Enlightenment & Irrationalism**

The vision for the enlightenment (political and economic liberalism) was built upon the confidence that individuals were capable of being autonomous. The disbursal of political
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agency and economic freedom in modernist thought is based on the assumption that individuals are capable of utilizing these tools wisely. This therefore means that, to modernist thinkers, reason has a primordial role in shaping worldly activities. Reason is deemed by modernists to be the means by which individuals can understand the world (capture knowledge), plan their lives and interact socially. More obvious to the modernist philosophy is the dependence of science and math on reason. Results obtained in both fields are trusted based on our confidence in reason. Postmodernism and its predecessor, counter-enlightenment and irrationalism, saw these as threats to upending the status quo and were hence determined to annihilate this world view. In order for this to occur, they needed to strike a fatal blow in the enlightenment philosophy. How better to achieve this than by crippling one of the core tenets of enlightenment: the correspondence between science, reason and objective reality.

Immanuel Kant was chief among those who aligned themselves with the counter-enlightenment project. He had rejected the enlightenment worldview and sought to pursue the thesis that objective realities discovered by scientific methods were completely subjective. In essence, Kant’s ideological aim was to subvert objectivity and reason so as to grasp true reality. Kant asserted that science only serves to explore what exists **“only in our brain”** and hence we will never be able to understand the outside world. Kant hence believed that the sciences were only able to inform us of the world as structured by human experiences, rather than the world as structured by forces of nature. To Kant, science was innate and had no worth in informing us of what had independent existence outside of our thoughts.

> “Everything intuited in space or time, and therefore all objects of experience possible to us, are nothing but appearances, that is, mere representations, which in the manner in which they are represented, as extended beings, or as a series of alterations, have no independent existence outside our thought.”

To Kant, science was not objective simply because our minds are made up of structures that limit what we can be aware of. This thesis was what he used to deduce that we are hence prohibited from being aware of reality. This means that, to Kant, cognitive structures did **not** exist for the purpose of registering and responding to reality, but rather our minds **imposed** upon us a reality that was subjective based on the individual. Kant therefore, by subverting the concept of objectivity, rejected the notion of universal concepts, thereby reducing us to various subjective existences. This Kantian proposition was later latched onto by postmodernists and is what they used to further their rejection of an objective reality, whilst simultaneously promoting their own doctrine. Despite the fact that Kant claimed to believe in consistency, consistency with no connection to an
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objective reality results in a game of endless subjectivity. That is to say, if a game’s rules are dependent on the interpretation of different players, there is nothing to stop different individuals from interpreting the rules of the game differently, which is precisely what attracted postmodernist thinkers to the Kantian philosophy.

By characterizing the scientific method as a subjective endeavour, Kant began redefining truth on subjective grounds. Given that he had found that science and the production of knowledge were entirely subjective, our minds were hence disconnected from reality and could not possibly fathom Truth. Truth, to Kant, was a concept based entirely on internal presuppositions, which means that external reality is a mirage and we are all imprisoned in subjective existences. This is why Moses Mendelssohn labelled Kant “the all-destroyer” 14, because he severed reason and objectivity from reality, opening enlightenment up to the pillaging that would follow at the hands of the postmodernists and critical theorists after them. Kant laid the foundation for a whole host of philosophers to continue the assault on reason. These thinkers came to be known as the irrationalists and included Kierkegaard and Nietzsche (though Kierkegaard and Nietzsche are only irrationalists in the sense that they were skeptical of reason. They are only cemented as Counter-Enlightenment figures because of the idolization they received from the postmodernists, who defiled their work. This is an important point to note as Nietzsche was extremely critical of Kant) who all shared a mutual contempt for reason. They condemned reason as a totally artificial and limiting faculty that had to be abandoned in order to embrace reality. As Nietzsche put it in the ‘Genealogy of Morals’, once men had embraced reason, they

“no longer possessed their former guides, their regulating, unconscious and infallible drives: they were reduced to thinking, inferring, reckoning, co-ordinating cause and effect, these unfortunate creatures; they were reduced to their ‘consciousness,’ their weakest and most fallible organ!”15

He further reiterates the failure of reason in ‘The Will to Power’, stating, “how pitiful, how shadowy and fleeting, how aimless and capricious the human intellect is.” In Nietzsche’s view, the human intellect is completely dependent on intuition and instincts and is hence neither autonomous nor in control of anything16. Similarly, Heidegger reached the same conclusions about reason as Nietzsche. Inspired by Kant’s work on the subject, Heidegger’s abandonment of reason and his guiding principles are where we can observe the foundations for postmodernism being laid. Where Kant and Nietzsche can be


said to have created an open path for postmodernism to take shape, Heidegger and his conclusions can be said to have been the architects for the postmodern worldview. Three of Heidegger's conclusions would prove essential to the formation of postmodernism:

- Reason's elements – words and concepts – are obstacles that must be subjected to *Destruktion*, or otherwise unmasked;
- Feelings, especially morbid feelings of anxiety and dread, are a deeper guide to reality than reason;
- The entire Western tradition of philosophy – whether Platonic, Aristotelian, Lockean, or Cartesian – based as it is on the law of non-contradiction and the distinction between subject and object, is the enemy to be overcome.\(^\text{17}\)

A quarter of the way through the twentieth century, the Kantian theory of perception and the non-existence of an objective reality became du jour. Thus, began the process of depicting science and logic as divorced from reality. The notion put forth by the earliest of postmodern thinkers was that if our intuition does not conform to objects, but rather that it conforms to what we already know, then logic cannot be said to be neutral or independent. Meaning that if we create scientific knowledge based on what we already know or are culturally exposed to, then the field of scientific investigation cannot be said to be unbiased. *(However, we know that the process of scientific discovery starts with hypothesis formulation, which in most cases is separated from prior knowledge due to the simple fact that hypotheses are constructed by making informed guesses.)* If what we presuppose shapes our observations, then, as Kant concluded, we are stuck in an endless loop of subjectivity, with no direct access to reality.

As Wittgenstein put it in *'Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus'* , "All propositions of logic say the same thing. That is, nothing."\(^\text{18}\) Accordingly, logic, mathematics and science are merely *games of manipulation*, by which those playing invent knowledge based on their whims and fancies. What is considered a logical principle is hence no longer dictated or in any sense tethered to reality. Rather, logic is entirely up to individual interpretation. Logical principles become a matter of which formulations we are "*willing*" to accept, depending on whether or not we like the consequences of accepting any given principle.\(^\text{19}\) As the postmodernist, Richard Rorty, describes, logical justification "*is not a matter of a special relation between ideas (or words) and objects, but of conversation, of social practice.*"\(^\text{20}\) This view is devastating for any field that is dependent on logic as anyone
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who disagrees with conventional wisdom can now abandon it and adopt a set of their own. This line of reasoning thus untethers humans from the objective and entrenches us in the subjective, where our own preconceptions can reign supreme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Enlightenment</strong></th>
<th><strong>Counter-Enlightenment/ Irrationalism</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reason is the foundational tool of epistemology (way of knowing).</td>
<td>• Reason and objectivity do not correspond with reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reason led to the discovery of the modern science and the idea of individualism (individual free will).</td>
<td>• The world can never be viewed objective and instead conforms to our subjective interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modern science, as informed by reason, led to medicine and engineering, which in turn decreased mortality rates due to illness and improved the standards of material goods.</td>
<td>• Science itself is subjective and depends entirely on what we already know, not what we seek to discover. Feelings, instead, provide a more accurate portrayal of reality than science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individualism, as structured by reason, led to liberalism and capitalism. Liberalism oversaw the abolition of slavery and the emancipation of women, as well as desegregation of the workforce along racial and gender lines. Liberalism also gave people the autonomy to elect their leaders, instead of having to live under a monarchy. Capitalism allowed hundreds of millions to be lifted out of needless poverty and created individual wealth.</td>
<td>• The human intellect is constructed entirely of instincts and intuition and thus cannot be said to be autonomous. Hence, it follows naturally, that we abandon individual autonomy and instead follow our subjective individual experiences or adopt a collectivist (group-based) worldview.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
regardless of the circumstances one was born into.
Chapter 2: What are the fundamental features of postmodern philosophy?

An Overview of Postmodernism

In the preceding chapter, the battle between Modernism/Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment/Irrationalism has been laid out. As the latter movement began to wane, postmodernism filled the void and took up renewed arms against the enlightenment vision. Given that most postmodern thinkers relied heavily upon the theorizing of Kant, Nietzsche and Heidegger, postmodernity can thus be viewed as an ideological next-of-kin of the counter-enlightenment vision. However, as we shall observe later, postmodernism acts in a highly politicized fashion, utilizing subjectivity as a rhetorical strategy more than the epistemological premise which Kant advocated. Before we explore postmodernism and its core thinkers, it is necessary to provide an overview of the postmodernist belief system.

Postmodernism is concerned primarily with the deconstruction of the enlightenment beliefs in reason, truth and objective reality as the postmodernists believe that Western civilization has wrought dominance, oppression and destruction via the exploitation of these concepts. Michel Foucault asserts as much when he writes, “All my analyses are against the idea of universal necessities in human existence.” Such necessities must be cast aside as baggage from the past: “It is meaningless to speak in the name of – or against – Reason, Truth, or Knowledge.” This is because Foucault views “reason is the ultimate language of madness” – there is absolutely nothing that is able to guide or constrain our thoughts or feelings, human nature is thus a mere illusion. Likewise, Jean-François Lyotard states that “Reason and power are one and the same.”

Postmodernity, in the words of Frank Lentricchia, “seeks not to find the foundation and conditions of truth but to exercise power for the purpose of social change.”
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Postmodern accounts of human nature are also extremely collectivist, that is to say that individual autonomy is merely an oppressive social construct and an individuals’ identities are instead wholly constituted by the socio-linguistic groups that they are a part of. The further down a social hierarchy, the greater the group is valued by postmodernists. Additionally, postmodern notions of ethics and politics are conceived by viewing hierarchies as structures of power and the world as in a state of constant conflict where those atop hierarchies of power oppress those lower than themselves.

Hence, postmodernism is characterized by an identification with and sympathy for groups that postmodernists perceived to be oppressed in these conflicts, and a willingness to enter the fray on their behalf. As Professor Hicks describes,

“Postmodernism’s essentials are the opposite of modernism’s. Instead of natural reality – anti-realism. Instead of experience and reason – linguistic social subjectivism. Instead of individual identity and autonomy – various race, sex, and class groupisms. Instead of human interests as fundamentally harmonious and tending towards mutually-beneficial interactions – conflict and oppression. Instead of valuing individualism in values, markets, and politics – calls for communalism, solidarity, and egalitarian restraints. Instead of pricing the achievements of science and technology – suspicion tending toward outright hostility.”

Similarly, the physicists, Alan Sokal and Jean Bricmont, define the postmodern condition as “an intellectual current characterized by the more-or-less-explicit rejection of the rationalist tradition of the Enlightenment, by theoretical discourses disconnected from any empirical text, and by a cognitive and cultural relativism that regards science as nothing more than a ‘narration,’ a ‘myth,’ or a social construction among others.” Based on postmodernism’s internal belief system, “reason” is a white male Eurocentric construct for oppression. “Equality of opportunity” viewed through the lens of postmodernism is a mask for the domination of whites or ethnic majorities over ethnic minorities. “Progress” is met with a chorus of cynical denunciations of power. Despite postmodernism being built upon the pillars of subjectivity and egalitarianism, the only aspect of reality that the postmodernists seem to assert as non-relative is the oppression that is born out of asymmetric power relations. In spite of its deeply nihilist roots, postmodernism gives in to a singular objectively verifiable dichotomy: that the world and its hierarchies are constructed by power and that at the heart of every human interaction is a conflict between the oppressed and the oppressor. To the postmodernists, power is not merely exercised visibly from above by some dictatorial leader. Instead, power is miasmatic and hovers above everyone, having the ability to penetrate any social structure


or institution. Power to the postmodernists can be enforced by anyone, through everyday interactions, social conditioning and culturally constructed discourses that espouse a particular worldview. In the world constructed by postmodernists, power is coded into social systems and the operative power dynamics that exist within those systems are viewed as the roots of oppression. It is thus not necessary for individual agents to exercise power for oppression to manifest itself, oppression is innate and perpetual.

Foucault, for instance, saw himself as “uncovering” aspects of historical culture through recorded discourses. Drawing heavy inspiration from Kant, Foucault was of the view that discourses control what can be “known” and that institutional power controlled these discourses. Knowledge, to the postmodernists, is thus a manifestation of oppressive power. “In any given culture and at any given moment, there is always only one ‘episteme’ that defines the conditions of possibility of all knowledge, whether expressed in theory or silently invested in a practice.”28 Furthermore, according to the Foucauldian worldview, people themselves are culturally constructed by systems of power and have no individual autonomy or agency. “The individual, with his identity and characteristics, is the product of a relation of power exercised over bodies, multiplicities, movements, desires, forces.”29 In a similar fashion, Jacques Derrida asserts that the world is constructed by oppressive hierarchies intended to subjugate certain groups and perpetuate power for others. He writes, “We are not dealing with the peaceful co-existence of a vis-a-vis, but rather with a violent hierarchy. One of the two terms governs the other (axiologically, logically, etc.), or has the upper hand.”30 Thus, by embracing a postmodern worldview, we would be championing the relativism of knowledge and values, prioritizing the experiences of those belonging to stereotypically oppressed social groups, whilst simultaneously devaluing the logical, scientific and mathematical enterprises as Eurocentric instruments employed to consolidate and maintain white supremacy and subjugate the masses.

Due to the fact that postmodern philosophy is driven primarily by nihilism, feelings are placed at the core of every issue. The pivotal feelings which postmodernism informs us we must embrace are those laid by the forebears of postmodernism. “From Kierkegaard and Heidegger, we learn that our emotional core is a deep sense of dread and guilt. From Marx, we feel a deep sense of alienation, victimization, and rage. From Nietzsche, we discover a deep need for power. ... Rage, power, guilt... and dread constitute the center of the postmodern emotional universe.”31 The postmodernists
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hence constructed an ideology which described individuals as having no control over their feelings. Instead postmodernism informs us that feelings are derived on the basis of group membership, whether based on class, sexuality, gender or ethnicity. Due to the fact that this framework would result in multiple variations of the same experience, postmodernism can hence be seen as an ideology that promotes societal fragmentation. Having dismantled the idea of an individual existence, postmodernism thus urges individuals to seek their identities via in-group membership.

The three most prominent strands of postmodern philosophy can be seen as extensions of the counter-enlightenment/irrationalist era. Foucault, who was a student of the Nietzschean school of thought, reduced knowledge to an expression of social power and lobbied for members of society to play power politics on behalf of the traditionally disempowered. Foucault, when viewed in this light, can be deemed the architect of identity politics as he had long advocated for us, as individuals, to place in-group identification as the most accurate reality upon which we can view the world. In similar fashion, Richard Rorty, who had long abandoned the notion of an objective reality, wanted us to seek “inter-subjective agreement” among “members of our own tribe”. In essence, Rorty argued for consensus building within individual membership groups in order to construct a multivariate of existential realities dictated fundamentally by group values. As for the method used to disassemble systems of power, Jacques Derrida, drawing on Heidegger, provides us with the ability to deconstruct and weaponize language. Postmodernism can be encapsulated as having become a Lyotardian metanarrative, a Foucauldian system of discursive power, and a Derridean way of construing the world as an oppressive hierarchy. As the British scholar, Helen Pluckrose summarizes,

“Above all, postmodernists attacked science and its goal of attaining objective knowledge about a reality which exists independently of human perceptions which they saw as merely another form of constructed ideology dominated by bourgeois, western assumptions. Decidedly left-wing, postmodernism had both a nihilistic and a revolutionary ethos which resonated with a post-war, post-empire zeitgeist in the West. As postmodernism continued to develop and diversify, its initially stronger nihilistic deconstructive phase became secondary (but still fundamental) to its revolutionary ‘identity politics’ phase.”
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### Epistemology  
**Ways of knowing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enlightenment</th>
<th>Postmodernism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliant upon the notion of an objective reality <em>(that objects exist regardless of our personal awareness of their existence)</em> as informed by reason and rationalism.</td>
<td>Rejects the concept that anything can be objective. Hence, reality is completely subjective. This is officially termed anti-realism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Human Nature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enlightenment</th>
<th>Postmodernism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on the notion of individualism and autonomy. Every person, regardless of identity group, has the free will to make choices in life <em>(in terms of education, employment, voting, etc.)</em>. Social hierarchies are constructed on the basis of competence and are mutually beneficial.</td>
<td>Based on the notion that current life is socially constructed to maintain the power of straight, white males. Conflict is omnipresent <em>(i.e. social interactions are carried out between oppressor and the oppressed)</em> and all hierarchies are oppressive structures of power.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enlightenment</th>
<th>Postmodernism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of science, math and logic to come to common consensus about reality and the world we live in.</td>
<td>Rejection of science, emphasis on subjective life experiences and feelings. Knowledge constructed by traditionally disempowered groups <em>(women, ethnic minorities, disabled and LGBT)</em> favored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communist Crash & Postmodern Ascendance

Given that postmodernism is defined by a deep skepticism, nihilism towards reason and a subsequent emphasis on relativism, we should expect postmodernists to be evenly
distributed in a wide array of political ideologies. Yet, postmodernists are monolithically entrenched in far-Left politics. Foucault was very openly in favour of communism, declaring for the French Communist Party in 1950 and subsequently proclaiming himself as a Maoist in 1968. Jean-François Lyotard spent his developmental years in philosophy working for radical Leftist group *Socialisme ou Barbarie*. Jacques Derrida was closely associated with far-Left journal, *Tel Quel*, and would constantly reiterate his sympathies for the communist ideology. Richard Rorty, while not as far-Left politically, cited A. Philip Randolph, leader of the American Socialist Party, as his greatest hero. Similarly, other postmodern figures such as Jacques Lacan, Stanley Fish, Catharine MacKinnon, Andreas Huyssen, and Frank Lentricchia were all radically Left-wing. Postmodernism’s fundamental internal contradiction between the primacy of subjectivity and unitary support for radical Left politics gives credence to Hicks’ thesis that “*Postmodernism is the academic far Left’s epistemological strategy for responding to the crisis caused by the failures of socialism in theory and in practice.*”

In theory, free-market capitalism defeated socialism. Not only did pro-capitalist economists such as Friedrich Hayeck, Milton Friedman and Ludwig von Mises successfully rebut socialism’s four key tenets, they completely decimated the socialist theory. Friedman and economists of his ilk highlighted how, contrary to the popular assertions of socialism, markets are efficient and top-down command economies will always fail. Distinguished socialist economists such as Robert Heilbroner conceded in print that the capitalists have wholeheartedly won the debate. The empirical evidence has been much more relentless on socialism. Economically, in practice, the capitalist nations grew increasingly productive and prosperous as the twentieth century progressed. In stark and severe contrast, every socialist experiment ever attempted in human history has been punctuated by abject economic failure. Widespread shortages led to years of starvation in China, North Korea and the Soviet bloc. Squalor dogged Venezuelans, Cubans, Ethiopians and the people of Mozambique. Even Sweden was plagued by stagnation during the brief period where they dabbled in socialism, which resulted in a reverse course and the subsequent embrace of heavily deregulated free markets that has since defined Sweden’s politics. Morally and politically, liberal capitalist nations grew even more humane in terms of respecting rights and freedoms.

As time progressed, socialism became a stark juxtaposition to liberal capitalism. At the time, however, socialism was still and had long been considered morally superior to
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capitalism, with supporters of the ideology openly declaring this. Kantian, Marxist scholar, Allen Wood, stated in 'The Marxian Critique of Justice',

“But no one has ever denied that capitalism ... is a system of unnecessary servitude, replete with irrationalities and ripe for destruction. Still less has anyone defended capitalism by claiming that a system of this sort might after all be good or desirable, and it is doubtful that any moral philosophy which could support such a claim would deserve serious consideration.”40

That rose-tinted view of socialism began imploding in 1956 when Khrushchev disclosed sensational revelations about the early beginnings of the Soviet Union under Stalin. Khrushchev informed the twentieth Congress of the Communist Party that, in the name of securing socialism's future, Stalin had tortured millions, subjected millions more to inhumane deprivation, and executed or sent yet still more millions to die in Siberian Gulags. What capitalist nations had long suspected and socialist supporters had dismissed as fear-mongering was now revealed as Truth. The leading light of the socialist vision was now guilty of unthinkable horrors. Khrushchev's revelation opened the floodgates that would make advocating for socialism increasingly untenable. Even more spine-chilling revelations began unfurling. It was discovered that between 1959 and 1961, 30 million Chinese had been purged as a consequence of Mao's communist regime41. In 1973, Alexander Solzhenitsyn published 'The Gulag Archipelago' which drew upon extensive research and the author's own eight years in the Gulag for writing a critical letter of Stalin in 1945. As the twentieth century waned, R.J. Rummel uncovered the fact that Communist regimes were responsible for the majority of democides in the twentieth century, or 110 million deaths in terms of flesh-and-blood figures42.

As the fantasy of socialism as morally righteous and economically superior was shattered, the postmodern Marxists therefore deviated in their plot to undermine capitalism. They went from raising socialism up as the world's savior to exclusively critiquing capitalism. The postmodernists therefore turned to depicting capitalism as immoral, due to the fact that the basic moral test of a social system is its ability to provide for people's basic economic needs. Karl Marx popular slogan from ‘Critique of the Gotha Program’ was hence used to achieve this end. Marx stated, “From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.” 43 Thus, satisfying the needs of the people became the foundational criteria upon which postmodern Marxists judged the morality of a system.


However, in the 1950s, it became increasingly difficult to argue that capitalism had failed to satisfy the needs of its people. In fact, one of the biggest problems that had developed was capitalism’s ability to over-satisfy its people’s needs. Hence, postmodern, Marxist philosophers required new moral standards upon which to critique liberal capitalism. One of the foremost strategic changes involved an audacious shift in ethical standards. Where once postmodern Marxism had supposed that providing adequately for human needs was a basic test of a system’s morality, this argument was subsequently turned on its head. The postmodernists hence began to condemn capitalism precisely for being good at producing wealth.

The chief perpetrator of such an ideological presupposition, was Herbert Marcuse of the Frankfurt School and former assistant of fellow irrationalist devotee, Heidegger. Despite being influenced heavily by the Hegelian school of thought, Marcuse was politically a Marxist and held the firm belief that the primary role of the proletariat (worker) was to be a revolutionary class. Marcuse thus defined the current state of the proletariat under capitalism as that of being a captive class: The proletariat had become locked into a capitalist system, dependent upon its rewards, and enslaved by the goal of climbing the economic ladder and to “the aggressive performances of ‘earning a living’.” In the eyes of Marcuse, it would be much better if the proletariat were in economic misery under capitalism, in order for them to realise the oppression they suffer so they can then be psychologically primed to perform their historical mission. In the modern day, though talk of a proletariat revolution has since died down in mainstream academic circles, the central theme of Marcuse and other Frankfurt School philosophers remains alive and well.

It is not uncommon, today, to hear talk of how the rich oppress the poor and how the rich strip the poor of their income. In the eyes of the postmodern Marxists, the proletariat under capitalism is embedded into the oppressive system of capitalist dysfunction – a system veiled by hefty veneers of peace and comfort. The proletariat under capitalism is unaware of the reality of oppression and is instead reprogrammed to be un-revolutionary. Thus, the thesis of postmodern Marxism is that capitalism does not merely oppress the masses existentially, it also psychologically represses them, withering away their innate instincts for a working class uprising. Such attacks on capitalism encapsulate the strategy that postmodernism would take in the latter half of the twentieth century before morphing into what we now call critical social justice.

As the scaffolding that supported the radical socialist Left began crumbling, it turned desperately to those best able to repurpose the utopian dream of socialism for a new generation of thinkers not indoctrinated by capitalist ‘propaganda’. The radical Left


simultaneously required thinkers who were steeped in the latest trends in epistemology and knowledge construction. Foucault, Lyotard, Rorty and Derrida were hence the obvious successors to breathe new life into a dying ideology. Lyotard himself described postmodernism “as incredulity towards metanarratives.” Lyotard and the other postmodernists identified two metanarratives, the Enlightenment and Marxism. The latter of which Lyotard, himself, sought to further refine by fragmenting it into multiple narratives of collective oppression at the powerful hands of the white Western patriarchy. As Hicks rationalises,

“If one is an academic foe of capitalism, then one’s weapons and tactics are not those of the politician, the activist, the revolutionary, or the terrorist. Academics’ only possible weapons are words. If one’s epistemology tells one that words are not about truth or reality or in any way cognitive, then in the battle against capitalism words can be only a rhetorical weapon.”

This the most crucial concept to grasp about postmodernity. Though it may have its roots in Counter-Enlightenment and Irrationalism, those philosophical schools of thought merely served as inspirations upon which the postmodernists would model their doctrine. As Hicks notes, postmodernity is not philosophy. It is ideological in nature. It is highly opposed to capitalism and its free market structures and wishes to deconstruct it from within. Postmodernism is, in a very literal sense, Marxism caked in layers of epistemology and pseudo-philosophy to create the veneer of profundity. In reality, however, postmodernism and its successor, in today’s critical theory, are nothing more than ideological pursuits for the establishment of a Communist world order.

### Overview of Communism Evolving into Postmodernism

- Communism touted itself as morally superior to capitalism in terms of its ability to create a sustainable economy and improve people’s lives.

- After a period of competition, capitalism began edging ahead of communism on both counts. The Marxists then changed tactics from claiming communism as morally superior to claiming capitalism had undesirable outcomes like inequality.

---


• The horrors of life in under a communist regime began seeping out into the mainstream after having been kept secret for decades. This opened the floodgates to even more heinous revelations about the hideous, true nature of communism.

• With the dream of communism as a utopian system of government shattered, a specific few individuals, drawn to the work of Immanuel Kant and other Counter-Enlightenment/ Irrationalist philosophers, decided to undermine capitalism. These far-Left individuals who chose to continue the ideological aim of communism would later come to be known as postmodernists.

**Postmodern Rhetorical Strategy**

The core of the postmodern epistemology is its reliance on language and rhetoric. Philosophers and believers of the enlightenment vision utilized language as a vehicle, guided by objective standards, to gain knowledge and an awareness of reality. In contrast, postmodernists viewed language as a construction. Language, to the postmodernists, was connected to still more language and never to an external reality. Jacques Derrida characterized language as “the fact of language is probably the only fact ultimately to resist all parenthization.” 48 This means that there is no non-linguistic standard to relate to language and hence there can be no standard by which to differentiate the literal and the metaphorical, fact from fiction or truth from falsehood. This is reiterated again when Derrida claimed that “there are only contexts without any center of absolute anchoring.” 49 Every text “engenders infinitely new contexts in an absolutely nonsaturable fashion.” 50 Derrida coined the term différance which he derived from the verb “differer” which means both “to defer” and “to differ.” This was to indicate that not only is meaning never fixed but it is constructed, fundamentally, by differences; specifically by oppositions.

Richard Rorty makes it explicitly clear why postmodern philosophers take this nihilistic view of language in his essay ‘The Contingency of Language’. In it, Rorty argues that the modernist view of language has highlighted that “human languages are human creations.” 51 The postmodern purpose of language is hence not to attempt to prove or


disprove anything. In lieu of this, Rorty dictates to us that his use of language to show “solidarity” is instead

“Conforming to my own precepts, I am not going to offer arguments against the vocabulary I want to replace. Instead, I am going to try and make the vocabulary I favour look attractive by showing how it may be used to describe a variety of topics.”

In a later work, Rorty adds that “we must, in practice, privilege our own group” which means that “there are lots of views which we simply cannot take seriously.” Language, as a neutral tool for conflict resolution, is thus not on the horizon for postmodern thinkers. Rather, language is a weapon that we must employ in the service of uplifting traditionally disempowered social groups and deconstructing dominant power structures. Again, we must recall Lentricchia’s pronouncement that postmodernism “seeks not to find the foundation of truth but to exercise power for the purpose of social change.” This broad rejection of discovering truth as a primary focus of knowing is evident in how Richard Rorty makes a similar pronouncement to Lentricchia’s, arguing, “We need to make a distinction between the claim that the world is out there and the claim that the truth is out there.” This core tenet of postmodern philosophy is what drives it. It is important to grasp the postmodern rejection of the pursuit of truth as it serves to illuminate us to the underlying principles that guide much of this school of thought. Postmodern discourse is hence typified by a rejection of the need to have any internal consistencies. When viewed in this light, we realize that the appeal of postmodernism to the realm of subjectivity and the rejection of consistency are merely invitations to obfuscate from facts rather than actual profound philosophical claims. Take for example a few of the most prominent postmodern contradictions:

- On the one hand, all truths are held to be relative and there is no differentiation between claims made by any particular group; on the other hand, postmodernism hoists the subjective truths of historically disenfranchised groups to be truer than all others. Furthermore, postmodern philosophy tells it like it is.
- On the one hand, postmodernism holds that all cultures are equally deserving of respect; on the other hand, Western culture is unconditionally destructive and evil.
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• Technology is bad and destructive – but it is unfair that some people have greater access to technological resources than others. Redistribution of power is called for despite claims that wielding this power is destructive.

• Tolerance is good, and dominance is bad – but postmodernism seeks to install its own unique brand of groupthink and conformity when it usurps power from the current system.56

There is a running theme across all four of these postmodern claims: Subjectivism and relativism are used to appeal to universality and promote equality, while dogmatic absolutism is simultaneously exercised to invoke emotive outbursts towards a supposedly Western system of oppression. How then do we know that claims of subjectivism are merely attempts to undermine the current political framework and promote the ideological ambitions of the postmodernists? Fredric Jameson’s oft-quoted line – “everything is ‘in the last analysis’ political”57 – immediately springs to mind and, given the context, seems to indicate that Machiavelli’s teachings, on using any available weapon (epistemology, rhetoric and politics), have been undertaken by postmodern thinkers. In this sense, the constant use of subjectivity and relativism align with Machiavelli’s strategy of realpolitik and are nothing more than rhetorical strategies intended to divert the attention of one’s opposition and undermine their arguments. Postmodernists, when viewed through the lens of Machiavellian teachings, need not be at all consistent, as language is merely a weapon used to destroy their enemies and promote their own ideological worldview. The pieces of the puzzle really begin to take shape when we understand postmodernism through the Machiavellian lens. When subjectivism is viewed as a rhetorical strategy (a win-at-all-costs strategy), the intentions behind the postmodern worldview of endless power structures and deconstruction begin to make sense.

An illustration is helpful in outlining postmodernism’s manipulation of language to achieve their political ambitions: Imagine that you are arguing with a friend about the primary function of a ten-dollar bill. Your friend, the objectivist, states, “That’s obviously a form of money. It was designed first and foremost to be used as legal tender when individuals make transactions. Anyone who has ever had money would know that’s what it’s for.” This perfectly rational, fair-minded line of thinking is obviously impossible to counter (since that is indeed what a ten-dollar bill was made for). Hence, having been unable to construct a legitimate counter-argument in your head, you feel trapped and decide to take the postmodern subjectivist stance, by exclaiming, “Perhaps all this is merely a matter of personal opinion; it’s all just semantics! I can use that bill for other purposes. I can use it for origami. How do you know for a fact that it wasn’t intended


to serve as green origami paper instead?” Considering that you have been backed into a corner, you do this in order to create some breathing space between yourself and your opposition. How does an appeal to subjectivism create breathing space? If your opposition decides that the debate is indeed a matter of personal preferences, then there is no clear winner and your arguments henceforth are inconsequential as nobody is right or wrong. However, if your opposition rejects your appeal to relativism, then he/she will have to divert his/her attention away from the current subject matter – politics in this instance – and debunk your claim by diving into the world of epistemology. For instance, your friend might reply, "Yes, it can be used for origami. No one is denying that. The argument is on its primary function and the primary function of a ten-dollar bill is for the purpose of carrying out financial transactions.” Since your friend has made significant headway on the epistemological front, you then revert back to subjectivism and further probe him/her, enquiring with malice aforethought, “Well, how then do you know that your opinion is the real function of the ten-dollar bill? Could this not be a mere perceptual illusion on your part?” In your adoption of the subjectivist view here, we can conclude three things about postmodern rhetorical strategy.

Firstly, the postmodernists (unfortunately, you in this case) do not care about actually engaging in healthy discourse and refuse to admit defeat. Secondly, postmodern rhetorical strategy involves extreme simplification or caricaturizing of an opponent’s arguments. We see it in this example from how you shifted the topic of conversation from that of the primary function of the ten-dollar bill, to the fact that it can serve multiple functions. Postmodernists thus rely heavily on repositioning the topic of conversation away from its point of origin, in order to gain the upper hand. Lastly, postmodernists actually don’t believe in subjectivism at all. We can see this again from the example above: You clearly don’t truly believe in subjectivism as you came into the debate with a clear stand where you intended to prove that a ten-dollar bill’s primary function wasn’t actually to serve as legal tender. You merely reverted to the realm of the subjective in order to distract your opponent to put yourself in the driver’s seat. This final conclusion about postmodern rhetorical strategy becomes even more plausible when we take into account the preconditions from which postmodern thought arose and Hicks theory on the purpose of postmodernism: the crisis of radical Left ideology and the need to find new means by which to dismantle capitalism. The postmodernists themselves have admitted that deconstruction and rhetorical strategies are mere instruments for their disassembling of the capitalist system. Derrida writes, “deconstruction never had meaning or interest, at least in my eyes, than a radicalization, that is to say, also within the tradition of a certain Marxism, in a certain spirit of Marxism.”\(^{58}\) The postmodern perception, in the words of Jean François Lyotard, does not bother with verifying truth: “Our hypotheses, therefore, should not be accorded predictive value

in relation to reality, but strategic value in relation to the question raised.” 59 In simpler terms, Lyotard and the postmodernists do not wish to discover what is factually true, they merely adopt what the position that is strategically useful in helping them achieve their ideological ambitions. In similar fashion, Michel Foucault identifies the use of language as a weapon, stating, “Discourses are tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations; there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy.” 60 Foucault further clarifies his position on the use of discourse, asserting, “My point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do. So, my position leads not to apathy but to a hyper- and pessimistic activism. I think the ethico-political choice we have to make every day is to determine which is the main danger.” 61 To Foucault, the discovery of truth is secondary and he must instead fulfil his ideological motivations by prioritizing the narratives, systems and knowledges of oppressed groups, while simultaneously devaluing what is considered to be the dominant discourse.

The postmodernists lash out, intent on destroying the Enlightenment, applying language as a battering ram to mow it down. This is evident in how Foucault takes a cue from André Breton’s surrealist characterization of language as the “anti-matter” of the world. Foucault explains, “The profound incompatibility between Marxists and existentialists of the Sartrian type on the one hand and Breton on the other comes no doubt that for Marx or Sartre writing is part of the world, whereas for Breton a book, a sentence, a word – those things alone constitute the antimatter of the world and can compensate for the whole universe” 62. Postmodernism, seeing Marxism inability to combat the Enlightenment on its own terms, thus devolves into a series of ad hominem linguistic attacks on the latter, in order to destabilize people’s faith in it. As Richard Wolin observes on the postmodernists, “Moreover, in retrospect, it seems clear that this same generation, many of whose representatives were comfortably ensconced in university careers had merely exchanged radical politics for textual politics: unmasking ‘binary oppositions’ replaced an ethos of active political engagement.” 63.


This clearly exemplifies the fact that postmodernism is aware of its highly oxymoronic nature and pays no heed to it pursuant to the fact that it is primarily concerned with achieving its ideological ambition of destroying the Enlightenment and the free market it has fostered. In summary, it can be concluded that postmodernism is a revival of radical, far-Left ideologies, which draws on the theoretical frameworks provided by the thinkers of the Counter-Enlightenment and irrationalist eras in order to undermine capitalism and its Enlightenment philosophy. Postmodernism is hence an academic strategy to subvert the faculties of reason, logic and a belief in an objective reality. In its place, postmodernism seeks to expound relativity and bring the subjective experiences of historically oppressed groups to the fore. As Pluckrose summarizes,

“Shared humanity and individuality are essentially illusions and people are propagators or victims of discourses depending on their social position; a position which is dependent on identity far more than their individual engagement with society. Morality is culturally relative, as is reality itself. Empirical evidence is suspect and so are any culturally dominant ideas including science, reason, and universal liberalism. These are Enlightenment values which are naïve, totalizing and oppressive, and there is a moral necessity to smash them.”

Though postmodernism despises power and its supposed structures, implicit within postmodern philosophy is the need to consolidate power for the individuals it purports to represent. However, this can only be achieved by crippling the current system. We can thus summarize the strategies adopted by postmodernism to fulfil their ideological ambitions as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Postmodern Strategies to Vanquish Capitalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Using deconstruction as a linguistic and rhetorical device to undermine the confidence that the masses have in the current system. Deconstruction is also a tool to gain the upper-hand in arguments and places a heavy emphasis on redefining words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reason and logic must be subverted and cast as tools of power, which serve to perpetuate racism, exploitation, sexism and any social pathology that is in alignment with postmodernism’s self-victimization narrative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Objectivity and the belief in a uniform, shared reality must be destabilized. In order to achieve this, such beliefs must be depicted as tools of oppression, implemented by dominant social classes to tyrannize the masses.
Chapter 3:
How do critical theorists apply postmodernism?

An Overview of Critical Theory

As the nihilism of postmodernism began to consume it, a newer, more refined iteration of postmodern Marxism began to establish itself. Rather than target the general public, postmodern Marxism changed tact significantly, adopting a more prudent approach. Postmodern Marxism decided to embed itself in institutions of higher learning, where academics already espoused a left-leaning bent. This strategic shift from the mainstream to the institutions, has allowed postmodern Marxism to be taught as a serious field of study to a generation of students from as early as the late 1960s. Pluckrose and Lindsay document this ideological shift:

“That is, Theory couldn’t content itself with nihilistic despair. It needed something to do, something actionable. Because of its own morally and politically charged core, it had to apply itself to the problem it saw at the core of society: unjust access to power. After its first big bang beginning in the late 1960s, the high deconstructive phase of postmodernism burnt itself out by the early 1980s. But postmodernism did not die. From the ashes arose a new set of Theorists whose mission was to make some core tenets of postmodernism applicable and to reconstruct a better world. The common wisdom among academics is that, by the 1990s, postmodernism had died. But, in fact, it simply mutated from its earlier high deconstructive phase into a new form. A diverse set of highly politicized and actionable Theories developed out of postmodernism proper.”

In fact, today, postmodern Marxism has its clutches on almost every faculty at most prestigious universities (definitely every American and Canadian university). Though this ideological field of study first manifested itself in the social sciences, it has since reared its ugly head in more heavy-going areas of study such as the law and the hard sciences. In universities, one can always tell when one has received a piece of “academic” literature that was concocted with specific postmodern ideological presuppositions in mind, as such literature goes by a very distinct calling card: Critical Studies / Theory. From what many had considered the ashheap of history emerged a new set of identity-based theories that animated themselves by embracing postmodern methodologies and precepts. The American literary theorist, Brian McHale, observes this shift in the academic world, noting, “With the arrival of poststructuralism to North America,

‘theory’ was born, in the freestanding sense of the term that became so familiar in subsequent decades: not theory of this or that – not, for instance, theory of narrative, as structuralist narratology aspired to be – but theory in general, what in other eras might have been called speculation, or even indeed philosophy.” 66 This chapter therefore aims to bring to the fore the multitude of tactics that the field of ‘Critical Studies’ has imported from postmodernism. Additionally, this chapter shall also highlight why the aims of both postmodernism, ‘Critical Studies’ and social justice are aligned. In order to achieve this, this section will explore how the critical theorists utilize their academic fields to:

i. Enfeeble the hard sciences so as reject objective reality;
ii. Deconstruct language and redefine words to suit their vision of social justice;
iii. Engender self-victimization among students in order to form a broad coalition of historically oppressed social groups.

Before we begin analyzing the brutal assault that is currently being dealt to objective reality by the critical theorists, it is useful to outline who the key figures of critical theory are and what they stand for. By now, many will be familiar with some household names like Kimberlé Crenshaw and Robin DiAngelo, but the canon of critical social justice literature includes a whole host of other bad actors. These range from Ozlem Sensory, Ibram X Kendi, Judith Butler, Kate Ellis, Peggy McIntosh and Barbara Applebaum. Their works are often highly accredited by social science journals and they are also mainstays on bestseller lists. As we will see later on, their influence on the trajectory that social discourse has taken in recent years should not/ cannot be understated. As much as postmodern Marxism is a threat to our social fabric, critical theory is arguably more so as these individuals have mastered the art of weaponizing the postmodern worldview to make their spurious assertions highly unfalsifiable. The critical theorists form of education is, in the words of Robin DiAngelo and Ozlem Sensoy,

“An approach based on critical theory calls into question the idea that ‘objectivity’ is desirable, or even possible. The term used to describe this way of thinking about knowledge is that knowledge is socially constructed. When we refer to knowledge as socially constructed, we mean that knowledge is reflective of the values and interests of those who produce it. This term captures the understanding that all content and all means of knowledge are connected to social context.”67


To be ‘critical’ in this worldview, is to be aware of the postmodern concept that the world is constructed by hierarchies of power. Hence, everything in the world, knowledge included, is a mere instrument of oppression. In accordance with the postmodern worldview, critical theorists reject the notion of an objective reality as a social construction intended to perpetuate Western hegemony and undermine more indigenous knowledge systems. Not only do the critical theorists align themselves with the postmodernists, the very description they use to describe themselves is nothing more than a casual riff off Karl Marx, himself. Marx, just like the critical theorists, saw criticism of the system itself as the vital first step in achieving his utopia of equals, stating, “I am referring to ruthless criticism of all that exists, ruthless both in the sense of not being afraid of the results it arrives at and in the sense of being just as little afraid of conflict with the powers that be.”68

Consequently, the ‘critical’ approach to education is heavily reliant on interpreting academic texts (for instance the great literary works i.e. Shakespeare) through the lens of power dynamics and is also focused on uncovering the systemic oppression towards ‘marginalized’ groups (though the presence of students belonging to such groups in a university faculty should already indicate that they are not marginalized). The current view of education is that it focuses primarily on training a child’s cognitive capacity for reason so as to shape an adult who is capable of functioning autonomously. Critical theorists, since they reject the enlightenment notion of objectivity, hence reject this mainstream view of education as well. Critical theory instead enforces the vision that in lieu of education's reliance on language to pass down knowledge, language must be repurposed to create a human being that will be sensitive to his/her racial, sexual and class identity. The current social climate surrounding education (in the almost exact terms cast by the postmodernists as early as the 1950s), is typified by oppression that benefits ethnic majorities, males, heterosexuals and the rich at the ruthless expense of everyone else. This is why the critical theorists denounce the current system of education as reflecting only the self-interests of those in positions of power.

To bring about balance, critical theory calls for a recasting of the entire educational enterprise. Greater emphasis must be placed on works not in the canon; it must focus almost exclusively on the achievements of non-ethnic majorities, females, sexual minorities and the poor; it must bring the historical crimes of whites (extended to ethnic majorities in countries with no white presence), males, heterosexuals and the rich to the fore; and it must teach students that the scientific method is not at all objective and has no better claim to yielding the truth about reality than any other knowledge system. Accordingly, students of critical theory must champion women, ethnic and sexual minorities, and the poor, whilst simultaneously problematizing whites (or ethnic

majorities), males, heterosexuals and the rich. Finally, these students must conclude that science is a subjective reality and must be more receptive to alternative ways of knowing (particularly indigenous knowledge systems). If said students belong to any of the privileged groups (white/ethnic majority, male, heterosexual or rich), then critical theory states that they must behave exactly as Tennyson described in his famous poem, ‘The Charge of the Light Brigade’, “Their not to make reply/ Their not to reason why.” as they cannot fathom the supposedly unspeakable atrocities inflicted upon ‘marginalized’ individuals.

True to Fredric Jameson’s aforementioned quote, critical theorists deem politics to be relevant to everything and further believe that politics is the solution to every social pathology. In a similar fashion to Foucault, critical theorists also believe that the power dynamic is the most relevant axiom upon which all interactions take place and thus they only analyse social relations through this singular dimension. As we will see, one of the most vital aspects of critical theory is its need to indoctrinate students with political messaging that originate from it’s insane factory of ideological academia in order to supposedly “redress power differentials.”

3(i) The Lynching of Objectivity

The modern-day assault on objective reality has its roots very much in the Kantian and postmodern philosophies. In an almost identical fashion to these thinkers, critical theorists seek to depict the scientific enterprise as biased (Kant) and an instrument of oppression (postmodernism). What the rational mind tells us is an objective truth, the critical theorists tell us what an oppressive white hegemony want us to believe so as to maintain their power base. For instance, the scientific and empirically-driven explanation as to why black Americans have an increased probability of contracting and suffering higher morbidity rates from coronavirus is discarded by critical theorists, who have instead utilized the global pandemic as an opportunity to advance their macabre theories on racial hierarchies of power. The fact that these increased risks faced by black Americans are due to the dense areas they reside in, lifestyle choices and the fact that they are more likely to already have pre-existing conditions such as hypertension, diabetes, high blood pressure and high cholesterol, etc. is completely rejected by critical social justice theorists. Instead, worshippers of the prevailing social vision have spurned the scientific and empirical evidence that explains these disparate health outcomes by favoring a more politically expedient, simplistic and emotionally evocative explanation: that the US healthcare system is overwhelmed by “implicit biases” towards


black Americans and that such disparities are evidence of the tyrannical system of white power practicing "structural racism"\(^7\). The fact that America's Jewish community also face greater risk than most other Americans of contracting covid-19\(^7\) is ignored entirely by purveyors of critical social justice theory as such facts cast doubt on their characterization of systems of power in America.

So why exactly do critical theorists choose to ignore scientific evidence in favor of their own unscientific, unprovable theories/ analyses? DiAngelo and Sensoy are again at hand to explain, what can only be described to the rational mind, as willful ignorance in favor of catastrophizing. They describe how Critical Theory developed in lieu of the fact that

"[The] scientific method (sometimes referred to as 'positivism') was the dominant contribution of the 18th century Enlightenment period in Europe. Positivism rested on the importance of reason, principles of rational thought, the infallibility of close observation, and the discovery of natural laws and principles governing life and society. Critical Theory developed in part as a response to this presumed superiority and infallibility of the scientific method, and raised questions about whose rationality and whose presumed objectivity underlies scientific methods."\(^7\)

Critical Social Justice Theory can hence be seen as highly sceptical and in many ways very openly hostile toward the sciences. This hostility is so cogent, in fact, that it is arguable that the fundamental purpose of critical theory is to undermine scientific credibility without learning, knowing or referencing any science at all. The critical theorists meld together the notion promoted by Kant that science is merely a game of manipulation which fails to inform us of any objective reality and the notion promoted by Rorty that scientific knowledge is driven primarily by social practice. This marriage of Counter-Enlightenment and postmodern notions on science and objective reality allow critical theorists to conclude, just as the two sets of aforementioned thinkers did, that science is but one in an infinite number of ways of knowing and that science cannot be said to hold any significant monopoly over Truth and reality (in fact due to its Western roots, critical theorists assert that we should reduce the value we place on scientific knowledge). Scientific theory and discovery in the eyes of critical theorists are merely cultural artefacts and "social constructs" created by white, masculine and Western cultures to perpetuate the subordination of minority/ "oppressed" groups. This is the justification employed by

\(^7\) Ibib, [Accessed 28 July 2020].


critical theorists to paint the scientific method as problematic and in need of deconstruction and replaced with alternative methods of epistemology, i.e. critical theory, itself.

While specific scientific models and theories are technically social constructs (insofar as scientific theories, models and statements are necessarily abstractions expressed by means of language), this is NOT the case in terms critical theory's definition of social constructivism. This is due to the fact that, at its foundational core, science is a realist endeavour – unlike social constructivism that relies completely on theorising and hypothesizing – that accepts that in order for the statements it makes to qualify as universally true, said statements must correspond to our physical, discernible realities. It is true that the original inventors of the scientific method were white males, but that does not in any way prove the claim made by the critical theorists that they created this way of knowing for the purpose of continued subordination of other groups. In fact, the genius of science (something that the critical theorists, Kant and the postmodern Marxists all could not comprehend), lay in how its methods and conclusions would remain true regardless of the sociocultural background of the person conducting a particular experiment. This is why all of us are able to enjoy the fruits of scientific labour anywhere in the world. This aspect of science is what has allowed people from different cultural, socioeconomic and geographical contexts to apply and advance its methods. If we assume, as the critical theorists do, that science is a limiting, Western cultural artefact to further white, male dominance, how then would we explain the fact that science has been applied outside of the West and has yielded remarkably positive outcomes for those societies? Take for instance the application of menstrual science in India, Arunachalam Muruganantham utilized existing knowledge on women's sanitation during menstruation to develop an affordable, award-winning sanitation napkin for Indian women74. If science's theories, as critical theorists assert, were indeed mere hegemonic Western social constructs which are completely untethered from objective reality, there would have been no way Mr. Muruganantham could have extrapolated existing knowledge and advanced it further. Instead, science is a series of social constructions that have major robust correspondences to the genuine artifices of objective reality which thus enables incredibly accurate descriptions of and predictions about its workings.

What has happened within critical theory (which again suggests that they have no real understanding of the scientific field whatsoever) is that there is a conflation between the scientific method and the philosophy of positivism. As evidenced by the above quote from DiAngelo and Sensoy, critical theory asserts that the two are one and the same. The positivist view was propagated in the 19th century which asserted that only that which is mathematically proven or scientifically justified can be considered knowledge,
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essentially rejecting metaphysics (nature and relations between things that exist; the concept that reality exists outside of one’s mind and yet can be known). However, as the critical theorists fail to note, positivism has no longer to be deemed ideologically sound since the early 1960s. Since then, science has developed so much that the metaphysical concept of realism is a crucial feature of scientific exploration. Thus, it is politically advantageous for critical theorists to attack “positivism” as though it is in any way related to modern science, as they are essentially fighting philosophical ghost. The rejection of science and its methods extend into the larger assault that critical theory carries out on the notion of objectivity. Once more referring to the work of DiAngelo and Sensoy (their second updated version this time), the pair embrace a nihilistic, postmodernist attitude to defining the term, stating,

“Objective: The perception that some things are factual and not informed by social or cultural interpretations; a universal truth outside of any particular framework. A person or position that is seen as objective is seen as having the ability to transcend social or cultural frameworks and engage without bias or self-interest.”

To the rational mind, objectivity is an ideal. In any piece of work, to attain objectivity would be to place a conscious effort in minimizing, identifying and controlling any and as many sources of potential bias, feelings, or opinionated interpretations as possible. This ideal is completely denounced by the critical theorists as they feel, as the postmodern Marxists did, that “objectivity” is merely a mask for oppression conducted by white, Western males (who are lean, able-bodied, heterosexual and relatively economically secure). The “unbiased” perspective to the critical theorists is merely built to suit the interests of the individuals who came up with such a theory. This belief is held due to the cynical fact that they consider biases to be inescapable. Critical theories always begin with the implicit assumption that our biases are extremely pervasive, and that these biases are a direct consequence of dominant (Western, Eurocentric) ideologies having control over the narrative of thought.

According to critical theory, a belief in “objective reality” allegedly reaffirms the inequitable status quo and unfairly excludes and marginalizes other forms of knowledge. When this aspect of critical theory is applied to the sciences, the theorists’ motivation for attempting to undermine it become clearer. This is because science, in particular, refutes the feelings and “lived experiences” of the “oppressed”. Science, a belief in facts, logical approaches and objective reality are hence problematized and demonised by critical theory due to the fact that these theorists employ feelings and “lived experiences” as their chief form of epistemology. Critical theory fundamentally rejects objectivity because their preferred alternative ways of knowing are integral to the field’s ability to make its claims

---

and are, by design and out of necessity, subjective and reliant upon interpretation. As fellow critical theorist, Patricia Hill Collins notes, life is indeed constructed by axioms of power. Though she theorizes that there are four particular axiomatic domains in which power manifests itself in everyday life, namely: structural, disciplinary, hegemonic, and interpersonal power. She describes the fact that “The structural domain organizes oppression, whereas the disciplinary domain manages it. The hegemonic domain justifies oppression, and the interpersonal domain influences everyday lived experience and the individual consciousness that ensues.”76 Lived experience hence does not refer to all anecdotal accounts experienced by various individuals. The critical theory of “lived experience” as stated by Collins refers specifically to the “lived experience of oppression” at the hands of interpersonal power structures created by dominant social groups. Thus, critical theory rejects propositional knowledge as the chief vector by which we gain access to external reality. The critical social justice theorist, Alexis Shotwell, pushes for such an abdication of rigorously tested, evidence-based knowledge, proclaiming, “focusing on propositional knowledge as though it is the only form of knowledge worth considering is itself a form of epistemic injustice. Such a focus neglects epistemic resources that help oppressed people craft more just worlds.”77

The reckless assumption that critical social justice theory adopts indicates either a lack of understanding on how scientific knowledge is constructed or a wilful ignorance of the fact. Though scientific truths hold firm regardless of the cultural background of the individual attempting to construct such knowledge, Shotwell informs us that it is of paramount importance that we cast reasoned knowledge aside and instead center the experiential knowledge(s) of minoritized groups. Shotwell, presumptuously assumes that all individuals existing within “oppressed” groups share similar, if not the exact same, experiences defined only on the basis of in-group identity. To Shotwell, this reimaged version of knowledge construction will provide “A richer account of forms of knowing and a richer attention to people’s lived experiences in the world helps us identify, analyse, and redress epistemic injustices.”78

Because scientific knowledge is allegedly constructed by dominant groups, such knowledge is thus ordered in accordance with the experiences of the dominant worldview. By stark contrast, critical social justice theory informs us that those belonging to oppressed groups experience the world in a subordinated manner as they exist in a world that is culturally constructed to benefit dominant groups. Therefore, theory argues, members of oppressed groups are able to comprehend both the dominant and the oppressed perspective, while members of dominant groups understand only the


78 Ibid, p. 81.
dominant worldview. Thus, being able to lay claim to an oppressed identity category allows for multi-faceted perspectives on the world, endowing the oppressed with a richer and more accurate grasp on reality; which is why we must take their accounts of the world as gospel. Science, as a method of epistemology, tends to repudiate such anecdotal accounts of reality by formulating empirically derived Truths. Since critical theorists value the anecdotal over the empirical, there is hence an urgent necessity for them to portray science as evil and what better way to achieve such a portrayal than imply that science is but a devious ploy to cause the continued subordination of minorities even after the abolition of slavery. By replacing the scientific method for knowledge production with "lived experiences of oppression" as the foundational way of knowing, critical theorists can essentially suppress any dissenting view that might refute or cast doubt upon their ideological enterprise. Even attempting to try and undo critical theory on its own terms is seemingly an impossibility. This is because people occupying dominant positions within critical theory's hierarchy of power (males, whites/ethnic majorities, heterosexuals, the rich/upper-middle class) cannot appeal to their own anecdotal experiences and label them "lived experience" as they have not lived the true experience of oppression. Providing empirical evidence to attempt to debunk these nonsensical claims is an overt indicator one's white supremacy.

This use of argumentative fallacy is known as a “Kafka Trap.” The “Kafka Trap” was conceived by Franz Kafka in his novel 'The Trial,' in which an unassuming clerk is hauled into court, where he is not offered any clues as to why he is being charged. Due to the inescapability of the trap and the illogical but powerful statements averred by the presiding judge, the clerk was unable to proffer up a defense for his crimes. His inability to prove his innocence due to the scarcity of details and the moral suasion employed by the judge damned him to a predetermined guilty verdict. In parallel, critical theorists proclaim that one's denial of their theorizing is proof of white supremacy. Further, attempting to explain one’s denial with factual evidence serves as just more proof of one's white supremacy. Just like Kafka’s clerk, anyone attempting to debunk the unfalsifiability of critical theory is ensnared in a treacherous Kafka Trap. The only way that critical theory allows members of said dominant groups to have valid claims of “lived experience” is for them to self-denounce and confess to their “complicity” in systemic dominance. After the Maoist self-denunciation process is complete, these individuals must then proceed to convince other members of their group that they only operating in comfort due to their privilege and must hence be “woke” to their “internalized white supremacy.”

supremacy”. This restriction on the claim to whose “lived experiences” are valid is extended still further to members of “minoritized” groups who disagree with critical theory and resort to adducing empirical evidence to debunk the claims made by these theorists. Most of us would assume that the “lived experiences” of members of such groups should be admissible as challenges to critical theory, yet this is not the case. Indeed, such individuals may be talking about their personal experiences, but since these experiences show no trace of oppression, they hence do not commensurate with critical theory and are hence rejected. Critical theory asserts that any member of a “minoritized” group who challenges its ideology cannot be doing so honestly or authentically and critical theory has manufactured a whole host of labels and narratives by which to demonize these individuals and their experiences. These manufactured labels and narratives range from “the model minority myth” to “internalized racism/ sexism/ classism” to being a “race traitor” or espousing “false consciousness”83. Even the protestations of these demonized individuals is deemed by the critical theorists as evidence of their characterizations. For instance, a rational person would ask, “How do you claim to know what I have ‘internalized’ better than I do?” or “What exactly is your proof for these spurious assertions?”, which is then either met with an even louder chorus of denunciations and personal attacks or that one’s requirement for factual evidence to be put forth is direct proof that one has indeed “internalized” white, Western, patriarchal structures of power.

Once again, critical theory betrays itself as its postmodern Marxist roots become ever more visible. As illustrated in the previous chapter, the postmodern Marxist view of scientific knowledge was that it is always culturally contingent and socially constructed and therefore a function of power. Another aspect where we can undeniable see postmodern Marxism manifest itself in critical theory’s claims on science, is the fact that critical theory asserts that there is no such thing as a universal truth and there are only structures of power and “lived experiences of oppression”. Postmodern Marxism proclaimed that subjective feelings are the most accurate indicator of reality. Likewise, critical theory followed suit, erecting the “lived experience of oppression” as the epistemological epicentre of their universe around which all of Theory and related activism could revolve around. This is why they refer to their Theory-based interpretation of issues like racism/ sexism/ classism/ homophobia as “the realities of racism/ sexism/ classism/ heteronormativity”. In the Theory of Critical Social Justice, which is anti-realist with the key exception to the lived experience of oppression, there is no other epistemological means by which to access reality. Furthermore, there is no authentic way to interpret that experience except through the application of critical theory (with a “critical consciousness”) since anything else would
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be “false consciousness” or self-interested cynicism, thus an incorrect, biased, or corrupted misinterpretation of what had actually been experienced by members of “minoritized” groups. In this way, experience is transformed into “lived experience” by having been situated in accordance with critical theory, and this is considered to be the only legitimate path to knowledge(s).

Indeed, lived experiences are an important tool for us to access reality. However, the fact of the matter is that each of us have individual lived experiences. No two people experience the same incident the same way and each person forms independent perceptions of his/her circumstances. The point of lived experiences is that they serve as unique indicators which set us apart from everyone else. When lived experiences are formulated by way of a single, homogenous metanarrative (in this case, oppression), they no longer count as lived experience because these experiences are atypical in nature (even lived experiences that involve great suffering are unique to the individual forced to live through them). Framing lived experiences in terms of a metanarrative is extremely oxymoronic given that such views are collectivist in nature. Sigmund Freud’s lesser-known compatriot, the Austrian psychologist, Alfred Adler, termed this a “life-lie”. Someone living a “life-lie” is attempting to manipulate reality with perception, thought and action, so that only a narrowly desired and pre-destined outcome is allowed to exist. A “life-lie” is based on the underlying premise that all current knowledge as informed by one’s own presuppositions is sufficient in defining reality. In the case of what critical theory is attempting to advocate, individuals are asked to believe that all their shortcomings are the result of the maxim that is oppression. People who buy into critical theory consequently bend their lives into knots in a desperate attempt to fulfill this supposedly undeniable reality, they filter and screen their experiences and insist ever more narrowly that everything in life can be explained by this specific maxim. What unites the critical theorists and their adherents is that underneath all the ghastly theory, they narcissistically believe that the world could be put right, if only they held the reins of power. This manner of gross oversimplification and falsification is highly unsustainable, especially since most of us in the developed world are exempt from having to experience such atrocities. As senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation, Mike Gonzalez notes, “Likewise, those who go around in search of racial or sexual slights are setting themselves up for a lifetime of grief, much if not most of it self-inflicted.”

The unprincipled nature of critical theory is manifested in its inherent belief that it alone holds the only valid way in which to interpret knowledge. In order for critical theorists to

---


compel individuals into buying into their Theory, a further critical blow must be dealt to the sciences. Hence, critical theory characterizes the propagation of science outside of the West as a form of neo-colonialism, which requires the use of “Postcolonial/Decolonization Theory”. This process is, in the words of its chief proponent Gurminder Bhambra, “a way of thinking about the world which takes colonialism, empire and racism as its empirical and discursive objects of study; it re-situates these phenomena as key shaping forces of the contemporary world, in a context where their role has been systematically effaced from view.” 86 Decolonization seeks to read everything through a framework of colonialism and uncover how it has shaped all sorts of power dynamics in society, particularly in the realms of discourse and knowledge creation. The depiction of science and reason by critical theorists as ways of knowing that are the property of white, Western men, it is thus an imperialistic demand to expect people from other cultures to use them. Efforts at decolonization thus require societies that have been advanced by the proliferation of modern science to revert (and probably regress) to indigenous, local ways of knowing that include but are not limited to superstition, tradition and mythology. The corollary of Postcolonial/Decolonization Theory’s assault on the sciences are calls for “Research Justice.” Andrew Jolivette, professor and former department chair of American Indian Studies at San Fransisco University, defined “Research Justice” as “a strategic framework and methodological intervention that aims to transform structural inequalities in research. ... It is built around a vision of equal political power and legitimacy for different forms of knowledge, including the cultural, spiritual, and experiential, with the goal of greater equality in public policies and laws that rely on data and research to produce social change.” 87 Critical theory, in this instance, openly adopts the activist standpoint. It aims not just to revolutionize the creation of knowledge – which is not done in the service of refining said knowledge – but also to influence public policy away from objective realities that are driven by data and the scientific method. Instead, data-driven empiricism is to be supplanted with emotions, tribal faiths, indigenous knowledge, with some added zest coming in the form of its authors lived experiences of oppression.

Critical theorists thus see the application of biology and medical science to questions of sexuality, gender, race, obesity, disability and anything else that has to do with critical theory’s conception of “identity” as wholly unjustified and oppressive. As Laura Boykin informed Wired magazine, “Science at its core is systematically racist and sexist.” 88 This is why, as highlighted at the start of this section, critical theorists asserted that health


outcomes of black Americans during the global pandemic are a consequence of "structural racism" in spite of the fact that the scientific and geographic literature negated such a narrative. If it were indeed true that modern science is an instrument of the past evils of colonial oppression, why is it that science is not wielded to commit genocide upon the supposedly “oppressed”? If indeed science were a tool to perpetuate continued racial superiority, why would these racists stop at merely using it to make their lives miserable instead of just exterminating them? If modern science were truly as oppressive as the critical theorists make it out to be, we would surely have been able to see individuals attempt to use scientific methods to wipe out those they deemed inferior, like how Hitler used gas chambers to eradicate the Jews in Nazi Germany.

Sidebar: Decolonization Theory in Singapore & Why It’s All a Lie

Decolonization Theory has been employed to fit the Singaporean context. Lily Rahim utilised it in her book to explain academic outcome differences between Malay and Chinese Singaporeans. She framed the history of education in Singapore, much like education in the West is framed, as founded upon the original sin of Western colonial dominance. Singapore’s history of colonialism is hence exploited by Rahim to make the spurious assertion that the education system here systemically disadvantaged Singapore’s Malays. She further proceeds to assert that colonial values were internalized by Chinese Singaporeans who intentionally constructed the system of education to ensure millennia of Chinese hegemony. This grandiose theorizing would seem plausible if Singapore’s ethnic demography consisted only of Chinese and Malay people. Yet, this is not the case, the third major ethnic group, Indian Singaporeans, is always left out of social science analyses when these critical theorists attempt to paint Singapore as structurally racist.

Singaporean Indians form a super-minority, constituting only 9.2 percent of the population in 2010 (Malays were 13.4 percent)\(^89\). Despite constituting a super-minority in terms of ethnic population size, Singapore’s Indians have held a monopoly over academic outcomes in Singapore since as early as the year 2000, performing far better than the ethnic majority Chinese who are allegedly guilty of creating a preferential system that is supposed to entrench their dominance. For instance, in 2000, 16.5 percent of the Indian population graduated with a degree, whereas only 2.0 percent of the Malay population did so and 12.6 percent of the Chinese population\(^90\). In 2010, 35.0 percent of the Indian population graduated with degrees.


\(^90\) Ibid.
while this percentage was **5.1 percent** of the Malay population and **22.6 percent** of the Chinese population.** These trends persisted in 2015, as **39.4 percent** of the Indian population had attained a degree as their highest qualification, while only **7.7 percent** of Malays and **28.4 percent** of the Chinese population managed to do so.91

Decolonization theory and its offshoot claim about structural racism in education holds no weight, given that the outcome statistics show a very obvious trend of Indian academic excellence in Singapore. In fact, decolonization theory grows even more erroneous when we consider the actual realities of colonial rule, where Indians and Chinese were subjected to unspeakable atrocities at the hands of the British, while Malays living in the colonial era were subjected to far milder forms of Western colonialism. In this sense, the parallels between postmodern Marxism and critical theory could not be more striking. Critical theory’s conception of science, logic and objective reality harken back to how A.J. Ayer characterized analytical propositions as being “entirely devoid of factual content. And it is for this reason that no experience can confute them.”94 Offering logical, factually-driven evidence about experiential reality is thus pointless to both critical theory and postmodern Marxism. Conversely, in their view, it is pointless to expect any amount of factual evidence to amount to a universal conclusion as “lived experiences of oppression” are the most universal form of epistemology.

The culmination of all this catastrophic, nihilistic and almost nonsensical theorizing is that the various branches of critical social justice theory expound either a hearty disdain or a complete dismissal of the scientific enterprise and its methods. For instance, Critical Race Theory is extremely skeptical of any scientific or empirically derived data that potentially indicates physical, biological, or especially cognitive differences between the races. It also rejects any science and empirical data that indicates its analyses or remedial prescriptions might be incorrect. These, it is believed, would justify racism and so must be suppressed, even if true (placing an emphasis on **impact rather than intent**). It is also extremely hostile to **requests** for evidence to be brought to bear upon its claims. As illustrated by the instance drawn a few paragraphs prior, critical race theory makes

---
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the argument that asking for evidence is a denial of the “realities” of the lived experience of racism, despite those “realities” only being considered valid if they have been (highly) interpreted through Theory. Critical race theory further suborns the real-world application of pseudoscience like the Robin DiAngelo’s “implicit bias program”, recommending such fraudulent practices as antidotes to racial pathologies. The hostility of critical race Theory toward science and empirically derived facts often has the result of suppressing data that shows that racism isn’t as big a problem or isn’t a significant factor for differences in outcomes when critical race theory exclaims that it must be the most pertinent, if not the sole, source of the problem. This denial is particularly relevant when careful studies show that discrimination (thus racism) is unlikely or positively not the source of disparities in outcomes95. If science were indeed a source of opppression for ethnic minorities today, how would Arunachalam Muruganantham have been able to utilize scientific methods to create such an effective innovation? If science were truly racist, why is it the world’s leading body in health research, the World Health Organization (WHO), has an Ethiopian Director-General, Dr Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus?

Sidebar: What Is Implicit Bias Training? Does It Work?

In the wake of George Floyd’s tragic passing at the hands of Derek Chauvin, a number of high profile U.S. colleges have announced that they will be mandating on-campus implicit/ unconscious bias training. Northeastern University proclaimed that it would “Institute cultural competency and anti-racism training across the university” by “raising awareness of conscious and unconscious bias among every member of the Northeastern community through ‘cultural and racial literacy’”96. Similarly, Ohio Wesleyan University vowed to enforce “universal diversity, equity, and inclusion training for faculty and staff.”97 Likewise, the University of Florida, in their push to

95 For evidence of the FACT that racial discrimination is NOT the primary/ primordial determiner in racial outcome disparities and that racism is overblown, refer to ‘Economic Facts and Fallacies’, ‘Charter Schools and Their Enemies’, ‘Intellectuals and Race’ or ‘Discrimination and Disparities’ by Thomas Sowell. One can also refer to Jason L. Riley’s ‘Please Stop Helping Us’ and ‘False Black Power?’ or Walter E. Williams’ ‘Race and Economics’ or Taleeb Starkes’ ‘Black Lies Matter’, to name a few.


pander to today’s new fad for “anti-racism,” stated that it would “require training of all current and new students, faculty and staff on racism, inclusion and bias.”

So what does implicit/unconscious (these terms will be applied interchangeably forthwith, along with the term ‘diversity training/program’) bias training actually entail? It could take the shape of a “Privilege Walk,” that seeks “to provide college students with an opportunity to understand the intricacies of privilege and to explore the ways that we enjoy privileges based on being members of social identity groups in the United States.” To achieve this end, the “Privilege Walk” will require participants to take a step forwards if they were privileged enough to experience supposedly white-only cultural phenomena. Examples of these include “If you were encouraged to attend college by your parents and family members take one step forward.” or “If you studied the culture and history of your ancestors in elementary school take one step forward.”

Or participants could be instructed to play “Culture Bingo,” which is just as ludicrous as its name suggests. Questions to be answered on the “Culture Bingo” game range from the trivial “Who has never watched a super bowl?” to the subjective “Who knows why the year 2010 is important to people of color in the US?” to the downright absurd “Who knows what geometric symbol is cross cultural?”

Do keep in mind that the purpose of these first two activities is to actually get people to recognize that they have unconscious biases which cause them to unintentionally mistreat ethnic minorities. Yet, the slew of diversity trainers (who are also critical theorists) never enlighten us on how an individual's personal sporting preference or being encouraged to go to college factors into our mistreatment of ethnic minorities.

Another major activity conducted that allegedly helps erase bias are Maoist-like struggle sessions where participants are informed of how white people use “white talk,” which is “task-oriented” and “intellectual.” In contrast, critical diversity trainers inform their audiences at these struggle sessions that ethnic minorities use

---
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“color commentary” which is “process-oriented” and “emotional.” These struggle sessions are typified by critical theory’s jargon that participants are force-fed. One might be inundated with terms like the now-mainstream “microaggressions,” “white privilege,” and “Latinx and womxn” to the obscure “adultism” (which allegedly means “prejudiced thoughts and discriminatory actions against young people, in favor of the older”) Robin DiAngelo, arguably the most acclaimed critical theorist/diversity trainer, utilizes her struggles sessions to force her audience (who are compelled to attend by employers or college administrations) to confess to their white fragility. When audience members walk out in frustration at her racialized drivel, DiAngelo categorizes them as “leaving the stress-inducing situation,” which only serves to reaffirm white supremacy.

Given all this, one would not be remiss to conclude that critical theory’s use of unconscious bias training to apparently root out unseen racism in the workplace or on campus is utter bullshit. However, because we are determined to know the Truth, let us consult the evidence on whether unconscious bias training actually has an effect on resolving racism in school or at work.

The first thing to note is that critical theory’s assertions that race discrimination runs rampant in the workplace or on campus, is wildly overblown. The main claim critical theorists make for companies or institutions to buy into unconscious bias training is that there are racist people in the workforce and they act out their racial prejudices against their coworkers or subordinates. However, when we consult the scientific literature, the correlation between an individual’s attitudes and his/her acted-out behaviors is \( r=0.4 \) or 16 percent. This means that generally speaking, the overwhelming majority of individuals (84 percent) refrain from acting upon their emotions or convictions. The correlation between the espousal of prejudiced opinions translating to discriminatory behavior is even lower, with a correlation...
**Coefficient of \( r=0.286 \) or **11.44 percent\(^{106}\). Again, this effectively means that even if we assume that everyone on earth espouse prejudices, the vast majority of us (88.56 percent) do not overtly act them out to discriminate against others. These meta analyses cover known prejudices, whereas critical theory refers to us discriminating on the basis of unknown/ unconscious prejudices.

Of all the things used to debunk this claim, the data retrieved by the creators of the University of Washington and Yale’s Implicit Association Test (IAT) come in handy here. Brian Nosek, one of the social psychologists who spearheaded the IAT, **found that the overlap between unconscious biases and acted-out behavior was only an estimated 4 percent\(^{107}\). Furthermore, the validity of the IAT has come under serious scrutiny\(^{108}\) after it found that 50 percent of Black Americans possess unconsciously prejudiced opinions of other Black Americans\(^{109}\).

Additionally, for a program that purports to eliminate racial biases from the workplace, it would appear that the imposition of unconscious bias training led directly to a series of retrogressions in hiring practices by managers\(^{110}\). Sociologists Frank Dobbin and Alexandra Kalev, who published their findings in the Harvard Business Review, found that the adverse effects of unconscious bias training could be attributed to the fact that over 75 percent of all existing programs revolved heavily around negative messages\(^{111}\). The pair concluded that these programs had **“failed spectacularly”** and that **“The positive effects of diversity training rarely last beyond a day or two, and a number of studies suggest that it can activate bias or spark a backlash.”**\(^{112}\) This effectively means that those who underwent bias training, effectively learnt how to score well on bias tests, even though they still possessed inherent biases\(^{113}\). Similarly, the Dean of the
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School of Business and Management, Queen Mary University of London, and Professor of Human Resource Management, Mike Noon, concluded in his 2017 study of mandatory unconscious bias training: “Agency is overstated by psychology-inspired ‘unconscious bias training’ proponents, leading them to assume the desirability and effectiveness of this type of diversity training intervention, but from a critical diversity perspective (sociologically influenced) the training looks pointless.”

To compound matters, a litany of studies conducted on the effects of diversity training concluded that diversity training does not have positive effects, and that diversity training was found to have no effect on women’s or minorities’ careers or on managerial diversity. This means that while unconscious bias training causes regressions in hiring practices, opportunities for greater diversity within the workplace remained as static. The current model of unconscious bias training takes an extremely hostile approach towards white participants, informing them that they are “Socialized into a deeply internalized sense of superiority that we either are unaware of or can never admit to ourselves, we become highly fragile in


conversations about race.”

Correspondingly, whites feel excluded and reduces their support for diversity and generally feel that they will not they will not be treated fairly in workplaces that place such heavy emphasis on being pro-diversity. A consequence of this is that participants of unconscious bias training sessions leave feeling “confused, angry, or with more animosity” towards those belonging to other ethnic groups.

One of the biggest problems with unconscious bias training in the workplace is that over 80 percent of them are mandatory. Extensive research has shown that mandating such programs to eliminate such biases tends to have the opposite effects. In accordance with human nature, people react adversely to efforts to control them. Job-autonomy research finds that people resist external controls on their thoughts and behavior and perform poorly in their jobs when they lack autonomy. Self-determination research indicates that when organizations frame motivation for pursuing a goal as originating internally, commitment rises, but when they frame motivation as originating externally, rebellion increases. In their 2011 study on the matter, Legault, Gutsell and Inzlicht found this to be true in the case of anti-bias training, due to the fact that it was framed as external rather than internal. Two of unconscious bias training’s defining features, mandatory participation and its legal curriculum, will almost always induce resentment within participants as they feel that an external power is trying to manipulate and control their behavior. According to a 2007 study conducted by Legault, Green-Demers, Grant and Chung, by mandating participation, employers send the message that employees need to change, and the employer will require it. By emphasizing the law, employers send the


message that external government mandates are behind training. These features lead employees to think that commitment to diversity is being coerced.

In light of the insurmountable evidence to indicate that mandating unconscious bias training (using critical theory’s prescribed curriculum) does little to or in fact worsens unconscious biases, why then are such programs being touted as the ultimate solution to resolving unconscious biases at work or on campus? If we take a look at Robin DiAngelo’s earnings from the bias training industry, it should come as no surprise why critical theorists are pushing this so hard. DiAngelo reported to the New York Times that in 2019, she conducted eight to ten training sessions a month. Though she conducted some pro bono, she charged USD$15,000 per event for the most part. At the lowest estimate (eight sessions per month charging for only 51 percent of those sessions), **DiAngelo would have raked in USD$735,000, in 2019 alone, by conducting such sessions.** That is an eye-watering sum for a pseudo-scientific program that doesn’t even work. Perhaps, and this is mere speculation, the point of unconscious bias training is for it to fail. **If it fails, and tensions between ethnic groups are heightened, not only would the solution be to mandate more bias training, but it would also prove critical theory right in that all whites are racist** (regardless of whether they were the ones antagonized, instigated and fractured race relations on campus or at work).

This theory, that unconscious bias training is deliberately implemented by critical theorists to fracture group cohesion, is given even greater credence when we realize that training programs that negate unconscious biases do in fact exist. **However, none of these programs are prescribed, recommended or even brought up by critical theorists.** As Dobbin and Kalev demonstrated, there are in fact a plethora of programs that do indeed help improve race relations at work or on campus. It is just that these programs are cast aside by critical theorists as not being effective enough, even though the evidence suggests otherwise.
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Results of helpful diversity programs that are not recommended by critical theorists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of program</th>
<th>White Men</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Black Men</th>
<th>Black Women</th>
<th>Hispanic Men</th>
<th>Hispanic Women</th>
<th>Asian Men</th>
<th>Asian Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary training</td>
<td>+13.3</td>
<td>+9.1</td>
<td>+9.3</td>
<td>+12.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-managed teams</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>+5.6</td>
<td>+3.4</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-training</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>+2.7</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>+6.5</td>
<td>+4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College recruitment: women*</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>+10.2</td>
<td>+7.9</td>
<td>+8.7</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+18.3</td>
<td>+8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College recruitment: minorities**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+7.7</td>
<td>+8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+18.0</td>
<td>+9.1</td>
<td>-23.7</td>
<td>+18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity task forces</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>+11.6</td>
<td>+8.7</td>
<td>+22.7</td>
<td>+12.0</td>
<td>+16.2</td>
<td>+30.2</td>
<td>+24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity managers</td>
<td>+7.5</td>
<td>+17.0</td>
<td>+11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-18.2</td>
<td>+10.9</td>
<td>+13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*College recruitment targeting women turns recruiting managers into diversity champions, so it also helps boost the numbers for black and Asian-American men. **College recruitment targeting minorities often focuses on historically black schools, which lifts the numbers of African-American men and women.

In a similar fashion, critical gender studies and critical women’s studies are fervently sceptical of science. These two branches of critical social justice theory substitute a focus on race with a focus on sex, gender and sexuality. As science continually shows that there are biological roots to these components of one’s identity, including the incredibly obvious case that biological sex is, in fact, biological, these Theories choose instead to vilify the sciences for it. This leads to the claims that there are no biological differences between men and women, despite the litany of scientific studies that have been conducted that debunk such a claim. Professor Steven Pinker, the Johnstone Professor of Psychology at Harvard University, outlines such biological differences in his monumental book, ‘The Blank Slate’. Pinker states,

“Men are far more likely to compete violently, sometimes lethally, with one another over stakes great and small ... The ability to manipulate three-dimensional objects and space in the mind also shows a large difference in favor of men. ... boys are far more likely to be dyslexic, learning disabled, attention deficient, emotionally disturbed, and mentally retarded.” In stark contrast, “Women experience basic emotions more intensely, except perhaps anger. Women have more empathy towards their friends, though not toward strangers. ... Women are more attentive to their
The denial and dismissal of scientific literature as being mere “patriarchal stereotypes” has nightmarish consequences in the real world. It is precisely this non-acceptance of science that led to the sacking of autistic software engineer, James Damore, from Google for having the audacity to cite said literature and suggest that men had greater proclivities towards jobs in the tech industry than women. This is something one would know to be true if one were at all familiar with the scientific literature or had read


Pinker’s book and referred to its numerous citations. Note: the operative descriptor here indicates a greater likelihood for this particular attribute, in keeping with both the science and Damore’s claim, and should not be misconstrued as an absolute statement.) Another instance of how the rejection of biological differences between men and women can have dementing consequences in the real world, would be how Biologist, Heather Heying, was subjected to class walkouts at Evergreen State College when she taught that men are, on average taller than women, and that “women have to be the ones that gestate and lactate.”

In an article explaining the ordeal, Heying wrote, “It is ... terrifying to watch as this attempt by activist academics to dismantle logic and hypothesis, falsification and rigor, gains ground. This is conflict, plain and simple.”

Science, as Heying writes, has been dethroned by the politics of grievance, wherein results that do not meet with the approval of the critical theorists are simply shouted down, and their purveyors ostracized and dehumanized. If indeed science is the apparatus by which males enforce the patriarchy on women and against the will of women, why is it that some of the major scientific discoveries that improved women’s standards of living were made by men? In 1847, James Young Simpson employed the use of ether to help a woman with a deformed pelvis give birth. Afterwards, he switched to a better-performing chloroform and in 1853, the discovery of chloroform for childbirth was deemed reputable enough to be used by Queen Victoria when she gave birth to her seventh child. Today, the option of painless childbirth is available due to Simpson’s discovery of anaesthesia. In the 1930s, the world was introduced to the first practical tampon, Tampax, invented by Dr. Earle Cleveland Haas. By the early 1940s, 25 percent of women were using them. Thirty years later, it was 70 percent. Now, four-out-of-five women us tampons, with the remainder using sanitary pads, which are now hyper-absorbent and held in place by effective adhesives (unlike the awkwardly placed sanitary belts of the 70s). Another notable discovery, though more controversial amongst religious individuals, was the discovery of the birth control pill by Gregory Goodwin Pincus. Did Pincus, Haas and Simpson wish to oppress women or liberate them? In what manner were these practical, compassionate, enlightened men a part of the suffocating patriarchy?

The corollary of this rejection of science in critical queer and critical gender studies manifests itself in the form of purging of scientific studies conducted that repudiate their theories. For instance, Brown University’s School of Public Health Assistant Professor and the Rhode Island Department of Health’s, Dr. Lisa Littman, published her study which


found that “the clear majority (65 percent) of adolescent girls who had discovered transgender identity in adolescence – ‘out of the blue’ – had done so after a period of prolonged social media immersion” and that “the prevalence of transgender identification within some of the girls’ friend groups was more than seventy times the expected rate.” Dr. Littman’s findings were anomalous in comparison to the previous trends observed on gender dysphoria in how “the rates were so high, the age of onset had increased from preschool-aged to adolescence, and the sex ratio had flipped.” The atypical nature of dysphoria – occurring in adolescents with no childhood history of it resulted in the formulation of her hypothesis that modern dysphoria is a result of a peer contagion which she termed “rapid-onset gender dysphoria”. Despite the fact that Dr. Littman’s findings had been peer-reviewed and published by the scientific journal of the Public Library of Science, she was met with a chorus of claims that she was an anti-trans bigot. Her work was labelled as “dangerous” and it was insisted that the publication of such literature would inevitably lead to “worse mental health outcomes” for trans-identifying adolescents. Brown University removed its press release of the paper on its website and replaced it with an apology that lamented, “the conclusions of the study could be used to discredit the efforts to support transgender youth.” Child gender psychologist, Diane Ehrensaft, commented to The Economist that Dr. Littman’s use of parent reports was akin to “recruiting from Klan or alt-right sites to demonstrate that blacks really were an inferior race.” (Even though over 85 percent of parents surveyed by Littman self-identified as supporting LGBT rights.) None of the attacks on the credibility of Dr. Littman’s work seemed to acknowledge that parent reports have always been a standard method for assessing child and adolescent mental health as only they can most accurately detail a child’s psychological history. As noted by the ‘International Journal of Transgenderism’, “[p]arent-report questionnaires are widely used in clinical child psychology and psychiatry to establish the prevalence of various behavioural phenomena”. Nor did any of the critical gender theorists who denounced Dr. Littman care to mention that the primary academic research used to promote “social transition” (changing an adolescent’s name and pronouns with school and friends) for gender dysphoric children similarly relies on parent surveys.
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The claim made by critical social justice theory to justify their denunciations of biological differences and scientific literature in general is that critical theorists fear that these identity factors can be used to justify any of the pantheon of problematics relevant to these categories of identity, including but not limited to sexism, misogyny, transphobia, homophobia, heteronormativity and cisnormativity. The Critical line of argumentation is a murky quagmire based entirely on hypotheticals, assumptions, anti-science and anti-realism. Much like the alt-right who pay no heed to scientific evidence, critical theory does the exact same. However, unlike the alt-right, the denial of science when it pertains to gender and sexual identity arises from critical theory’s need to further its own unsubstantiated theory that men and women are NOT biological categories and instead are socially constructed categories. Gender according to critical theorists is entirely “socially constructed”. The oft incomprehensible critical gender theorist, Judith Butler, is a prominent proponent of this view. In fact, her conception of social construction theory in science extends so far that it also calls into question the very existence of biological sex, portraying it too as a social construct. She writes, “If the immutable character of sex is contested, perhaps this construct called ‘sex’ is culturally constructed as gender; indeed, perhaps it was always already gender, with the consequence that the distinction between sex and gender turns out to be no distinction at all.”142 Butler was attempting, here, to subvert scientifically conceived notions on gender identity by carrying out a move towards incoherence or as Butler termed it “parodic redeployment of power”143 which seeks to render science absurd. Butler sought to destabilize scientific conceptions of gender by asking, “Is the construction of the category of women as a coherent and stable subject an unwitting regulation and reification of gender relations?”144 Which, in essence, means that by labelling gender a biological category, we would unintentionally incur the costs of stabilizing what it meant to be male or female.

This view of science is almost directly transplanted from postmodernism. We see this most clearly in Michel Foucault’s ‘The History of Sexuality’, where he asserts that as scientists began to study and catalogue sexuality, they simultaneously constructed it and invented the sexual identities and gender binaries that accompany these constructions. He states, “The society that emerged in the nineteenth century – bourgeois, capitalist or industrial society, call it what you will – did not confront sex with a fundamental refusal of recognition. On the contrary, it put into operation an entire machinery for producing true discourses concerning it.”145 To Foucault and likewise to his pupils, today’s critical theorists and social justice advocates, science is merely a set of”discourses”
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which enabled dominant systems ("machinery") to enforce the truth that most benefited the dominant social group onto all levels of the social hierarchy. This is a process that involved power, which to Foucault and his students, functions like an interwoven network that travels through all of society and serves as the primary determiner of what people hold to be true. In the case of gender, Foucault and critical queer and gender theorists, the prime culprit for legitimizing, what they assert to be, false knowledge is science. Foucault popularly referred to this as "biopower," asserting that the scientific method "set itself up as the supreme authority in matters of hygienic necessity," and "in the name of biological and historical urgency, it justified the racisms of the state" because "[i]t grounded them in 'truth.'" 146 Here, we see that Foucault’s dogmatic precepts on science and the scientific method served not only as the inspiration for the stance that critical queer theory would take against science, but also served to fuel within critical race theory an antipathy towards scientific ways of knowing.

Yet, in spite of this social structionalist view, the critical theorists simultaneously proclaim, with all their morally superior authority, that individuals who claim they suffer from gender dysphoria must be affirmed (treated as the preferred gender, e.g. being referred to as he instead of she or being called ‘John’ instead of ‘Jennifer’) and sent for hormone treatment and eventually undergo gender re-assignment surgery. They claim that this is because those suffering (or who claim to be suffering) from gender dysphoria are men trapped in women’s bodies (or vice versa) 147. If gender is entirely or in large part socially constructed, then why is it that the solution to gender dysphoria is the scientific method of gender re-assignment surgery (which implies that gender is indeed binary)? The fact that both these claims cannot simultaneously be logically true, is completely ignored or rationalized by the corrosive (postmodern) denunciation that logic – along with science – is part of the oppressive white male heterosexual cisgender system of power. Another major irony of this rejection of science is that to even be diagnosed with gender dysphoria, given hormones for the condition and undergo surgery to reassign one’s gender, one has to obey scientific methods. It is thus evident that critical theory only cares about science when it serves their ends, but not when it refutes the prescribed doctrines of the Theories themselves. This particular self-serving aspect of Theory’s views on science is clarified by Gayle Rubin, who in her 1984 essay ‘Thinking Sex’, wrote, “It is impossible to think with any clarity about the politics of race and gender as long as these are thought of as biological entities rather than as social constructs. Similarly, sexuality is impervious to political analysis as long as it is primarily conceived as a biological phenomenon or an aspect of individual psychology.” 148
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Rubin’s view, thus confirms the fact that the social constructivism adopted by critical theory and by extension social justice, is merely in the service of ideological expedience. According to Rubin, we should adopt the view that sex, gender, and sexuality are social constructs not because this is necessarily true, but rather to service the ease with which one can politicize such issues and demand change if their biological aspects are eliminated. Regardless of its aims, critical social justice theory misses the point that by using biological science to codify gender, sex and sexual orientation, people begin to be more accepting of these views rather than less149.

### Sidebar: Social Construction Theory

Even if we ignore the inherent contradictions within critical theory with regards to gender, and even if we disregard the vast amount of scientific literature to the contrary, there have been actual studies conducted which negate critical theory's position that gender is socially constructed. The most extreme social experiment, that one can conduct in order to separate biological differences from sociocultural differences, would be to take a baby boy and conduct a gender re-assignment operation on him, have his parents raise him as a biological female, and allow other people to treat him as one. **If indeed gender were socially constructed, the boy (raised as a female) would exhibit overtly feminine traits and behave like a stereotypical girl.** If, however, gender is dependent on biologically determined prenatal hormones, the child should feel like a boy trapped in a girl's body and reject being treated as one.

Incredibly enough, this experiment has indeed been carried out in real life – not out of scientific curiosity but rather as a consequence of accidents or disease. One such experiment, in particular, examined twenty-five boys who were born without a fully-formed penis (a birth defect known as cloacal exstrophy) and who were then castrated and raised as girls. **All of them displayed stereotypical male patterns of rough-and-tumble play and had typically male attitudes and interests.** More than half, without being informed of their true gender identity, spontaneously declared that they were boys, one did so when he was just five years old150.


In a famous case study, an eight-month old boy lost his penis permanently in a botched circumcision due to medical negligence. Following the mishandled medical procedure, his parents consulted the acclaimed sex researcher, John Money, who assured them that, “Nature is a political strategy of those committed to maintaining the status quo of sex differences.” He advised them to castrate the baby permanently and let doctors construct an artificial vagina for him. His parents followed Money’s advice and raised the boy as a girl without ever telling him what had happened. Things looked promising for social construction theory, as a New York Times report would have it, Brenda (aka Bruce), “has been sailing contentedly through childhood as a genuine girl.”

The facts, which were up until that point suppressed, emerged in 1997, when it was revealed that from a young age Brenda had felt that she was a boy trapped in a girl’s body and gender role. Brenda had been known to tear off frilly dresses, reject dolls in favor of guns, preferred playing with boys, and even insisted on urinating while standing up. By the age of fourteen, Brenda had grown miserable with her assigned gender identity and decided either to live her life as a male or end it. Distraught, Brenda’s father finally revealed the truth to her. Brenda underwent another round of gender reassignment surgery, assumed her rightful male identity, and as of 2002 was married to a woman.

Not only is science suppressed under Critical Social Justice, the political imperative within Critical Social Justice (as drawn by postmodern Marxist Fredric Jameson) often distracts from and discredits science by sidelining the scientific for the political. Making science a political endeavour—thus not science—is one of the primary goals of the Critical Social Justice movement, for once that is accomplished, it can assert its own political dominance to bend what it will call “science” to legitimizing its own ideas to the exclusion of all others. By denying science and instead propagating the view that race and gender are entirely social constructs, critical theory is then able to solidify its claim that all outcome disparities are a consequence of the innate patriarchal, racist power structures that define modern society. Once again, critical theory returns to the origins from whence it came and can thus be viewed as a literal exercise in plagiarizing postmodern Marxism. Critical social justice theory thus uses the Foucauldian view, that everything in life is constructed by hierarchies of power, as its ideological core, while it simultaneously uses
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the Kantian view as its method of untethering science from reality. (A careful reader will pick up that much of what passes in Critical Social Justice as criticisms of that which it does not like is also an admission of what it intends to do, as its central thesis is that the things it doesn’t like are fundamental components of how social systems operate.) This approach to politicizing and controlling science has been tried before in the Modern world, most famously by Trofim Lysenko, whose Soviet Science led to the starvation and murder of tens of millions.

These deranging theories have broken free of their chains within the walls of academia and been unleashed into the mainstream consciousness, infecting even the most hallowed of institutions. Just recently, the National Museum of African American History and Culture, an arm of the Smithsonian collection of taxpayer-funded museums, published a poster that drew heavily from Judith H. Katz’ ‘Some Aspects and Assumptions of White Culture in the United States’\(^\text{156}\). The poster, which has since been taken down by the institution, ran the sub header,

“... whiteness, refers to the ways white people and their traditions attitudes and ways of life have been normalized over time and are now considered standard practice in the United States. And since white people hold most of the institutional power in America, we have all internalized some aspects of white culture – including people of color.”\(^\text{157}\)

So what exactly are these pervasive aspects of whiteness that the Smithsonian sees fit to problematize? Well, would you believe it, just like critical theorists, they purport that an “Emphasis on Scientific Method”, “Objective, rational linear thinking”, “Cause and effect relationships”, and “Quantitative emphasis” are instances of modern white supremacy that require steadfast denunciation\(^\text{158}\).


\(^\text{158}\) Ibid.
"Aspects & Assumptions of Whiteness & White Culture" poster published by the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture
Furthermore, outside the realm of academia, medical science is also being subverted directly by requests to focus upon diversity, equity, and inclusion in medicine and medical outcomes, including through initiatives like health equity. In addition, critical approaches to environmentalism tend to recognize the validity of climate science but then forward a radical and almost nonsensical “Social Justice” political agenda called “climate justice” that overwhelmingly distracts us from and discredits good climate science. These programs are immediately identifiable by statements like “racism is a public health crisis,” “we have to examine the social determinants of health” (as indicated by the commentators who declare that covid-19 health outcomes imply structural racism, in spite of the scientific literature that directly negates such a claim), and “we cannot solve climate change until we end racism.” These statements, as they are given, are preposterous and could only be uttered in earnest by someone who understands neither the relevant science nor racism. Such absurd claims on environmental science is what led a major paper on ‘feminist glaciology’ to be published by the University of Oregon in the journal ‘Progress in Human Geography’. The paper, which is not a hoax and instead a genuine article that was peer-reviewed and published in earnest, argued that most research on glaciology – the scientific study on glaciers – “stems from information produced by men, about men, with manly characteristics,” and that the feminist perspective on glaciers has been thoroughly ignored by this system of patriarchal oppression. The paper proceeded to propose a “feminist framework” for studying glaciers, in order to properly analyze “gender, power, and epistemologies in dynamic social-ecological systems, thereby leading to more just and equitable science and human-ice interactions.” The study’s lead author, Mark Carey, was endowed with a research fund of USD$459,452 to pursue his work on ‘feminist glaciology’ by the National Science Foundation. Carey stated in defence of his paper, “We wanted to present a variety of different sociocultural forms of glacier knowledge that go beyond science, to generate discussion.” Where he intuited that glacier knowledge was about men or that glaciers features manly characteristics is anybody’s guess, but the fact that a social scientist (someone with no background to study hard sciences) was endowed with the funds necessary to invent pseudoscientific knowledge is a very clear indicator that critical theory is inching ever
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closer to its ultimate goal of dismantling the sciences by politicizing the field. How much of a threat is critical theory to science?

Apart from the aforementioned firing of James Damore from Google and the walk-out staged during Heather Heyer’s class at Evergreen, other real-life events indicate that critical theory is making significant headway in its attempts to debilitate the sciences. In the recent protests against a talk given by Charles Murray at Middlebury, the protesters chanted, as one, “Science has always been used to legitimize racism, sexism, classism, transphobia, ableism, and homophobia, all veiled as rational and fact, and supported by the government and state. In this world today, there is little that is true ‘fact.’” When the organizers of the March for Science tweeted: “colonization, racism, immigration, native rights, sexism, ableism, queer-, trans-, intersex-phobia, & econ justice are scientific issues,” many scientists immediately criticized this politicization of science and derailment of the focus on preservation of science to intersectional ideology. In South Africa, the #ScienceMustFall and #DecolonizeScience progressive student movement announced that science was only one way of knowing that people had been taught to accept. They suggested witchcraft as one alternative. This is particular view that has been adopted by South African students is actually one that is procured directly from critical social justice scholarship, which informs us that empirically-derived knowledge is unjustly favored over indigenous ways of knowing. The justification behind this warped viewpoint is in turn procured from postmodern Marxism as the belief is that the power imbalances that have infiltrated everyday discourses resulted in the discrimination of reasoned knowledge over folklore and the like. The critical theorist, Kristie Dotson, is notorious for depicting the dominance of reason and evidence-based knowledge as a “culture of justification.” Instead, she argued for a “culture of praxis” which would integrate multiple indigenous knowledge systems in order to provide an inclusive knowledge framework to minoritized groups. Likewise, Allison Wolf castigated the current system of thought as creating a “reason/emotion divide” which was an oppressive Western construct. Unlike Dotson, Wolf advocated the use of centering
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feelings as the primary arbiter of knowledge. Even the STEM fields have been perverted by critical social justice theory’s boorish view of scientific knowledge. A 2015 paper proposed that an engineer should “demonstrate competence in the provision of sociotechnological services that are sensitive to the dynamics of difference, power, and privilege among people and cultural groups.” Purdue University published the book ‘Engineering and Social Justice’ which was littered with a particularly absurd refrain: “getting beyond views of truth as objective and absolute is the most fundamental change we need in engineering education.” Mathematics has been cast as racist and sexist due to its reliance on the correspondence between objective reality and truth. A 2018 paper proclaimed, “Drawing upon Indigenous worldviews to reconceptualize what mathematics is and how it is practiced, I argue for a movement against objects, truths, and knowledge towards a way of being in the world that is guided by first principles – mathematx. This shift from thinking of mathematics as a noun to mathematx as a verb holds potential for honouring our connections with each other as human and other-than-human persons, for balancing problem solving with joy, and for maintaining critical bifocality at the local and global level.”

Conclusion for Chapter 3, Part i
As Steven Pinker astutely observed in his monumental 2002 book, ‘The Blank Slate: The Modern Denial of Human Nature’,

“The dogma that human nature does not exist, in the face of growing evidence from science and common sense that it does, has led to contempt among many scholars in the humanities for concepts of evidence and truth. Worse, the doctrine of the blank slate often distorts science itself by making an extreme position – that culture alone determines behavior – seem moderate, and by making a moderate position – that behavior comes from an interaction of biology and culture – seem extreme.”


The brutal savaging that science and objective reality have been dealt at the hands of critical theory has allowed for large swathes of society (including our most cherished institutions) to believe that politics, power and hegemonic Western domination are at the heart of our current belief system. By allowing this extremely nihilistic worldview to consume all faculties of objective reality, critical theory creates a void in our epistemological beliefs, a void that it readily offers to fill. Pluckrose and Lindsay note the dangers that such a dim view of science poses to those of us who reside in the real world: “More egregiously still, ... Theory, with its disparagement of science and reason as provincial Western ways of knowing, not only threatens the foundations of advanced contemporary societies but also impedes the progress of developing ones. Since many developing countries would benefit from technological infrastructure, which could ameliorate some of the world’s most significant causes of human suffering – malaria, water shortages, poor sanitation in remote rural areas, and the like – this claim is not only factually wrong, morally vacant, and patronizing; it is also negligent and dangerous.”

Once reason, science and objectivity have been successfully demonized and depicted as instruments of oppression and subordination, critical theory then provides us with the tools to liberate ourselves from the shackles of this supposedly omnipresent bondage: the deconstruction of the medium (language) by which said oppressive knowledge is transmitted and the rebirth of this medium in a construction that is “equitable” towards minoritized groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Theory on Science/ Facts</th>
<th>Actual Science/ Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The assertion that science and math correspond to an objective reality is false. Science and math are completely subjective and biased in favour of dominant groups. We must instead employ “lived experiences of oppression” as the chief form of epistemology.</td>
<td>• Science and math are not subjective. If they were bridges would collapse, as the math required by engineers could be decided upon by individual whims and fancies. Lived experiences are unique to the individual and cannot be quantified in terms of a metanarrative (grand narrative, in this case one of universal oppression).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• &quot;Minoritized&quot; individuals who disagree with the view advocated by critical theory are guilty of internalized racism/ sexism/ heteronormativity.</th>
<th>• Critical theory’s claim to represent the collective/ majority of all minorities is absurd, as can be seen by the presence of dissenters (myself included 😊).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Science is a “social construct” intended to oppress ethnic minorities and further the power that Western/ ethnic majority men wield. Indigenous ways of knowing (mystical, spiritual, cultural, etc.) are favoured as science is a product of the evils of colonialism.</td>
<td>• Science when introduced to ethnic minorities and less developed regions of the world aided in reducing infant mortality rates, disease morbidity rates and greatly improved standards of living as a whole. If oppression was the goal, why was science used to save lives in these parts of the world (which is still being done today), instead of say using science like the Nazis did in their horrific gas chambers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Science and math are tools of the patriarchy, intended to oppress women by enforcing “patriarchal stereotypes”.</td>
<td>• The irony of this claim about women is that the some of the greatest scientific discoveries that improved standards of living for women, were invented by men. Tampons and anaesthesia (for the easing of pain during childbirth) are some of these inventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender is a “social construct” and we all exist on a gender spectrum, which indicates that to a certain degree, we all suffer from gender dysphoria (mismatch between identity and gender of birth).</td>
<td>• If gender is “socially constructed” then why is it that critical gender studies advocates that individuals seeking gender re-assignment surgery are men trapped in women’s bodies (or vice versa)? Why not just break down that cultural barrier instead? Gender dysphoria, today, is increasingly a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3(ii) Newspeak and the Perversion of Language

Similar to how Heidegger’s theory of Destruktion of reason was inherited by Derrida, Derrida’s theory of deconstruction has also been appropriated by critical theorists. Just like how Derrida tweaked certain aspects of Destruktion to formulate deconstruction, so too have the critical theorists refined deconstruction to suit the campus environment. As Jonathan Culler notes,

“Derrida’s writings were at one time the primary referent of the term deconstruction, ... became an extraordinarily powerful intellectual paradigm, whose exfoliation in myriad fields of the humanities and social sciences marked the intellectual life of the 1980s and 1990s. The term deconstruction has thus come to designate a range of radical theoretical enterprises in such fields as law, architecture, theology, feminism, gay and lesbian studies, ethics and political theory, in addition to philosophy, psychoanalysis, and literary and cultural studies. Though diverse, these enterprises share a critical dismantling of the conceptual oppositions that had previously been regarded as fundamental to the disciplines.”

Deconstruction, to the social scientists (critical theorists, the terms are basically interchangeable today), referred to the fact that words are merely a way to further entrench power structures that emasculate dominant social groups (ethnic majority, male heterosexuals), while oppressing traditionally disempowered social groups (ethnic minorities, females and members of the LGBTQIAAP+ community). Critical theorists deem sexism, racism, misogyny, classism, homophobia and transphobia to be thinly veiled by language and are hence committed to deconstruct language and reconstruct it on their own terms. Talking points of how the “patriarchy is hidden” or “underlying structures of racism” exemplify how nihilistic they are and serve as further evidence that they have adopted the postmodern Marxist view that every social interaction is typified by conflict that reinforces power hierarchies.

For instance, the radical gender feminist and professor at Rutgers University, Kate Ellis, wrote in Socialist Review that she believed that sexism and capitalism go hand in hand, and that achieving genuine equality between the sexes requires an overthrow of existing societal order. She found, however, that she has a problem when trying to re-educate her students on these themes. She claimed that they thought too much like liberal capitalists – thinking in terms of equality of opportunity, in terms of simply removing artificial barriers and judging everyone by the same standards, and worst of all they thought that

---

by personal effort and ambition they could overcome most obstacles and achieve success in life. Ellis was mortified that they had become indoctrinated by capitalist propaganda and hence wrote that she would enlist deconstruction as a weapon against those evil, patriarchal Enlightenment beliefs. If she can first subvert her students' belief in the superiority of capitalist values and of the idea that people make or break themselves, then their core values will be destabilized. She found that pushing relativistic arguments (lived experiences of oppression) helps achieve this. She concluded that once their Enlightenment beliefs are hollowed out by relativistic arguments, she can fill the void with the correct social justice principles.

Before we dive hitherto into the demented realm of social justice Newspeak, we shall first take a detour as it is worth outlining exactly what postmodern/ Derridean deconstruction theory entails. The twentieth-century art world gives us a prescient example of deconstructive theory at work. Duchamp's urinal (a replica of which is on display at London's Tate Modern) sent the message Piss on you, and his later works put that general attitude into practice. As Professor Hicks notes,

"His version of the Mona Lisa was a clear example: a reproduction of Leonardo's masterpiece with a cartoonish moustache added. That too made a statement: Here is a magnificent achievement that I cannot hope to equal, so instead I will deface it and turn it into a joke."
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The postmodern artist, Robert Rauschenberg, took deconstruction a step further than Duchamp. Feeling that Willem de Kooning’s achievements in the world of art cast too long a shadow for any new artist to overcome, Rauschenberg asked for one of de Kooning’s paintings – which he then vandalized by painting over it. That too made an equally vindictive statement: I cannot distinguish myself unless I destroy the achievements of
Deconstruction theory as manifested in critical theory is the literary version of Duchamp and Rauschenberg’s work. Any meaning that we glean from our current model of education and epistemology can be revealed to be masks for oppression and the continued subordination of minoritized groups.

Deconstruction has the effect of levelling all meaning and placing meaning as ascribed by “minoritized groups” as superior to traditional interpretations. Critical theory use of deconstruction attempts to portray academic texts as a cover for something fraudulent as it intends to allow the seeds of doubt to creep in about everything we traditionally uphold as great. Critical theory thus suggests that by altering the discourses (by deconstructing them and the power dynamics they carry), one can alter (social) reality, overcome oppression and achieve justice. In practice, deconstruction is a method by which meaning is either broken down or problematized, specifically for the purposes of either showing meaning to be arbitrary (kind of a postmodern, particularly Derridean, vehicle of morbid aesthetic wordplay) or to expose and rearrange the power dynamics believed to be carried by the ways words relate to one another (how Derrida stated that language led to still more language and never to external reality). Deconstruction, as carried out by the critical theorists, involves two overarching strategies. The first is the tearing down (‘problematizing’ in their language) the great works of the modern era. The second is the replacement of torn down language structures with their own redefined words and history; Orwellian Newspeak come to life.
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**Problematization**

Ever helpful, Sensoy and DiAngelo are at hand to explain how exactly critical theory carries out deconstruction by means of ‘problematizing’. After a bit of waffling on intersectionality, the pair state,

“our identities and the social meaning attributed to them must be understood in their interdependence on one another; identity is multidimensional. For example, one is not just a woman but a white heterosexual cisgender able-bodied woman. All of these identities interact in complex ways that shape how this particular woman will experience gender. Prior to Crenshaw popularizing the term, scholars had been writing about the problematics of a single axis of analysis for many years. Many of these scholars were and are Black, transnational, and queer feminists who have problematized the idea that there is a singular female experience that feminism speaks to and under which all women can be gathered.”

Problematics are ways in which the phenomenon, entity, person, circumstance, object, etc., under examination falls short of the moral agenda that necessarily lies at the heart of the critical theory examining it. Of particular interest are ways in which those things might marginalize, exclude, minoritize, harm, cause oppression, or maintain or legitimate dominance and injustice through the machinations of systemic power. Problematizing is, as adherents to Critical Social Justice and other critical theories would say, the process of making those oppressions (and other moral failings) “visible.” Put otherwise, problematics are what critical theories criticize, and problematizing is how it does its criticism. The goal of this activity is to replace false consciousness (especially internalized oppression) with critical consciousness (i.e., wokeness) and thus agitate for a social and cultural revolution (we all know how that turned out 😊). Problematization is the primary, if not sole, means by which a critical theory decides whether or not a concept is valid and thus constitutes authentic knowledge (as opposed to knowledge born of “oppression”).

To explain this eroding intellectualism in critical movements at a guess, it would have to be because problematization is a much easier (and exponentially more subjective) approach to disqualifying statements than defeasibility (as employed in philosophy) and falsifiability (as employed in the hard sciences). All it requires is the capacity to claim offense or blame a system, or to do so on behalf of someone else or an identity group.

In other words, traditional theories are hard, requiring setting aside one’s feelings and ego, usually obtaining significant education and training, and proceeding with extreme caution and care. Critical theories are comparatively easy, requiring only the ability to complain and somewhat plausibly connect one’s complaints to the system of power being
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critiqued by the critical theory (be that ideology, economic, knowledge, discourse, government, or some combination thereof). In the hands of intellectuals, then, critical theories will be one thing, but in the hands of non-intellectuals (or people pretending to be more intellectual than they are), they are quite another. (One will notice this simple observation explains much over the last half century.) Here we see critical theory’s open embrace of postmodern Marxism resurface once more, as just like the latter ideology, critical theory places feelings as one of the core tenets of its epistemological universe.

With regard to Critical Social Justice Theory, the anti-intellectualism and centrality of problematization via the (highly interpreted) “lived experience of oppression” reaches fever pitch because of the profound influence postmodern Theory has had upon it. Recall Lentricchia’s proclamation that postmodernism “seeks not to find the foundation of truth but to exercise power for the purpose of social change.”180, critical theory is thus able to disavow the correspondence between truth and reality as compared with the political application (recall Jameson) of propositions that have been authenticated as “true” by the powerful Western elites. This is why the Gender Studies Department at Queen’s University in Kingston Ontario, “teaches feminist, anti-racist, and queer theories and methods that centre activism for social change” – therefore demonstrating their validation of the insane supposition that university education should above all foster ideologically motivated political engagement181.

Thus, in Critical Social Justice and its Theory and activism, ideas that are in any way problematic are deemed invalid whereas ideas that are not (yet) identified as problematic are valid, and this process is (nearly) wholly unconstrained from matters of truth and falsity in reality (and, as proven in the previous section, objectivity is seen as an undesirable myth claimed only to maintain hegemonic power, which is itself problematic). The result is that problematizing (through discourse analysis, close reading, and other critical qualitative methods) becomes the chief occupation of anyone in Critical Social Justice who is interested in producing “knowledges,” including by disqualifying actual knowledge from that status. Problematization manifests itself in the real world in the example of the anti-white Smithsonian poster, where everything that was supposedly of white, Western origin was an indication of how pervasive modern white supremacy is, such that even people of colour are unaware of when they are internalizing white supremacist diatribe.

The poster characterized having a “Future Orientation” as a sign of one’s whiteness and described adopting the concept of “Delayed gratification” to be a symptom of how one


has been consumed by white hegemonic power structures. What the authors of the poster failed to note was that the concept of delayed gratification is as old as time and can actually be attributed to the Abrahamic credos of Islam and Christianity (both of which did not begin in the West and have never been exclusive to whites). Delayed gratification can be understood simply as a proposition of sacrifice and put plainly refers to the fact that something better might be attained in the future by giving up something of value in the present. God as represented in the Quran asks Muslims to sacrifice the immediate pleasures and temptations of this world in order to receive the ultimate reward of nearness to God and a place in heaven. The Holy Quran states, “And this life of the world is nothing but a sport and a play; and as for the next abode, that most surely is the life — did they but know!” [29:64]

The principle of delayed gratification is not simply limited to that verse in the Quran either. As students of either faith would know, one of the major features of the Bible and Quran is the mapping of the various sacrifices made by our ancient forefathers. After the Fall from Paradise, mankind began its arduous mortal existence. The idea of sacrifice enters soon afterwards, beginning with the account of Cain and Abel, and developing through the Abrahamic adventures and the Exodus: Following much contemplation, we, suffering humans, learn that God’s favour could be gained, and his wrath averted, through proper sacrifice. In its haste to problematize everything, critical theory often neglects the most basic facts of life. No white man can lay claim to the proposition of ‘delayed gratification’. Indeed, they can adopt it as a way to structure their lives, but it does not belong to them. The failure to recognize the fact that principles belong to no mere mortal should already highlight the fact that critical theory pays no heed to the veracity of the assertions it makes, as long as those assertions score a direct and damaging blow to capitalism and its Enlightenment beliefs.

Another instance of critical theory’s deconstruction via problematization, bleeding out into the real world, would be that of how the associate dean of the College of Integrative Sciences and Arts at Arizona State University, Asao Inoue, claimed that, “grading is a great way to protect the white property of literacy in schools and maintain the white supremacist status quo without ever being white supremacist or mentioning race.” He went on to assert that we have to “engage with the question of how English language practices in college classrooms contribute to white supremacy.” Inoue, in his 75-minute lecture (indoctrination session), posed a question to his audience, “How
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do we innovate ourselves out of this historical racist project so that we are engineering together, a bigger, more diverse, more equitable braver, more beneficent, tomorrow?" In case anyone reading this is wondering, yes, this nut really is an associate dean at a real university. Essentially, what Inoue is asserting is that the English language is a tool to further white supremacism and continue the alleged subordination of minoritized groups. That is quite a bold proclamation to make. English grammar is oppressive and grading schoolchildren upholds white supremacy. The way that Inoue frames education, one would think that David Duke, former Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, was in charge of designing most of the English-speaking world’s curricula. What’s most insulting about Inoue’s averments is that he presupposes that ethnic minorities are unable to do better than their white counterparts, let alone cope with the study of the English language.

This is a patently absurd sentiment to hold, considering the data on educational outcomes that flies in its face. For instance, Indian American kids have won every Scripps National Spelling Bee since 2008, except for 2019, when there was a tie among eight children, seven of whom were Indian American. As anthropologist, Shalini Shankar, wrote in the Los Angeles Times, these children come from “a culture invested in competitive spelling and parental investment in a child’s educational success.” Asian American students also do exceptionally well on the highly competitive Specialized High School Admissions Test (SHSAT), a rigorous set of math and English exams for students to gain entry into nine of New York City’s most prestigious public schools. Despite accounting for only 30.7 percent of test takers, Asian American students made up 51.1 percent of offers to these nine schools, based on SHSAT test scores, in 2019. What is most astounding about the Asian Americans who constitute the majority of the students in New York City’s specialized schools is that almost half (44 percent) hail from low-income households, impoverished enough to be qualify for free or reduced-fee lunches. What’s more,


the SHSAT is by far the most accurate indicator of a student’s mastery of math and English is the fact that it is a color-blind form of testing that doesn’t reveal a student’s gender, sexual orientation, nationality or ethnicity to markers. These markers by the way, are computers and not actual people. How then is it possible for Mayor Bill de Blasio and Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez to castigate the SHSAT test results as “biased”?191

The rate of acceptance for Asian Americans was substantially higher than any other ethnic group in New York City. Despite the fact that Asian Americans have proven their exceptional linguistic abilities on standardized tests, mainstream media outlets like the New York Times choose instead to focus on the fact that Black and Hispanic students gained entry into these institutions at far lower rates than did Asian Americans, with only a tokenistic mention of the academic excellence achieved by the latter ethnic group. Indeed, the SHSAT produces unequal outcomes, but to depict all ethnic minorities as incapable of mastering the English language is an affront to Asian American students who have taken pains to excel at it. The focus on framing racial disparities in enrolment to specialized schools has become something of a niche issue for New York politicians. For instance, Representative Cortez ignored the success of Asian American New Yorkers who overcame adversity to gain entry into specialized schools and instead chose to take offence at the fact that in 2019, only 7 black students were admitted to Stuyvesant, which had a student population of 895.193 Students enrolled at Stuyvesant were required to score between the 96th and 97th percentile to gain admission.194 Though there was an uptick in the number of Black students enrolled in other specialized public schools, such as the Brooklyn Tech (which admits students at the 80th percentile), Blacks only constitute 57 out of 540 students at Brooklyn, with the majority of students in all nine specialized schools being Asian American.195 Given these statistics, it does seem that
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Black Americans are unable to cope with the study of the English language. Perhaps, and one would not be remiss to think this, there is indeed some truth to Inoue's assertions, as the data seemingly corroborates his stance.

However, when we analyze the history of specialized schools and take a look at New York's current academic landscape, Inoue's assertions fall apart. Back in 1971, students were also made to take the SHSAT, Black students at Stuyvesant vastly outnumbered Asian American students and the trends are the same for other specialized public schools in New York. In 1984, Black and Hispanic students made up for 63.5 percent of the student population at Brooklyn Tech. In 1989, Black and Hispanic students still constituted a majority (51 percent) of students at Brooklyn Tech. Therefore, historically speaking, the English language and the use of grading did not seem to impede Black or Hispanic Americans from being admitted into specialized schools in a time replete with far less progress in terms of race relations. Furthermore, for those still persist in the belief that grading and the study of English unfairly produce unequal outcomes for Black Americans, it would be useful to consider the case of charter schools (which New York City Mayor, Bill de Blasio, and the New York State’s Teachers Union are so desperately attempting to shut down).

The Wall Street Journal reported in 2019 that "The most recent state test results for grades 3-8 show that while the majority of New York students attending traditional public schools are not proficient in either math or English language arts (ELA), a majority of charter school students are. For New York City, the charter performance is even more impressive when broken down by race. At city charters, 57% of black students and 54% of Hispanic students pass ELA, compared with 52% of white students statewide. It's the same in math, with 59% of black students and 57% of Hispanics at city charters passing, against 54% of white students statewide."

It almost seems as if, given the right tools for academic success, ethnic minority students tend to be very good at studying a white supremacist subject. Some might say ethnic minority students are even better at English than whites – for whom Inoue claims the subject and system of grading was built with the intention of aiding. In spite of the
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overwhelming evidence to indicate that ethnic minority students have a long history of outperforming white students in the study of the English language, critical theorists within the education system persist in problematizing the subject. We see the culmination of this problematization in how a subcommittee of professors from the Conference on College Composition and Communication called for the abolition of “White Mainstream English” to make way for “Black Linguistic Justice”.

In summary, the easiest way by which to grasp the psychology that influences critical theory’s application of deconstruction via problematization would be to draw a parallel with the work of a very white, very dead European male (the exact profile of person critical theory seeks to “problematize”): William Shakespeare’s Othello. In the tragedy, Iago’s loathing for Othello is depicted as boundless, but he is aware of his own physical limitations and knows he will be unable to best Othello in open confrontation. What other strategy could he employ to bring about Othello’s destruction? Iago schemed to attack Othello where he knew it would be most lethal – through Othello’s passion for Desdemona. Iago hence proceeds to spread rumours that she had been promiscuous, he further spread subtle lies and innuendo about her faithfulness and was able to successfully sow doubt in Othello’s mind about the most beautiful being in his life, letting that doubt sink in like a slow poison. Like the critical theorists, Iago’s only weapons are words. The only difference is that the theorists are not as subtle about their intended targets, blatantly castigating the sciences and current language use. And like Iago, critical theory does not have to get the girl in the end. Destroying Othello will suffice. In a more philosophical sense, the very individual who postmodernists and critical theorists idolize, Friedrich Nietzsche, presciently captured such psychology in his ‘Genealogy of Morals’:

“When would they achieve the ultimate, subtlest, sublimest triumph of revenge? Undoubtedly if they succeeded in poisoning the consciences of the fortunate with their own misery, with all misery, so that one day the fortunate began to be ashamed of their good fortune and perhaps said one to another: ‘it is disgraceful to be fortunate: there is too much misery!’ But no greater or more calamitous misunderstanding is possible than for the happy, well-constituted, powerful in soul and body, to begin to doubt their right to happiness in this fashion”.

The Newspeak Version of Complicity


Having used its keen rhetorical devices to create antipathy towards the current system, critical theory now has a wide berth to redefine the Truth on its own terms. This next section shall look at some of the key linguistic manipulations that constitute the second step of Derridean deconstruction that critical theory has decided to inflict upon us all. Let us begin our exploration of Newspeak (as defined by critical theory) by analyzing the morbid redefinition of the word ‘complicity’. Traditionally, in the standard sense, before the explosion of critical theory into the mainstream, ‘complicity’ was used to describe the participation in an unlawful or immoral activity by way of encouraging other perpetrators of that action. Individuals who were complicit shared a mutual intent to see the crime/immoral act committed with the actual perpetrators of said unlawful or immoral action.

The Newspeak version, however, has decided that it doesn’t like mutual intent as a prerequisite for one to be complicit in something, therefore unwitting participation will suffice. As the pioneering figure in redefining ‘complicity’ on social justice terms, Barbara Applebaum, states, "The white complicity claim maintains that all whites are complicit in systemic racial injustice and this claim sometimes takes the form of ‘all whites are racist.’ When white complicity takes the latter configuration what is implied is not that all whites are racially prejudiced but rather that all whites participate in and, often unwittingly, maintain the racist system of which they are part and from which they benefit."202

Here, Applebaum clearly exemplifies Orwellian Doublethink. In his monumental novel, 1984, George Orwell sought to highlight how totalitarian regimes could manipulate reality by forcing its citizens to simultaneously accept two contradictory beliefs. In order to illustrate what he meant, Orwell created the Party (the totalitarian regime in his book) slogan, “War is Peace. Freedom is Slavery. Ignorance is Strength.”203 If we were to think along the lines of the critical theorists, their Doublethink slogan would probably be: “Science is Ignorance. Objective Truth is Subjective. Free Speech is Hate Speech.”

(credit to Dr. James Lindsay for that ☺) Applebaum, in her redefinition of ‘complicity’, emulates the totalitarian Party by simultaneously putting forth and expecting us to accept two paradoxical statements with regards to race relations. She proclaims initially in the most explicit, absolute terms possible that “all whites are racist”, before then stating that she did not mean that “all whites are racially prejudiced”. So which is it? Are all whites racist, or are there only some white racists? It cannot be both simultaneously. Similarly, Robin DiAngelo asserts that, “All white people are invested in and collude with


racism\textsuperscript{204}, despite having no empirical evidence for this apart from her own delusional preconceptions. (\textit{But of course as DiAngelo has made clear, asking for evidence is proof of one’s white supremacism.}\textsuperscript{205})

But of course, in keeping with their postmodern predecessors, critical theorists don’t trouble themselves with the need for consistency or the need to redress inherent contradictions within their doctrine. (Recall Foucault’s pronouncement that, “Discourses are tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations; there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy.”\textsuperscript{206}) The Critical conception of ‘complicity’ extends the idea out of the traditional realm of contributory actions and into one of unearned benefits from systems that oppress. The notion of complicity is stretched in this way so that it can assign collective responsibility and guilt to entire identity groups for their participation in (consciously or unconsciously) and benefit from structural advantage, systemic power, and/or privilege(these being close cousins well within the same fundamental concept). Specifically, members of theoretically dominant identity groups are Theorized to be complicit in, thus responsible for (and guilty of) the harms caused by those systems of power and the oppression they visit on marginalized and relatively oppressed groups/identities. Complicity in current critical social justice parlance is no longer limited to just the realm of systemic racism and white supremacy and has extended its reach to many other quandaries of the ideology. The most prominent area, apart from race, where the notion of ‘complicity’ manifests itself is in critical women’s studies such that being successful in the current system is evidence of ‘complicity’ within a sexist, patriarchal power structure.

We see offshoots of this sect of critical women’s studies outside of academia in the ever-popular Twitter hashtag: \#KillAllMen. Ezra Klein of Vox is at hand to help us explain what social justice ideologues mean when they use the hashtag. Klein states its usage does not actually mean to call for mass genocide on half the global population, this was merely “another way of saying ‘it would be nice if the world sucked less for women’” and that “It was an expression of frustration with pervasive sexism.”\textsuperscript{207} Again, here we see Orwellian Doublethink at play. On the one hand, social justice ideologues wish to enact mass genocide, whereas on the other hand they wish to call for greater female empowerment and for men to be sensitive to the plight of females. And once again, we

\textsuperscript{204} DiAngelo, R., 2018. \textit{White Fragility: Why It’s So Hard For White People To Talk About Racism}. Beacon Press.
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are stuck in a rut, which is it? Do you want to actuate a pogrom on the male half of the species (which your words literally suggest) or do you want men to be less sexist and more empathetic towards women? At the heart of this Doublethink, of course, is the central issue of complicity. Men are complicit (in critical theory’s terms) in the continual oppression of women and therefore must be subject to calls for the genocide of their kind in order to evoke greater empathy towards women. Exactly how this tone-deaf, Nazi-like sentiment is supposed to evoke empathy within males, no one knows.

A further by-product of social justice ‘complicity’ is the obligation to “Believe ALL Women!”, without the need to examine the authenticity of their claims. Why does this idea hold such sway in social justice circles? Because the patriarchy are guilty of perpetuating a “rape culture” (not going to bother diving down this particular wormhole) and hence all men are, by virtue of birth into a fixed biological category, complicit in this system. The notion that one has to unquestioningly “believe all women”, without any due consideration for the possibility of a false claim being made, has been stretched to such demented limits that even decisions reached by judicial bodies with a Judicial Effectiveness score of 92.9/100²⁰⁸ (one of the best, if not the best, rating in the world) can be cast as saving rapists for the sake of upholding the patriarchy. These absurd aspersions can be made even when the evidence is extraordinarily conclusive that such heinous crimes did not actually occur and were, instead, quite possibly fabricated²⁰⁹ ²¹⁰. As the famed lawyer, Alan Dershowitz, who was falsely accused of rape, describes,

“If you call a woman a liar, even if you didn’t do [what you’re being accused of], you’re guilty of calling a woman a liar, so there’s no way out. If you don’t deny it, you’re thought to be guilty. If you do deny it, you’ve committed an additional political sin, so it’s a trap. And it feels just horrible...They either assume your guilt or they assume you shouldn’t be asserting your innocence. I had someone say to me at a public event, ‘I know you’re innocent, but why don’t you just fall on your sword in order to help the #metoo movement?’ I said I’m not going to do that. I support the #metoo movement


when it’s right, when there are real accusations. But I’m not going to become a sacrificial lamb to the abuses of the movement.”

Rape is an extremely heinous crime that warrants wholehearted denunciation, but when our immediate instinct is to carry out said denunciation without evaluating the allegation from a dispassionate perspective, we run the risk of ruining the lives of the innocent. And why should we be made to live with the blood of the innocent on our hands? Is it because the demented ideology that is critical theory declares that all men are “complicit” in pervading “rape culture” and demands they be made to pay for the sins of the wretched? Is that really true? Are all men really that evil? If one truly wishes to adopt that nihilistic perspective, then consider just for a second some of the men who we would be lumping in this supposed narrative of male “complicity” in perpetuating “rape culture”. The Reverend, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was the father of the Civil Rights Movement, it seems quite doubtful that a righteous, transcendental figure such as himself would be guilty of this great sin.

Perhaps he’s merely an anomaly, consider then one’s own father. For all his flaws, it would be fairly safe to assume that the vast majority of us have unreserved love and affection for him. Are our fathers complicit in perpetuating rape culture? Barring those who have experienced the hell that is growing up in an abusive home (and who deserve all our empathy), can we truly denounce the man who raised us as being no different from a monster who pillages women? Is your spouse, lover, brother or grandfather guilty of perpetuating rape culture? Probably not. Given this, we should most definitely abstain from lumping close to 4 billion people (most of whom we do not know) in the same category as the savages who sexually assault women, considering how unwilling we are to apply that same characterization to the individuals we hold closest to our heart. What gives us the right to admonish individuals we don’t even know, when we are reluctant to do so of individuals we know almost everything about? An episode documented by the clinical psychologist, Dr. Jordan B. Peterson, in his book ‘12 Rules for Life, An Antidote to Chaos’ helps illustrate the hypocrisy of castigating all men and then proceeding to shield those whom we hold dear from those same criticisms:

“When my now-adult daughter was a child, another child once hit her on the head with a metal toy truck. I watched that same child ... viciously push his younger sister backwards over a fragile glass-surfcaced coffee table. His mother picked him up, immediately afterward (but not her frightened daughter), and told him in hushed tones not to do such things, while she patted him comfortingly in a manner clearly indicative of approval. She was out to produce a little God-Emperor of the Universe. That’s the unstated goal of many a mother, including many who consider themselves

advocates for full gender equality. Such women object vociferously to any command uttered by an adult male, but will trot off in seconds to make their progeny a peanut-butter sandwich if he demands it while immersed self-importantly in a video game. The future mates of such boys have every reason to hate their mothers-in-law. Respect for women? That’s for other boys, other men – not their dear sons.”212

The final major derivative of social justice’s conception of ‘complicity’ is the widely held belief that “Silence is Violence”. This is the culmination of ‘complicity’ in social justice/critical theory ideology. If one does not openly declare support for any of the social justice causes, then one is equally guilty of oppression and will forever be marked an outcast by that horrible critical social justice catchword: Complicity. The pronouncement that “silence is violence” is, in reality, a call to virtue signal online. What is virtue? The distinction between virtue and vice is best defined through Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics. In it, Aristotle defined virtue (this is an overly simplified version, but serves utilitarian function here) as behaviours that are most conducive to happiness in life. In contrast, Aristotle defined vice in the opposite terms, as behaviours that are least conducive to happiness. Aristotle further observed that virtues always align themselves for the purpose of balance. Vice, in stark juxtaposition to virtue, is extreme in nature and can be described, in some senses, as a radical form of narcissism or self-promotion. With this in mind, can virtue signalling really be considered a manifestation of virtue? Most definitely not.

Professing one’s tolerance, openness and compassion online for likes to accumulate when under the influence of a pseudo-moralistic slogan cannot in any way be characterized as virtuous. Not in the sense that Aristotle defined it. Virtue signalling, at the behest of critical theorists and the horde of social justice warriors who lord the power of the “silence is violence” slogan as if it were gospel, is our commonest vice213. Another possible explanation for the hasty proclamations of “allyship” and self-denunciation, that has become an all-too-common feature of social media usage today, is that people are fearful of being denounced as immoral by a vociferous online mob. As one of the seminal figures in contemporary jazz, Bill Dixon, said, “Fear is the biggest motivator.” Indeed, our fear of being called out as complicit in society’s crimes leads us to self-prostrate online. Fear, coupled by the fact that we are driven by our innate desire to be deemed by others as morally upright, leads to a nauseating online culture of conformity. The psychology, displayed by those who comply with critical theory’s demands to self-flagellate in the name of ‘complicity’, emulates that demonstrated during Maoist-era “struggle sessions”.


In these struggle sessions, “the accused, often teachers suspected of lacking proletarian feeling, were paraded through streets and campuses, sometimes stadiums. It was important always to have a jeering crowd; it was important that the electric feeling that comes with the possibility of murder be present. Dunce caps, sometimes wastebaskets, were placed on the victims’ heads, and placards stipulating their crimes hung from their necks. The victims were accused, berated, assaulted. Many falsely confessed in the vain hope of mercy.”

In this sense, perhaps we should have a certain sympathy for those who do choose to self-flagellate online. This is because, like those deemed bourgeois in Mao’s totalitarian dictatorship, these individuals are could possibly be viewed as a captive class who fear the reckoning that will inevitably befall them should they fail to conform to the shrill demented choirs of the critical social justice ideologues who proclaim the ‘complicity’ of others in unverifiable crimes against humanity. Recall the aforementioned characterization drawn by Nietzsche of how the consciences of the well-constituted can be effectively poisoned, their souls broken by the vengefulness of others? Critical theorists are the ones doing this soul-breaking. The psychology exemplified by their lot is far darker and has its roots in an equally spine-chilling era of modern history. This moral perversion can be traced back to the Jacobins of the French Revolution and their obsession with Jean-Jacques Rousseau (funnily enough he had a great influence upon the postmodernists as well). Louis de Saint-Just was quite possibly the most bloodthirsty of the Jacobins and sought to consolidate “universal compulsory force”, which Rousseau had dreamed of, in order to combat recalcitrant private wills. Saint-Just and the Jacobins thus found it expedient that many die. The guillotine was kept busy under the radical general will of the Jacobins, who ruthlessly executed nobles, priests, and just about anyone whose politics was suspect. Their guiding precepts, in the words of Saint-Just, were to “not only punish traitors, but all people who are not enthusiastic.”

The Newspeak Version of Racism

The most plausible reason why the social justice conception of ‘complicity’ was used as the entry point to chart Newspeak is because it has since served as the foundational core for many deconstructive redefinitions of language within critical theory. Having understood the usage of ‘complicity’ one begins to realize the mammoth architecture that is being built off of this single redefinition. Take for instance the conception of “racism”

---


in critical theory and its subsequent remedy to said “racism” in the form of “equity”. Ibram X Kendi explains that,

“The opposite of ‘racist’ isn’t ‘not racist.’ It is ‘anti-racist.’ What’s the difference? One endorses either the idea of a racial hierarchy as a racist, or racial equality as an antiracist. One either believes problems are rooted in groups of people, as a racist, or locates the roots of problems in power and policies, as an anti-racist. One either allows racial inequities to persevere, as a racist, or confronts racial inequities, as an antiracist. There is no in-between safe space of ‘not racist.’ The claim of ‘not racist’ neutrality is a mask for racism.”

The ideological substructure in Kendi’s redefinition of what it means to be racist is extremely apparent: If one does not disavow racial disparities, one is complicit in a racist system and thereby also a racist. Furthermore, Kendi’s characterization of being ‘not racist’ (which contrary to what Kendi asserts is not a neutral position to hold, anyone who has ever studied English should know that when a negative adverb is placed in front of anything, the subsequent meaning is unequivocally negative) as a “mask for racism”, harkens back to postmodernism and the Foucauldian belief that the world is a playground for power structures as well as the Derridean charge that deconstruction must be employed to unmask the world’s oppressive agendas. Again, Kendi, conforming to the archetypal ideological presupposition of his peers in critical theory, espouses the doctrine that all racial disparities are a consequence of a single axiomatic dimension: Racist, white power structures established to bring about the continued subordination of ethnic minorities. In Kendi’s world, and by extension the morbid fantasy that critical theorists and their advocates reside in, there is no other factor worth considering as racism is seen as having parasitically infected every crevice of the system. In the eyes of the critical theorists, it is simply impossible for racism to be absent from any situation. How can this be so? Referring to Ibram X Kendi’s definition of structural racism and racist individuals helps clarify just how ludicrous critical theory’s conceptualization of racism truly is. Kendi’s Manichaean notion of racism in terms of public policy is stated clearly in his book: “Every policy in every institution in every community in every nation is producing or sustaining either racial inequity or equity,” with the former being racist and the latter being antiracist. In a clarification to Vox’s Ezra Klein, Kendi provides the example of the capital-gains tax cut. While most of us think of the capital-gains tax, if we think about it at all, as a policy that is neutral with regards to questions of race or racism. However, given that blacks are underrepresented among stockowners, Klein asks, would it be racist to support a capital-gains tax cut? “Yes,” Kendi answers, without a moment of hesitation. And in case one intended to evade the charge of racism by
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remaining agnostic on the capital-gains tax, that will not work either, as Kendi defines a racist as anyone who supports "a racist policy through their actions or inaction."218

Accordingly, one may be “actively” racist by perpetuating racial prejudice and discrimination against non-white people (particularly black people), or “passively” racist by failing to notice racism in oneself or others and thus failing to address it. Both of these are bad. One can only be “antiracist” by noticing racism all the time, in every person and every situation, even when it is not readily apparent (or a fair reading of the situation), and “calling it out.”219 This is understood to have the effect of making racism visible to everyone and enabling it to be deconstructed. The identification of racism against non-white people in any situation is always possible and completely unfalsifiable because it does not have to be intentional or conscious. For example, if a black customer and a white customer entered a store at the same time, and the white sales assistant approached the white customer to offer help first, this could be identified as racism because it prioritized the white person’s needs. However, if the sales assistant approached the black customer first, this could also be identified as racism because it could be read as indicating a distrust of black people and unwillingness to have them browse the shelves unsupervised. The shop assistant’s perception of her own motivations is irrelevant, and, to be a conscientious antiracist, she would need to admit her racism and pledge to do better. What is even more demented about the application of racism in critical theory is that in reference to the above analogy, it could apply even if the sales assistant in question were black or a member of some other ethnic minority (though in this case it would be characterized as the more forgivable sin of “internalized racism”). As Robin DiAngelo and Carole Schroeder enlighten us, there is a fundamental question that one is required to ask in order to properly evaluate every social interaction. The pair state, “the question is not ‘did racism take place?’ but rather, ‘how did racism manifest in this situation?’”220 To put this in the context of the preceding analogy about the racism of the sales assistant – in particular the racism underlying and defining her customer interactions – is omnipresent, though often hidden by her intended colour-blindness (an ideal that the critical theorists absolutely deplore and hence portray as internalized racism). Social Justice scholars, including DiAngelo, indicate that antiracism is a “practice” that requires a “lifelong commitment to an ongoing process”221 of fighting systemic


racism. This process expects people to constantly reflect upon the ways in which they, and others, support, or are complicit in, whiteness, anti-blackness, racism, or white supremacy, as these terms are understood from within the redefined context of critical social justice theory. Critical theorists then further expect antiracists to devoutly subscribe to social activism which allegedly minimizes its impacts, including—as DiAngelo has repeatedly stated—through the concerted attempt to “strive to be less white.”

To be antiracist, in the eyes of critical theorists, is to accept the social justice redefinition of racism as systemic (recall how, as mentioned in the section on science, critical theorists reject the need for proof as evidence is categorized as a white, male social construction for oppression)—that it exists everywhere and anywhere, always throughout time and space, regardless of intent—regardless of whether there are only a belligerent minority who fall into the category of being traditionally racist.

In the warped minds of critical theorists, the system itself is considered racist even if there aren’t any racists within that system. An antiracist has the obligation of searching for instances of racism that confirm the systemic “reality” of racism, internally, with others, and in society and its various forms of representation. Thus, in order to truly achieve our “higher calling” to be antiracists, we essentially need to live out Alfred Adler’s conception of “life-lies” and contort our personal experiences to fit this predetermined, narrow, dogmatic axiom. While critical theorists like Robin DiAngelo distinguish between “active racism” and “passive racism,” they indicate that it is not possible to be passively antiracist. There is only active antiracism. In fact, to be passively antiracist would be to be passively racist, instead. Given critical theory’s excessive use of Doublethink and the mental gymnastics they have effectively coerced us all into performing, even the Party in Orwell’s 1984 would be envious of how effectively critical theorists have harnessed the irrepressible power of Doublethink to create theories that are infallible despite their own logical incoherence. The conception of race in critical social justice theory is completely antithetical to the notion proposed by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in, what was arguably, his most famous speech. Dr. King proclaimed, atop the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington D.C., that he dreamt of a future where black Americans “will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.”

Dr. King sought the resolution of centuries of racial subordination and enslavement through the establishment of equality, by making race irrelevant in any social setting. This is why he spoke of how an indicator of his dreams being realized would be that “one day right there in Alabama little black boys and black girls will be able
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to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.” Dr. King’s message was that the realization of his dream had very little to do with material gains. Instead, his dream was concerned with the attainment of something far more profound: That blacks and whites would come to treat each other as equal human beings, not in terms of material, but rather in terms of a shared humanity. This appeal to our common humanity was what allowed his message to strike a chord in the hearts of millions. It was and continues to be the promissory note upon which the United States was founded. Though not fully realized over the lifetime of America’s founding fathers, their explicit intention was for the evils of their lifetime to gradually erode in the face of this simultaneously abstract and universal Truth. In grotesque contrast to Dr. King’s universal message of common humanity between races, critical theorists apparently seek to redress all racial issues by making race central to everything and over-amplifying its significance in relation to every racial outcome disparity in sight. The critical theorists, Delgado and Stefancic, emphasize as much, asserting, “as many crits believe, then the ‘ordinary business’ of society – the routines practices and institutions we rely on to do the world’s work will keep minorities in subordinate positions. Only aggressive, color-conscious efforts to change the way things are will do much to ameliorate misery.”

Sidebar: Critical Theory’s Assertions on Race v. The Facts

Critical Theory’s Assertions:

1. Affirmative Action was instrumental in liberating the incomes of Black Americans.

2. The legacy of chattel slavery and Jim Crow is extremely pernicious. The eternal effects of these two racist periods of history unmask themselves in the rampant existence of single-parent Black families, today.

3. White men continue to oppress Black Americans by denying them the right to receive bank loans, which has led to their continued economic destitution.
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4. Black unemployment is primarily caused by a shortage of jobs due to the legacy of Jim Crow segregation and discriminatory hiring practices.

5. The American education system prevents Black Americans from achieving success, by imposing oppressive colonial subjects like English and Mathematics.

The Facts:

1. As of 1940, 87 percent of Black families had incomes below the official poverty line. By 1960, before the passage of the Civil Rights Act, that figure was down to 47 percent.226 The Thernstroms document, “The proportion of black families who had to survive on incomes below the poverty line was thus cut in half.” This was “well before the Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlawed Jim Crow practices in employment, education, and public accommodations. It was also well before the advent of the War on Poverty and various other Great Society programs designed to uplift the poor.”227 The massive Black exodus – more than 3 million – from the Jim Crow south contributed significantly to this remarkable decline.228 The poverty rate among Blacks continued to decline at rapid rates such that by the time Affirmative Action rolled around, the poverty rate stood at 30 percent. What is significant to note is that during the entire first decade of Affirmative Action in the 70s, the poverty rate among Black families fell by a measly ONE percent, from 30 to 29 percent during the entire decade.229 As the Thernstroms reported, the progress of Black families only began to stall out after the serious imposition of anti-poverty policies: “progress in reducing black poverty rate was 30 percent in 1970, 29 percent in 1980, and 26 percent in 1995.”230 Furthermore, while it is an often repeated fact that the passage of the Civil Rights Act allowed a greater number of Blacks to enter the professions and other higher level occupations, it is an equally neglected fact that the number of Blacks rising into such high level occupations was even greater in the years preceding the passage of the Civil Rights Acts.231 Between 1950 and 1960 in New York City, which at the time had
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the largest urban Black population and where racial discrimination in employment was codified, the number of Black accountants rose by more than 200 percent. The number of Black engineers grew by 134 percent. The number of Black teachers increased by 125 percent. In the fields of law (55 percent), medicine (56 percent), nursing (90 percent) and social work (146 percent) the rise in the number of Blacks entering those professions was also extremely noticeable. The story of economic rise in the Black community cannot thus be attributed to affirmative action, as poverty rates were already plummeting with great speed during the period preceding its imposition, while such economic growth slowed when the policies meant to bring about material prosperity were implemented. As the Thernstroms concluded, “it certainly cannot be assumed that the progress that has been made since then could not possibly have occurred without affirmative action.”

2. In 1977, Herbert Gutman published a study on parenting and family structures within the Black community, entitled, ‘The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom, 1750-1925’. Gutman (and Leon F. Litwack in his own book) first found that all across America, the great majority of Black children were raised in two-parent homes during slavery. Gutman’s study, when localized to the Black community in Buffalo, New York, from the 1850s through to the 1920s, proved that, “double-headed kin related household always was the characteristic Buffalo Afro-American household, ranging from 82 percent to 92 percent.” A broader study on Gutman’s study of Buffalo confirmed the same family structure patterns in both the rural south and urban black households. During the era of the 1930s era of Jim Crow, Black children born to unwed mothers was 31 percent. By the early 1990s, that figure was 77 percent. Another indicator of the breakdown of the nuclear family post-Civil Acts Right


was the fact that by 1993, more than a million Black children were being raised by their grandparents. By 1995, only one third of Black children were being raised in two-parent homes. How can the breakdown of the nuclear family be attributed to the “legacy of slavery and Jim Crow,” if during those periods of history, the overwhelming majority of Black children were raised in two-parent homes?

3. While most loan applications are approved by banks, anti-racist critical theorists have denounced the fact that, a 1991 study showed that 34 percent of Black loan applicants have their applications rejected, which is disproportionately higher than the rejection rates of white loan applicants. This is evidence, they claim, of systemic racial oppression against Blacks in order to prevent them from flourishing economically. In 2000, mortgage lending data showed that Blacks were denied conventional mortgage loans at double the rate of whites. The case that critical theorists make thus far does seem plausible, except for the fact that they have omitted one very important piece of data. The 1991 study showed that white Americans had their loan applications denied at a higher rate than Asian Americans. Similarly, the mortgage lending data in 2000 also indicated that the denial rate of conventional mortgages was nearly double for whites than it was for Asian Americans. If we agree with the critical theorists that higher loan denial rates is concrete evidence of systemic racial oppression, then it follows that white Americans are systemically oppressed by Asian Americans, even though most banks are owned by whites. Why are there such obvious disparities in loan approval rates? Simply because loan approvals are highly dependent on credit scores and Asian Americans have higher credit scores than whites or Blacks and whites have higher credit scores than Blacks. The claim that Black Americans

---


are systemically oppressed by an inherently racist white system (in terms of loan approvals) grows even more erroneous when we realise that Black-owned banks rejected a significantly greater proportion of black mortgage loan applicants than did white-owned banks246.

4. If Black unemployment were truly due to a legacy of segregationist Jim Crow Laws, then how would we explain the fact that in every American census between 1890 and 1950, the Black labour force participation rate was higher than that of whites247? In 1986, the National Bureau of Economic Research released a detailed study of underprivileged communities in Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago. The study found that almost half (46 percent) of Black youths who were not in school and not working said it was “very easy” or “somewhat easy” to find a job in manual labour, and 71 percent said the same about the prospect of landing a minimum-wage job248. 16 percent of those surveyed reported having engaged in crimes; 26 percent reported drug use beyond marijuana; and 20 percent reported significant alcohol use. Only 17 percent of those surveyed spent their time on anything that could be considered socially useful250. The majority on the other hand “reported spending most of their time on ‘hanging out,’ ‘TV/ movies,’ ‘listening to music,’ or ‘getting high,’ as opposed to searching for jobs, reading or working around the house.”251 Another pertinent social pathology, that the Harvard economist, Richard Freeman, discovered was that almost a third of the Black youths surveyed (32 percent) deemed it more lucrative to be involved in criminal...
activity than holding an actual job. Furthermore, Freeman, together with Harry Holzer, found that a reliance on welfare programs worsened the employment prospects of Blacks: “One of the more depressing results of the study is our finding that youths whose families received assistance from major public programs for disadvantaged families did worse in the job market. Youths from welfare homes with the same family income and otherwise comparable to youths from non-welfare homes had a much worse experience in the job market.” All this is not to say that hiring discrimination does not exist, but it does mean that the rhetoric employed by critical theorists that every disparity in outcomes between ethnic groups is in large part or wholly due to racism, is utter hogwash.

5. In 1954, Chief Justice Earl Warren ruled in the case of Brown v. Board of Education, was inherently unequal, stating, “To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates feelings of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone.” One mile away from the Supreme Court, there was an all-Black public high school whose history and reputation belied the Chief Justice’s assertions. That school was Dunbar High School. Dunbar had a well-established reputation of sending a higher percentage of its graduates (80 percent) to college than any other white public school in Washington. Though most of Dunbar’s graduates proceeded to local colleges, some were beginning to go to leading American colleges and graduating Phi Beta Kappa as far back as 1892. Between 1892 and 1954, Dunbar’s graduates were admitted into prestigious institutions like Amherst, Harvard, Yale, Cornell, Williams and Dartmouth. Among graduates of the all-Black Dunbar High School, were the first Black female Ph.D. recipient, the first


Black federal judge, the first Black general, the first Black Cabinet member and the first Black tenured professor at a major university, Dr. Charles Drew, who won international recognition as a pioneer in developing the use of blood plasma. If Black Americans were able to achieve such a wealth of success even in the face of the seemingly insurmountable hurdle that was Jim Crow, what exactly is the excuse for a lack of academic achievement today (when racial segregation and racist laws have been abolished)? In the present, there exists a similar set of institutions like Dunbar which consistently produce Black academic excellence. These are charter schools. Charter schools do better than both New York public schools with comparable student demographics and also elite private schools which receive millions in private funding. Back in 2015, the New York Times reported that a higher percentage of the fifth-graders in a Success Academy charter school in Harlem passed the New York State Mathematics examination than any other public school fifth-graders in the entirety of New York state. This included, as the New York Times put it, “even their counterparts in the whitest richest suburbs, Scarsdale and Briarcliff Manor.”

As Thomas Sowell found when he compared charter schools against other schools in New York state was that “The 65 charter schools in New York City in 2017-2018 that were located in the same buildings with traditional public schools – each with most of their students either black or Hispanic... had a total of 172 grade levels tested on the New York State English Language Arts test. In 65 percent of those grade levels, a majority of charter school students scored at the ‘proficient’ level or above. The 72 traditional public schools located in the same buildings had a total of 191 grade levels. In 14 percent of those grade levels, a majority of students scored at the ‘proficient’ and above levels... In short, the disparity in achieving ‘proficiency’ was nearly five to one. On the ... Mathematics test, 68 percent of charter schools’ 161 grade levels had a majority of their students scoring at the ‘proficient’ level and above. In the traditional public schools’ 177 grade levels, just 10 percent had a majority of their students scoring at the ‘proficient’ level and above. Here the disparity in achieving ‘proficiency’ was nearly seven to one.”

What is so striking about these facts is that the average family income of children enrolled in the Success Academy was USD$49,800. In stark contrast, the average income of children from the three highest scoring public school districts in New York State ranged from USD$153,369 to
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USD$291,542. It cannot be that the education system is racist, if there are whole institutions producing ethnic minority students, who originate from the most impoverished backgrounds, that are able to surpass even the most privileged of white students in academic attainment.

**Conclusion:**

As much as it would be convenient for many if racism (whether systemic or otherwise) were the primary cause of racial outcome disparities, there is a considerable lack of empirical evidence to support such assertions. This probably explains why critical theory is so heavily reliant on coaxing individuals to live “life-lies”. Does racism exist? Definitely. Does it serve as the primary cause of racial outcome disparities? The facts suggest otherwise. One of the remaining few social scientists with any integrity, Orlando Patterson, wrote a scathing op-ed for the New York Times, castigating his fellow social scientists for their downright refusal to even consider how cultural traits impact Black outcomes. In his words,

> "The main cause for this shortcoming is a deep-seated dogma that has prevailed in social science and policy circles since the mid-1960s: the rejection of any explanation that invokes a group’s cultural attributes – its distinctive attributes, values and predispositions, and the resulting behavior of its members – and the relentless preference for relying on structural factors like low incomes, joblessness, poor schools and bad housing."  

Similarly, the sociologist, William Julius Wilson concurs with Patterson that any serious consideration of black cultural handicaps remains largely taboo. He stated in his periodical, *'Being Poor, Black, and American: The Impact of Political, Economic, and Cultural Forces,'*

> "Many liberal scholars are reluctant to discuss or research the role that culture plays in the negative outcomes found in the inner city," speculating that social scientists *'fear being criticized for reinforcing the popular view that negative social*
outcomes – poverty, unemployment, drug addiction, crime – are due to the shortcomings of the people themselves." 264

The esteemed Black author, Shelby Steele, describes the goal of America’s left-wing identity politicians (and by extension, the critical theorists) are intent on ensuring that Black voters become increasingly frustrated, paranoid and content on placing the onus on others to address racial disparities and negative social outcomes. Critical theory and its political abomination, identity politics, treat Blacks not as individuals with agency, but rather as a group of helpless, blameless victims. Steele writes,

“Liberalism in the twenty-first century is, for the most part, a moral manipulation that exaggerates inequity and unfairness in American life in order to justify overreaching public policy and programs,” this new breed of liberalism is “invested in an overstatement of America’s present sinfulness based on the nation’s past sins. It conflates the past into the present so that the present is indistinguishable from the ugly past. And so modern liberalism is grounded in a paradox: it tries to be progressive and forward looking by fixing its gaze backward. It insists that America’s shameful past is the best explanation of its current social problems.” 265

Critical Theory & “Equity”

Having recast what it means to be racist, critical theorists propose a remedy by which to resolve this inescapable reality. This comes in the form of calls by the critical theorists for “equity”. It is not the color-blind equality that Dr. King and many others have preached. No, sir. Critical social justice ideology takes great pains to distinguish its antidote to racial issues from traditional calls for equality and a level playing field. We already know that the postmodern Marxists classify “equality” in the most cynical, nihilistic terms possible: A mask for the preservation of oppression of ethnic minorities even after overtly oppressive policies have been repealed. This notion is one that critical theorists, especially Ibram X Kendi, hold to be one of the few self-evident Truths of reality. Where equality means that citizen A and citizen B are treated equally and are given identical opportunities, equity means adjusting shares in order to make the outcomes of citizens A and B equal. In that sense, equity is something like a kind of social communism, if we will—the forceful redistribution of shares, but not necessarily along lines of existing economic disparity but in order to adjust for and correct historical and current injustices, both those of the past and as have been drawn out by the various critical theories in the present (Decolonization Theory comes to mind).


In order to somewhat offset the radical nature of such a proposition, critical theory attempts, crudely, to imitate Dr. King’s appeal to universality by drawing an analogy to illustrate how their version of “equity” will play out in reality. The common favourite among critical theorists is to allude to how a disabled person in a wheelchair may need differential access to an elevator relative to an able-bodied individual. In this instance, the wheelchair-bound individual gets preferential treatment in the form of privilege over an able-bodied individual in using the elevator. However, within Critical Social Justice conceptions of the world, specifically critical disability studies here, invisible systems of power and privilege are understood to hold some people back in often invisible ways because of their race, gender, sexuality or other marginalized identity factors under the umbrella of critical theory. The critical theorist, Iris Marion Young, succinctly described this new dogma of equity when she wrote that, “racism, as well as other group oppressions ... condition the lives of most or all Blacks, Latinos, Asians, American Indians and Semitic people.” Therefore, she prescribes that the remedy required is “different treatment for oppressed and disadvantaged groups. To promote social justice, I argue, social policy should ... accord special treatment to groups.”

Therefore, “equity” requires giving some identity groups privileges in order to redress the perceived imbalance. This is the crucial distinction between attempting to force equality of outcome by enforcing some totalitarian resource allocation system and equality of opportunity, which Critical Social Justice regards not only as myth but as a harmful ideology that upholds injustices like “white supremacy”, “patriarchy” and “heteronormativity”. Critical theory, having thoroughly absorbed its Foucault, perceives all imbalances of representation along the lines of race, gender, sex, class and disability to be the direct consequence of lopsided power structures. This is why critical theory has methodically pushed for “equity” programs that arbitrarily increase the number of female or ethnic minority CEOs, doctors, lawyers and politicians. Of particular concern to the critical theorists are positions that have significant influence where their conception of power is concerned, including in terms of shaping everyday discourses within society. This thus explains why there are no calls to utilize equity to redress lower status outcome disparities such as the preponderance of males in the janitorial, construction or coal mining industries. It is also why there are no calls to equalize the preponderance of male suicides (men are three times more likely to commit suicide than women), male homelessness and male deaths at the workplace. Furthermore, for a set of ideologues who display such open revulsion to the notion of power, they do not hesitate to seize the opportunity to wrest power for themselves. Alas, as we know from Foucault,


internal incoherence in one's ideological substructure does not matter, as consistency is a white male social construction for oppression.

Moreover, equity, importantly, is often to be assessed historically, not merely in the present moment. If an identity group has historically been disenfranchised or excluded from a particular (power-bearing) role, equity often implies achieving representation numbers higher than demographic parity to make up for the historical injustice. Thus, we can understand quips like Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s when she said that the proof of equality would be that there are nine women on the Supreme Court of the United States (that is, the entire court is female). It is also in this light that many arguments about reparations (as demanded for by individuals like Ta-Nehisi Coates) - whether material, monetary, or symbolic (e.g., through employment in positions of “power”) - are situated.

That is, equity is not merely about making up for injustices but also often about “correcting past injustices.” (It is arguable that past injustices serve as the main claim made by critical theorists in attempting to enact equity programs.) It is in the name of equity that critical theorists like, Darnisa Armante, proudly exclaim, “If I had a poor white male student and I had a middle-class black boy, I would actually put my equitable strategies and interventions into that middle-class black boy because over the course of his lifetime he will have less access and less opportunities than the poor white boy. That’s what racial equity is.”

Today, as calls for equity are making significant headway in our everyday discourses, critical theory has decided to push the envelope for acceptable policy a step further. Critical theory now takes the position that equity can also be problematized as it is incremental (reformative) in nature. Reforms are rejected by critical theorists as they apparently just contribute back to upholding white, Western power structures. As Delgado and Stefancic assert, “Unlike traditional civil rights discourse, which stresses incrementalism and step by step progress, critical race theory questions the very foundations of the liberal order including equality theory, legal reasoning, Enlightenment rationalism, and neutral principles of constitutional law.”

If neutral positions are inadequate to provide appropriate redress, then the only option that we have left is to dissolve the rule of law and instigate a drastic overhaul of the current social order by launching social revolution.

This is, in fact, the underlying objective of the critical approach—social revolution based on the terms dictated by Critical Social Justice Theory—and incrementalist proposals like

---


diversity, equity, and inclusion are merely their own masks to hide this radical agenda. The end goal of critical theory (social revolution) has in fact begun to unmask itself and we can observe this from a number of critical social justice advocates, namely the co-founder of the BLM Movement, Patrisse Cullors openly declaring herself a “Trained Marxist” (along with many other damning facts that indicate her enthusiasm for what is arguably, history’s deadliest ideology) 270 and the Washington state legislature that assembled an ‘Equity Task Force’ that defined equity as: “Equity = Disrupt and Dismantle”. The proximity to Derrida’s deconstruction theory and its ideological inclinations towards Marxism is, in the case of the supplanting of “equality” with “equity”, unmistakable. So, what exactly is the problem with the favoring “equity” programs over “equality of opportunity”? The problem is that critical theorists make three calamitous assumptions about reality when formulating their policy prescriptions on “equity”. The first is that hierarchies are “unnatural” and merely power structures to ensure the perpetual subservience of minoritized groups. The second is that equality among individuals is “natural”. The final calamitous assumption is that social revolution will necessarily take place in the form of a peaceful transition and lead to utopia. These are the three fundamental assumptions that critical theorists make when they propose the “readjusting of shares” through “social revolution and equity programs” and I describe them as calamitous because of the simple fact that they are all dead WRONG.

Let us begin by unpacking the first implicit assumption, that hierarchies are “unnatural” and exist for the sole purpose of furthering power and oppression. The principal flaw with such an assumption is that one would have to cast aside literally hundreds of millions of years of evolutionary biology that indicate hierarchies as being part of the Darwinian process of natural selection. The Norwegian zoologist and comparative psychologist, Thorlief Schjelderup-Ebbe, observed all the way back in 1935 that even common barnyard chickens establish a “pecking order”271. One of the ways in which hierarchy asserts itself in the animal kingdom is in the form of territory, just like with suburbanites. The wiliest, strongest, healthiest and most fortunate animals occupy the best real estate and defend it. Territory in the animal world, as in ours, is of utmost importance and there is little difference between territorial rights and social status. If a contagious avian disease sweeps through a well-stratified territory occupied by birds, it is the most exposed and least sheltered birds, occupying the lowest rungs of the bird world, who are most likely to contract this disease and die272. This is true in the world of


human hierarchies as well, the poor are more susceptible to contracting both infectious and non-infectious diseases. Because territory matters and because the best domains are always in short supply, territory-seeking animals often come into conflict with each other. Conflict, in turn produces a whole host of problems, not least of which is learning how to win or lose without incurring too great a cost upon oneself. Imagine that two wolves engage in a squabble over a desirable habitat. This particular interaction can very easily degenerate into outright physical combat. Under such circumstances, one wolf, usually the stronger of the two, will eventually win – but even the victor may be severely hurt by the fight. That means a third wolf, an undamaged, shrewd bystander, can easily move in and cunningly defeat the now-crippled victor.

Yet, and this is often the case, such an occurrence is rare among wolves. How could this be so? It is because over the vast millennia of this planet’s history, animals who occupy the same territory as others have learned to co-habit. That is not to say that competition is erased entirely, it is simply to say that due to the wonders of biological evolution, animals and humans have learnt to compete with one another, whilst simultaneously reducing the potentiality for destructive elements of said competition to a minimum. Returning to the example of the wolf, a defeated wolf rolls over onto its back and exposes its throat to the victor, who forgoes its natural inclination for brutality and opts not to tear the loser’s throat out. The victorious wolf spares its fallen foe in order to gain a future hunting partner and ally. Innate within the nature of inhabitants of this planet is the propensity for conflict over resources, status and prime real estate. However, burgeoning in tandem with this irrepressible instinct for conflict, is the instinct to compete in a manner that is least destructive. This is why we can term hierarchies within humanity and animals to be dominance hierarchies, because they are the end result of conflict. Yet, these hierarchies must also, simultaneously, be characterized as hierarchies of competence, as their end result is, more often than not, mutually beneficial, peaceful coexistence between beings of the same species. A pride of lions does not cede control to a male lion until he has demonstrated his ability to serve as a competent leader. If hierarchies were merely constructed on the sole basis of dominance, then lions and all other animals would probably have gone extinct by now as they would be embroiled in perpetual conflict for positions of power.

However, the fact that animals are able to structure their lives in accordance to these hierarchies is a very distinct indicator that those atop social hierarchies are there not because they are dictatorial, but rather because they have successfully demonstrated their competence to others of their kind. We can also observe that hierarchies of competence often build peaceful coexistence within the animal kingdom. For instance, bearded dragons wave their front legs peaceably at one another to signify their desire for

continued social harmony. Dolphins, too seek the need to exist peacefully within hierarchies, producing specialized sound pulses while hunting and during other times of high adrenaline to reduce the potential for conflict between dominant and subordinate group members.

Humanity’s hierarchies can be construed in an almost identical manner with the nature of animals. Governments are elected into office due to the confidence of the electorate in their ability to govern competently. Even the most dictatorial of regimes first existed as hierarchies of competence before devolving into volatile power hierarchies. As Dr. Peterson describes,

“All that matters, from a Darwinian perspective, is permanence – and the dominance hierarchy, however social or cultural it may appear, has been around for some half a billion years. It’s permanent. It’s real. The dominance hierarchy is not capitalism. It’s not communism, either for that matter. It’s not the military-industrial complex. It’s not the patriarchy – that disposable, malleable, arbitrary cultural artefact. It’s not even a human creation; not in the most profound sense. It is instead a near-eternal aspect of the environment, and much of what is blamed on these ephemeral manifestations is a consequence of its unchanging existence.”

Those currently proposing deconstruction by means of equity are not intent solely on dismantling the current hierarchy. They also wish to institute their own. The founder of Fabian socialism, Beatrice Webb, indicated as much, stating, “we have little faith in the ‘average sensual man’, we do not believe that he can do much more than describe his grievances, we do not think he can prescribe his remedies.” This dictate is one that critical theory subscribes to. Even within current social justice circles, there exists a hierarchy. The critical theorists invent their fatuous theories, the social justice activists absorb said theory as if it were gospel, worshipping the authors of these theories as messiahs and finally when this information is distilled to netizens, they begin uplifting the activists who helped “enlighten” them. The final stage of this hierarchy is how netizens then allow this information metastasize to more laypersons. The social justice hierarchy simply put is: critical theorists > activists > netizens/ layperson. The critical theorists justification for obtaining their place atop this hierarchy (position of “power” in their terms, an intellectual aristocracy in rational terms) is that they occupy a moral expertise which legitimizes their standing within the prevailing social vision. In essence, those who call for equity merely demonize the current existence of hierarchies, only to later impose a repressive aristocracy upon the masses.

274 Ibid, pp. 16-17.

While the current social order does involve a natural hierarchy, it is constructed, predominantly, on the basis of competence and competence informs the direction and manner by which individuals progress and operate within these hierarchies. In contrast, hierarchies imposed by those who champion equity/equality of outcomes, throw the need for competence out the window, base their presuppositions entirely on the benighted notion that equality between individuals is “natural” and must be achieved by upending the current order that has perpetuated infinite inequality. Critical theorists and activists thus view themselves as the anointed elite intelligentsia whose duty it is to effect, in Lenin’s words, a “revolution from above” and then impose equality of outcomes in a “dictatorship of the proletariat”\textsuperscript{276} (this sounds very peaceful indeed ☺). This brings us squarely to the critical theorist’s insistence that equality is part of the “natural” order and must be achieved by any means necessary. Such a belief can actually be traced back to the work of Counter-Enlightenment philosopher, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who served as a great inspiration and laid much of the groundwork for his postmodernist successors. Rousseau was thus a key proponent (and even after death, remains instrumental to the perpetuation) of the invincible fallacy that inequality between individuals is caused primarily by biased human interventions from within a tyrannical capitalist structure.

He characterized these inequities in his eighteenth century piece, ‘A Discourse on Inequality’, writing of “the equality which nature established among men and the inequality which they have instituted among themselves.”\textsuperscript{277} However, human beings have never been and are nowhere close to being equal. As extensive research has proven that nutritional differences among pregnant women have produced IQ differences amongst children\textsuperscript{278, 279}. Contrary to what Rousseau and the perpetrators of the equity narrative assert, equality of circumstances is nothing more than a rhetorical device used to mask the harsh realities of life. Even in the face of equal opportunities, no one enters this world with the same potentiality to seize those opportunities as the next individual. Paradoxically, this is true even in an environment where one would expect the greatest equality: among children born and raised by the same set of parents, in the same home. Inequality of outcomes among children in the same household is a subject that has been well-documented for centuries\textsuperscript{280}.


Most notably, this general pattern unveiled itself in a study of National Merit Scholarship finalists in the US. More than half the finalists were first-born children in their family, regardless of whether they came from two-child, three-child, four-child or five-child families. Even in five-child families, the first-born was the National Merit Scholarship finalist more often than the other four siblings combined\textsuperscript{281}. If we know that nature itself has played a significant role in cementing inequality between individuals, how then are we to expect equality between individuals in society, let alone a multicultural society? A landmark scholarly study of ethnically divided societies around the world described the fact that, when observing “proportional representation” of ethnic groups in terms of educational attainment, economic progress and occupational preferences, “\textit{few, if any societies have ever approximated this description}”\textsuperscript{282}. Another international study of multi-ethnic, multi-faith societies referred to the “\textit{universality of ethnic inequality}” and emphasised the fact that such inequities are multidimensional in nature, stating, “\textit{All multi-ethnic societies exhibit a tendency for ethnic groups to engage in different occupations, have different levels (and often, types) of education, and receive different incomes, and occupy a different place in the social hierarchy}.”\textsuperscript{283}

To compound matters for the critical theorists who assert that equality is the “natural” state of Being, two mathematicians unearthed the principle of unequal distribution as an evolutionarily ingrained phenomenon. Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923), the Italian polymath, discovered what is now referred to as the “Pareto Distribution”, which was applied to wealth distribution and Derek J. de Solla Price discovered what is now termed “Price’s Law”, which was applied to science. \textit{These two mathematical principles sought to explain that unequal distribution of resources/ productivity was a naturally occurring phenomenon.} They are modelled approximately by an L-shaped curve with the vertical axis representing the number of people and the horizontal axis representing the proportion of resources accumulated\textsuperscript{284}. Pareto’s discovery was highly applicable in charting wealth distribution for every society studied in the twentieth century, regardless of the form of government. Afterwards, the applicability of both principles became near universal and explained the frequency of words used in any given language (90 percent of communication occurs using just 500 words); why only a tiny proportion of musicians have a monopoly on all commercially recorded music; why only a handful of scientists publish the majority of all scientific papers; why 1.5 million separately titled books are

\textsuperscript{281} Ibid., p. 45.


published in the US every year with only 500 authors selling over 100,000 copies285; amongst many other things.

Even modern societies that decided to go against the available biological literature and consequently attempted to eliminate gender differences between men and women, have found it impossible to achieve. These sociologists and countries seemingly obeyed the teachings of the pioneering gender theorist, Simone de Beauvoir (she was also a long-time partner of the postmodern Marxist Jean-Paul Sartre), who wrote, “One is not born, but rather becomes a woman. No biological, psychological, or economic fate determines the figure that the human female presents in society; it is civilization as a whole that produces this creature, intermediate between male and eunuch, which is described as feminine.”286 The expectation among those conducting the respective studies and experiments, as informed by the dogma preached by Beauvoir, was that once free of gender expectations, women would be liberated and do as well as, if not better, than men. The various individuals and governments who carried out these societal experiments assumed, much like Beauvoir and today's critical theorists, that all differences between sexes were socio-cultural (basically the patriarchy). Thus, they attempted to eliminate these sociocultural differences by constructing gender-egalitarian societies that incentivized women to participate in male-dominated fields (to name one of the various methods employed). The results, however, went completely against conventional wisdom.


It was discovered that the more a society attempted to eliminate these supposedly "socio-cultural" differences and achieve gender-equality, the more pronounced those differences became. Correspondingly, equally as perplexing to the social scientists and the politicians was the discovery that the more regressive a society was (with a few exceptions), the less distinctly gender differences manifested themselves. For instance, the 2015 World Economic Forum ranked Rwanda the 6th most progressive country with respect to gender. This is because men and women earn similar wages and have similar labour force participation rates. But Rwanda is hardly an advanced economy. When we take a deeper look at the state of the country itself, 44.9 percent of its citizens live in absolute poverty and "in most rural areas the poorest citizens tend to be women, often genocide survivors." The idea that Rwanda is a utopia for gender equality grows even more spurious when we consider the fact that two in five Rwandan women suffer physical violence at least once since they were fifteen and one in five Rwandan women experience sexual violence. The most notable study, conducted by Schmitt, Realo, Voraceck and Allik found that, "With improved national wealth and equality of the sexes, it seems differences between men and women in personality traits do not diminish. On the contrary, the differences become conspicuously larger."

Should anyone doubt their methodology and simultaneously disregard all the other studies on the matter, the quartet have this to say: “In this study, a collection of eight different gender equality indicators provided a comprehensive set of measures that assess disparity between male and female roles in society. In every case, significant findings suggest that greater nation-level gender equality leads to psychological dissimilarity in men’s and women’s personality traits." This was especially the case in Scandinavia where the push for gender-egalitarianism between men and women had gone the furthest. For the sake of clarity, it is worth repeating: Gender differences
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MAXIMIZED in societies where gender-egalitarianism and gender-equality received the most zealous pushes. Schmitt, Realo, Voraceck and Allik found that this is because “society becomes more prosperous and more egalitarian, innate dispositional differences between men and women have more space to develop and the gap that exists between men and women in their personality traits becomes wider.” This is exactly the opposite result that those conducting the experiments anticipated and serves as jaw-crunching right hook to the critical theorists who ceaselessly aver that gender is a social construct and differences between men and women are a consequence of the oppressive patriarchy. Indeed, the patriarchy exists (the Middle East, North Korea and certain nations within the African continent serve as enduring examples). However, as the data proves, disparities in outcomes between men and women have very little to do with the patriarchy and more to do with innate biological differences (as science has informed us) that serve as influences in educational, occupational and recreational preferences between men and women. This is observed from how all these studies concluded that egalitarian countries where one would expect the smallest gap between the sexes (due to their strenuous attempts at supposedly eliminating ‘patriarchal’ sociocultural differences), actually caused gender differences to make themselves more conspicuous.

Sidebar: More Proof that the "Patriarchy" is Not the Cause of Gender Gaps

Many critical theorists and radical feminists have long claimed that the disparities between men and women in terms of income and high-paying occupations such as executive positions, in science, math, economics and engineering serve as clear-cut evidence of “discrimination” by the “oppressive patriarchy.” For instance, we see that in the U.S. as of 2000, women made up less than 20 percent of the workforce in science and technology and only 9 percent of the workforce in engineering. So far so good,


the critical thesis on the surface appears to be quite sturdy. However, correlation is not causation. Just because these statistics seemingly prove critical theory right, does not mean that we should accept their claims as the absolute Truth.

What happens when we actually investigate the reasons as to those causes, personal career preferences and inherent biological differences seem to contribute in large part to those disparities in female representation within various occupational fields. For instance, in a 2006 study conducted by psychologists Steve Strand, Ian Deary and Pauline Smith, it was found that when the test scores of 300,000 British students were analyzed, girls had a slightly higher average score in verbal reasoning and boys a slightly higher average score in quantitative reasoning. What was most notable about the findings of this study was that boys were substantially overrepresented at the high and low tail ends of the distribution of quantitative reasoning scores. This means that there were significantly more high performing boys than high performing girls in quantitative reasoning and that there were significantly more poor performing boys than poor performing girls in quantitative reasoning. In fact, 60 percent of students who scored in the highest tenth for quantitative reasoning were boys.

This holds true in the American context as well, as the average score of male students taking the SAT-Math test has been consistently higher than the average score of female students taking the same test. This general pattern has held true since 1967. For the 2016 American SAT-M scores, just like what was found in the 2006 British study, male students were greatly overrepresented at the tail ends of the distribution. Among those who scored between 700-800 points (the highest decile), 61.5 percent of those students were male with only 38.5 percent being female. In the next highest decile, male students accounted for 54.6 percent of those who scored between 600 and 700 points. This should not be misconstrued as saying “Girls are bad at math!” because that’s very obviously an erroneous sentiment to hold. In fact, based on the 2016 candidature for the SAT-M, girls and in spite of the higher averages of boys, girls seem to be better at Math on average as they were overrepresented (55 percent) in advanced AP/Honors math classes compared to boys (45 percent). However, what is true, is that at the extremes (meaning the most brilliant performers), boys do better than girls.
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girls in terms of standardized math testing scores. Of all female test-takers in 2016, only 5.1 percent were in the top decile. In contrast, among male test-takers in 2016, 9.4 percent were in the top decile. As STEM fields require excellence in quantitative reasoning, the data collected via SAT-M and British standardized testing go a long way to explaining gender gaps in science and math related fields.

Average SAT-M scores of males and females, 1967-2016

For those inclined to question whether the sociocultural influences of male and female students impacted the SAT scores seen above, let me assure you, this is simply not the case. In America, contrary to popular belief, parents do not treat their sons and
An assessment of 172 studies involving over 28,000 children found that boys and girls were given similar amounts of encouragement, warmth, nurturance, restrictiveness, discipline, and clarity of communication. The only exception was that two-thirds of the boys were discouraged by their fathers from playing with dolls. Therefore, until such time as there is a study proving a causal link between being allowed to play with dolls and poorer average SAT-M scores, very little credence can be given to the notion that sociocultural influences caused the above gender inequities.

Another significant explanation for gender gaps in the STEM fields would be the respective career preferences among men and women. In 2000, the social scientist, Patti Hausman, sought to explain gender gaps in STEM as a consequence in variances between the preferred career paths of men and women. She stated, “The question of why more women don’t choose careers in engineering has a rather obvious answer: Because they don’t want to. Wherever you go, you will find females far less likely than males to see what is so fascinating about ohms, carburetors, or quarks. Reinventing the curriculum will not make me more interested in how my dishwasher works.”

In most professions, average differences in career preferences have set men and women on different paths. The most comprehensive study, spanning 35 years, of differences in career preferences between men and women was conducted by David Lubinski and Camilla Benbow. The pair selected a sample of America’s most mathematically precocious boys and girls based on their seventh or eighth grade SAT scores. The pair found that mathematically gifted girls were more interested in people, “social values,” and humanitarian and altruistic goals. In contrast, the pair found that the gifted boys were more interested in things, “theoretical values,” and abstract intellectual inquiry. In line with their values, when it came time for the gifted girls to enter college, they chose to pursue a broad range of courses from life sciences to the arts and humanities. In contrast, the gifted boys remained fixed in their interests and

---


stuck to pursuing math and science. Lubinski and Benbow found that “For example, in the SMPY cohorts, although more mathematically precocious males than females entered math-science careers, this does not necessarily imply a loss of talent because the women secured similar proportions of advanced degrees and high-level careers in areas more correspondent with the multidimensionality of their ability-preference pattern (e.g., administration, law, medicine, and the social sciences).”

In a 2010 study, psychologist, Richard Lippa, came to similar conclusions as Lubinski and Benbow, finding that there were very large differences between genders on the people-things dimension. Lippa found that women were much more people-oriented while men were much more thing-oriented. Lippa also discovered that “Gender differences in personality tend to be larger in gender-egalitarian societies than in gender-inegalitarian societies, a finding that contradicts social role theory but is consistent with evolutionary, attributional, and social comparison theories. In contrast, gender differences in interests appear to be consistent across cultures and over time, a finding that suggests possible biologic influences.” The findings of Lippa, as well as Lubinski and Benbow clearly demonstrate the preponderance of men in STEM fields as being a consequence of personal preference rather than gender discrimination.

To cast doubt on critical theory’s view that gender gaps in STEM fields are a consequence of gender discrimination, one need only consult the findings of psychologists Wendy Williams and Stephen Ceci. The pair examined a number of datasets on gender discrimination in interviewing and hiring professors and in grant and manuscript reviewing. Employing a comprehensive research methodology, they not only found little evidence of discrimination, but also reported that “men and women faculty members from all four fields [biology, engineering, economics, and
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psychology] preferred female applicants 2:1 over identically qualified males

Preferences and biological differences in personality also go a long way to explaining the overrepresentation of males in high-paying jobs. On average, men's self-esteem is more highly tied to social status, salary and wealth, which would perhaps indicate a greater drive to achieve higher-status executive positions than women. As Kingsley Browne’s study of male-female preferences yielded, on average men are greater risk takers and that is reflected in their career paths, even when qualifications are held constant between genders. This explains why a higher proportion of doctors running more lucrative private practices are male. Men, on the extreme tail ends of personality trait distributions, also have a tendency to be hyper-competitive and thereby less agreeable, wanting to win at all costs. Such a high drive inevitably leads to greater representation in executive roles due to the hyper-competitive hierarchies in place within privatized organizations. Women, on average, prefer comfort in a work environment and are more willing to sacrifice wages for additional comfort.

Extensive research has also shown that while both men and women value their children, the tradeoff between investing time in one's work and in one's child is balanced differently between genders. Women are more attentive to the well-being of their children and place a higher value on spending time with them, than do men.

The greater compulsion women feel, on average, to care for their child invariably leads to career choices that allow them to spend more time at home. This can come in the
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form of shorter working hours, fewer relocations, jobs that offer greater stability (the civil service comes to mind). However, the trade-off for this decision is that women will have to somewhat hamper their promotional opportunities, expect lower wages than men of the same seniority and less prestige. This is documented in Lubinski and Benbow’s study of high-ability students. The pair found that when their samples reached adulthood and entered the workforce, “The percentage of individuals who were working and preferred to work less than 40 hr per week was appreciably greater among the women than the men.” The percentage of men working and who preferred working more than 40 hours per week was also significantly higher than it was among women.

The preference for a healthier work-life balance among women would go a long way to explaining why, when they hit their thirties, most of the top-rate female lawyers bail out of their high-pressure careers. Only 15 percent of equity partners at the two hundred biggest U.S. law firms are women. This may seem alarming, but it becomes highly plausible when we consider individual career preferences between men and women. Women’s preferences for working shorter hours has been noted in numerous studies that sought to identify the root cause of the gender wage gap. A study conducted by The New England Journal of Medicine found that “young male physicians earned 41 percent more per year than young female physicians … However, after adjusting for differences in specialty, practice setting, and other characteristics, no earnings difference was evident.” The same study found that young male physicians worked over 500 hours a year more than young female physicians. A Harvard Business Review survey among individuals whose earnings were in the top 6 percent highlighted how 62 percent worked more than 50 hours a week and 35 percent worked more than 60 hours a week. Among those who held these “extreme” jobs – extreme in working hours and pressure – less than a fifth were women. When the women who did work in
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these “extreme” jobs were compared with men in the same job type, women were only half as likely to say that they wanted to still be working in such high-pressure environments in the next five years.328

Furthermore, a consistent trend that appears is that women’s earnings tend to be similar if not higher than men’s when they start in entry-level positions.329 However, as men and women grow older, the earnings of men become higher than that of women. During the intervening years, women’s labor force participation rates are mainly affected by child-bearing responsibilities. An American Economic Review study found that “at ages 25-44, the prime period for career development, 34 percent of women with children under the age of six were out of the labor force, compared to 16 percent of women without children. Thirty percent of employed mother worked part time, compared with 11 percent of women with no children. Among men, however, the presence of children is associated with an increase in work involvement. Only 4 percent of men with children under the age of six are out of the labor force, and among employed fathers only 2 percent worked part time.”330

The New York Times reported that among Yale alumni in their forties, “only 56 percent of the women still worked compared to 90 percent of the men.”331 It was much the same amongst female graduates from Harvard: “31 percent of the women from the class of 1981, 1985 and 1991 who answered the survey worked only part time or on contract, and another 31 percent did not work at all, levels strikingly similar to the percentages of the Yale students interviewed who predicted they would stay at home or work part time in their 30’s and 40’s.”332 The economist, Sylvia Ann Hewlett, in an empirical study on the career preferences of men and women, found that:

“About 37% of women take an off-ramp at some point in their career, meaning they quit their jobs – but for an average 2.2 years. Another substantial number take scenic routes for a while – intentionally not ratcheting up their assignments. For instance, 36% of highly qualified women have sought part-time jobs for some period, while others have declined promotions or deliberately chosen jobs with fewer responsibility … The data show that highly qualified women aren’t afraid of
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hard work and responsibility. But it's hard to sustain a 73-hour workweek if you have serious responsibilities in other parts of your life."³³³

There will never be perfect 50:50 gender parity in any given field. It is unavoidable that women will be overrepresented in some, and underrepresented in others. Finding a field where women are underrepresented is not sufficient evidence to infer patriarchal oppression against women. As the economist Jennifer Roback rightfully pointed out, "Once we observe that people sacrifice money income for other pleasureable things we can infer next to nothing by comparing that income of one person with another's."³³⁴ In fact, robust differences in occupational choices and representation are positive indicators of prosperous and egalitarian societies. Societies where, according to Schmitt, Realo, Voracek and Alli, the "innate dispositional differences between men and women have more space to develop."³³⁵

Critical theory's narrative of equity with which we contend today, posits that if some social categories of people are not equally represented in particular occupations, institutions, or income brackets, that is regarded as the malevolence of society interfering with the supposedly natural equality of outcomes from occurring, and not the fault of the individual in question. When we speak of nature and the supposed "natural equality", there is a fundamental asymmetry in burdens of proof. One can cite reams of scientific and historical literature as evidence of the inequality that nature institutes, yet there is simultaneously no corresponding burden of proof to present a single example of "natural", un-gerrymandered equal representation of various social groups in any given endeavour. For Rousseau and students of his school of thought, there is not one citation of a single society, country or group of individuals in any given century out of the vast millennia of human history, where equality between individuals has been a natural or even desirable state. In any activity where individuals are free to compete, there has never been an equality or proportional representation of individual outcomes. One can consult the litany of arguments, where proponents of equity assert that statistical disparities prove biased treatment and that there is a need to reinstate "natural" equality, without finding a single empirical example of the even distribution of social groups in any competitive endeavour, in any country or in any period of history.


The philosopher whose teachings were defiled by postmodernists, Friedrich Nietzsche, predicted that there may come a time, in the age of man, where some fiendish forces would coalesce to push for the execution of an unnatural, artificial “equality” amongst men. Nietzsche wrote,

“For that man be delivered from revenge – that is for me the bridge to the highest hope, and a rainbow after long storms. The tarantulas, of course, would have it otherwise. ‘What justice means to us is precisely that the world be filled with the storms of our revenge’ – thus they speak to each other. ‘We shall wreak vengeance and abuse on all whose equals we are not’ – thus do the tarantula-hearts vow. ‘And “will to equality” shall henceforth be the name of virtue; and against all that has power we want to raise our clamor!’ You preachers of equality, the tyrant-mania of impotence clamors thus out of you for equality: your most secret ambitions to be tyrants thus shroud themselves in words of virtue.” 336

Nietzsche makes one of a vital point about critical theory here. The critical theorists, having been shunned for decades by the hard sciences and accredited social science fields (psychology and economics), have consequently grown resentful and wish enact revenge by recasting their hatred onto the world. However, as Nietzsche notes, these ‘tarantulas’ (critical theorists) cannot pursue vengeance in the traditional sense. People, especially having been privy to the atrocities of Nazism during World War Two, would naturally be put off by nihilistic calls for anarchy or tyranny. This is why it is necessary for them to demonize the system, to paint inequality as a perverted bane to societal progress and simultaneously cast aside vast swathes of history that reveal that “equity” has only ever been achieved by inhumane violence and bloodshed. Concurrently, they portray equality as the ultimate virtue, as if the “natural” state of man is that of equals.

If something is a plague, as David Attenborough has it337, or a cancer, as the Club of Rome claimed338, the person who eradicates it is a hero – a veritable planetary saviour, a messiah who has effectively baptized the world of its evils. If the critical theorists challenge the status quo (having demonized the inequities it produces) in the name of fairness (masking their inner self-loathing) people will glorify their virtuosity and cast aside any nagging doubts about their true intentions. For who does not wish to walk the virtuous path? Well, for one, the critical theorists do not wish to do so. But how do we


know this? We know it because underneath their virtue signalling calls for greater equality of outcomes lie indescribable atrocities. It is thus time for us to unmask the Pandora’s Box of unspeakable horrors that radical advances, made in the name of “equity” and “fairness,” unleash upon the societies they have been implemented in. The acclaimed psychologist, Carl Jung, famously quipped, “*If you cannot understand why someone did something, look at the consequences – and infer the motivation.*” 339 Given how inequality is in fact man’s natural state, and noting the additional fact that more amicable means of ensuring equality of outcome have magnified differences between various social groups, it is hard to fathom how an individual could seek to tamper with the very fabric nature and earnestly expect a net positive sequela. This is why the following section will employ Jung’s aforementioned philosophical thesis to examine the consequences of trying to bulldoze nature and imposing “equity”.

The ideological undercurrent of critical theory is Marxist in nature. Even if we dismiss the fact that critical theory was developed by devout-Marxists, Antonio Gramsci340 and Max Horkheimer341 (who both believed, like Marx, that the free market was a mask that disguised the true condition of Western civilization: inequality, exploitation and domination), the attempt by critical theorists to deconstruct language, history and society down to brutal economics is an inherently Marxist trait. This is because the conception of liberation amongst critical theorists is expressed in the form of monetary value and positions of authority, rather than the search for individual fulfilment. That is why there are calls for greater representation of female CEOs and none for female labourers. It is also why there are greater calls for more Black American politicians and none for more Black Americans in coal mining. A simple equation maps the view proposed by the critical theorists:

\[
\text{Material Wealth} + \text{Social Status} = \text{Power} + \text{Equitable Utopian Society} \\
\text{(for all identity groups)}
\]

Similarly, Marx held the view that the world revolved around a single axiom (economics), with the resulting redistribution bringing about a utopian state. However, Marx was

---


primarily concerned with the rich and the poor, so there is a slight deviation in the beneficiaries of Marx’s utopia. The equation as idealized by Marx goes:

Material Wealth + Social Status = Power + Equitable Utopian Society (for the proletariat)

Who can deny that the notion of achieving nirvana on earth is not an extremely seductive proposition? However, our aim here is not to reside in the utopian bubble presented to us by critical theorists and is instead to pursue Jung’s thesis that the consequences of a proposition often inform us of its actual motivations. Therefore, the key question we need to be asking ourselves here is: Does the enforcement of equality of outcomes really effectuate utopia?

When the Marxist conception of equality of outcomes was put into practice in the USSR, China, Vietnam, Cambodia, Cuba, modern-day Venezuela and many other countries around the globe, the resulting economic redistribution was a brutal process. Private property was forcibly seized, and the rural poor were unceremoniously collectivized. The result? A hundred and ten million deaths in the twentieth century alone and hundreds of millions more living in utter destitution that no one today can fully comprehend. The economic systems were so corrupt and volatile that starvation and deprivation became the norm. And just like the preceding totalitarian regime in Nazi Germany, citizens under the fist of communist authoritarianism lived in a state of perpetual paranoia as friends and family betrayed each other. George Orwell captured the anxiety of living in a totalitarian regime, that enforced predetermined outcomes on its citizens, perfectly in the sentiment,

“Already we are breaking down the habits of thought which have survived from before the revolution. We have cut the links between child and parent and between man and man and between man and woman. No one dares trust a wife or a child or a friend any longer. But in the future there will be no wives and no friends.”

The totalitarian communist regimes did not merely oppress individuals by stripping the productive of their human capital (and in most cases their lives), or even by creating unliveable conditions for human sustenance. A large part of what made living under the states that imposed an equality of outcomes was that they created a mental Hellscape within the mind where one was tormented by the omnipresent fear of being accused (the veracity of the accusation did not matter, guilt was immediately assumed – nice parallel to critical theory and its conception of racism here) of espousing bourgeois (capitalist and therefore seditious) beliefs. Most of us are unable to literally conceive of what endless Hell the citizens under the tyrannical rule of the card-carrying, “equality of outcome”

communists had to bear. The closest possible depiction of their collective misery would be that of the metaphorical, religious Hell as described in John Milton’s ‘Paradise Lost’:

The dismal situation waste and wild:
A dungeon horrible on all sides round
As one great furnace flam’d: yet from those flames
No light, but rather darkness visible
Serv’d only to discover sights of woe,
Regions of sorrow, doleful shades; where peace
And rest can never dwell; hope never comes
That comes to all; but torture without end
Still urges, and a fiery deluge fed,
With ever-burning sulphur unconsum’d!

It is important, at this point, to draw what is another pivotal parallel between communism and critical theory. What makes the connection between communism and critical theory so glaring is that both were born out of the fundamental conviction that instituting mandatory “equality of outcomes/equity” would unequivocally beget utopia. As we know from the communists, utopia was never and has never been achieved. Instead, Hell was.

In the 1930s, at the height of the Great Depression, the Stalinist Soviets sent two million kulaks (rich peasants, including those who owned a small number of cows, who employed a couple of hired hands, or held a few acres more land than was deemed equitable) to the Gulags (forced-labour camps, like Auschwitz) of Siberia. From the communist perspective, much like that espoused by critical theory, these kulaks had amassed their relative wealth by exploiting those around them and hence deserved their fate. Wealth was a literal symbol of oppression, an excess of state distributed property implied theft. It was high time the proletariat get some equity! More than thirty thousand kulaks were executed on the spot, many more met their untimely fates at the hands of resentful, unproductive neighbours, who employed their morally righteous collectivist ideals to enact inhumane acts of barbarism.

Much like ethnic majorities, men, the wealthy and heterosexuals today, the kulaks then were “enemies of the people,” sub-human, scum, vermin, filth and swine. A popular slogan at the time was, “We will make soap out of the kulak!” The kulaks were driven, naked, into the streets, beaten and compelled to dig their own mass graves. The women were raped. Their belongings “expropriated”, which as Solzhenitsyn informs, typically


referred to how their homes were stripped down to the rafters and ceiling beams, with everything else inside looted. In many places, the non-kulak peasants attempted to show solidarity and defend the persecuted families. Such efforts proved futile as these defenders were either brutally ravaged or sent down to the Gulags with those they attempted to defend. The kulaks who managed, by some miracle, to survive were made to endure what was arguably an even worse fate: Being sent to the wastelands that were the Siberian Gulags, where shelter of the most inferior kind awaited them upon arrival in the desolate taiga.\textsuperscript{346} In accordance with the Pareto Distribution and Price’s Law, that only a minority are responsible for most of the production in any field, the “parasitical” kulaks were far and away the most skilful and hardworking farmers in the Soviet Union. It is thus no wonder why following their exile and slaughter, Soviet agricultural output nosedived. What scraps remained for the starving people of the countryside was stripped from them and redistributed into the cities, in the name of equity. Rural farmers who went out into the fields after the harvest to nick some grains of wheat for their malnourished families were executed on the spot. The result? Six million died of starvation in the Ukraine, the epicentre for Soviet agricultural output, in the 1930s. The privation descended to such an agonizing nadir that the Soviet regime had to release a poster declaring that “\textit{To eat your own children is a barbarian act.”}\textsuperscript{347}

However, such literal Hell did not deter the Soviets from persisting in their ill-defined Marxist pursuit of utopia. Once again, referring to Solzhenitsyn’s masterpiece, the author documented how, in spite of the inhumane violence, perpetual suffering and constant paranoia that typified life in the Soviet Union, there was an almost universal proclivity for the Soviet citizen to falsify his own day-to-day personal experiences, deny his own state-induced suffering, and thereby bolster the communist system’s dictate of “equality of outcome”.\textsuperscript{348} It was this inauthentic “\textit{life-lie}” that aided and abetted Stalin’s delusions that utopia was possible even after one human catastrophe led to another. Every savage intervention was justified in the eyes of the dictatorship as utopia necessitates initial suffering. This was Søren Kierkegaard’s voice of “\textit{inauthenticity}” literally manifested. An inauthentic person persists in perceiving and acting in ways his/her own experience has already demonstrated false, as Kierkegaard referred to “inauthentic” behavior as not speaking with one’s own voice.\textsuperscript{349} This was true of the proletariat’s denial of their privation as well as Stalin’s denial of his own crimes in the service of “equality of outcomes” derived from the unending lust for “utopia”. To illustrate what Kierkegaard outlined as
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the distinction between authenticity and inauthenticity, let us consider two sets of statements:

“Did what I want happen? No. Then, either my aim or my methodology was wrong.”

and

“Did what I want happen? No. Then, the world is unfair, it is society’s fault, I am a victim of oppression!”\(^{350}\)

Which is the Kierkegaardian voice of inauthenticity? The latter, obviously. It is not too far down the road from self-victimization to the manifestation of brutal hatred. In the case of Stalin, Lenin, Mao, Castro, Pol Pot, Hugo Chavez and countless others, this hatred came in the form of the rallying cry, “We must dismantle this corrupt system!” Taking into account every aspect of critical theory documented thus far, we should be able to conclude that the similarities between totalitarian communism and critical theory are too eerily conspicuous to deny. “But wait!” the critical theorists exclaim, “We aren’t asking for complete equality of outcome, we are only asking for equality of outcome in positions of power! We only want power to be equitably distributed.” Really? OK then, let’s explore the outcomes of pursuing that proposition in order for us to derive the true motivations of the critical theorists. To analyze the consequences of redistributive power policies, it is worth examining the outcomes of policies that are labelled under the broad umbrella of “Affirmative Action”.

Before we begin, it must be clarified that there will be no analysis of American affirmative action conducted simply because if it had worked, we would not need to be having this discussion. Affirmative Action in America (defined as the imposition of the much needed Civil Rights Act and the Great Society programs implemented by the Johnson administration) did not make a dent in alleviating Black poverty or creating much Black prosperity on the whole. The political scientist, Jennifer Hochschild found that the rate of Black prosperity declined severely in contrast with the era before Affirmative Action. She found that the “ratio of black to white poverty has remained at 3 – hardly a victory in the war on racially disproportionate poverty.” This was true even in absolute terms as “there are now four million fewer poor whites than thirty years ago, but 686,000 more poor blacks.”\(^{351}\) Additionally, low-income Blacks lost ground to low-income whites as between 1967 and 1992, incomes for the poorest fifth of Blacks declined at more than double the rate of low-income whites\(^{352}\). It is thus no wonder why Affirmative Action is considered insufficiently radical in the eyes of the critical theorists as its use of quotas is deemed

---
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tokenistic and provided no certain guarantees for the achievement of an equality of outcomes between minoritized groups and white Americans. We also not be discussing affirmative action in the Malaysian context, as while the ethnic Malays have gained political power, they have historically lagged (and continue to lag) behind in terms of material wealth. Malaysia’s ethnic minority Chinese still (despite close to half a century of the Bumiputra policy) hold the keys to the nation’s coffers.353. As a comprehensive study of the outcomes of affirmative action in Malaysia proved, Malays may have gained an iron-tight grip on politics, but the policy has failed to improve the material circumstances of the vast majority of the Malay population, with an early study of impacts finding that “at most 5 percent” of Malays benefitted from the policy, where the ethnic Chinese still hold economic dominance354. Why are we excluding an analysis of Malaysian affirmative action? Simply because the critical theorists conceive of equity in both political and monetary terms. Therefore, since Malaysia has allowed the Chinese to accumulate vast sums of material wealth, rather than forcibly redistributing it, the country cannot be regarded (in the terms conceptualized by critical theory) to be promoting equity.

The critical theorists have already made their aim of ending “shareholder capitalism”355 as explicit as possible and Malaysia is one country that has allowed the “exploitative” rich Chinese to maintain “power” on that front. This is made abundantly clear when Ibram X Kendi states, “The defining question is whether the discrimination is creating equity or inequity. If discrimination is creating equity, then it is antiracist. If discrimination is creating inequity, then it is racist. Someone reproducing inequity through permanently assisting an overrepresented racial group into wealth and power is entirely different than someone challenging that inequity by temporarily assisting an underrepresented racial group into relative wealth and power until equity is reached.”356. Theorists like Kendi are willing to suborn discrimination as long as it favors their ends. If achieving their conception of “equity” means that they must strip others of their hard work, then so be it as long as that wealth is being redistributed to a racial grievance group. In the eyes of theorists of Kendi’s ilk, disparities are racist, homophobic and misogynistic. This terrible assumption is what pervades all theory, thereby negating the individual decisions and effort that led to certain groups achieving desirable outcomes and others achieving undesirable outcomes. Within the realm of critical theory


there is no such thing as individual agency, that is merely a lie fed to us by white supremacists, instead there is the tyrannical power that creates success for some groups and oppression that results in the subordination of others. Critical theory thus seeks to redress this by any means necessary, no matter how brutal. Kendi makes his totalitarian desire to achieve the arbitrarily decided upon notion of “equity” explicit, when he advocates for the exercising of bigotry. Equity, to critical theorists, is not the attainment of merely equal outcomes, it refers very specifically to viciously stripping power from those who currently hold onto its reins and redistributing it amongst various grievance groups. The seizure of power, however, must also be complemented by economic dominance, as Kendi informs us that both wealth and power are prerequisites for true equity.

The countries that will be analyzed in the coming paragraphs have attempted to realize critical theory’s concept of “equity” and have done so by administering the very methods that critical theorists of Kendi’s ilk advocate today. Affirmative Action in the cases of India and Sri Lanka were enforced with ruthless abandon, all the while employing the same notion that outcome disparities were the result of unseen malevolent forces. This premise was what served as the foundation for campaigns that enforced the brutal redistribution of political and economic capital to less successful groups in both countries. In India, “equality of outcomes” was first instituted with educational quotas and lower grade requirements to gain preferential admission into institutions of higher learning. In name, lucrative places were reserved in the engineering, law and medical faculties of the best Indian universities for Scheduled Castes and Tribes, in particular the “untouchable” caste that was intended to be the primary beneficiary of India’s “equality of outcome” policies357. Explicitly lower cut-off scores for members of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes were one of the initial foundations of affirmative action policies in practice among Indian universities and technical institutions358 359. Government job and educational quotas were not the only level of equity programs put in place. Housing subsidies, health programs and maternity benefits were also put in place to ensure equality of outcome360.

In practice, however, there was an increasing shift away from merely providing a more equal playing field (debatable term, but reasonable in light of what was to follow) and a


heavy tilt towards the legislation of more overtly discriminatory and oppressive laws within individual states. This meant that if certain local ethnic groups were underrepresented in certain occupations, the state government could intervene and, to take a page out of critical theory’s book, “equitably redistribute” those jobs, regardless of individual merit. Those who had their jobs stripped from them were labelled “outsiders” and demonized as “exploitative.” This general trend could be observed in multiple Indian states where Affirmative Action programs had morphed from simple preference quotas to job “safeguards,” admissions “standardization,” and an overhaul of language policies that would severely hamper these “outsiders” from attaining academic or economic success. For instance, a local leader in the state of Andhra Pradesh (in an almost identical fashion with today’s identity politicians and critical theorists) stated on the overrepresentation of Andhras in the professions,

“Yes it is true that they are also better qualified for many of the jobs than we are. Maybe they are better qualified but why is merit so important? We can have some inefficiency. That will be necessary if our people are to get jobs. Are we not entitled to jobs just because we are not qualified?”

The Andhras people, who had lived under British rule, had become more advanced – in agriculture, education and modernization in general – than the Telanganans. This was the justification for the imposition of various “safeguards” instituted in 1956 to ensure that among other things, Telanganans would receive numerical representation in government and education for a period lasting until 1969. However, when 1969 rolled around, there were deafening demands by the Telanganans for an extension and expansion of state equity programs. What had occurred in the intervening years was that the Andhras had made full use of India’s “Green Revolution” when agricultural activities were industrialized, whereas the Telanganans had not. To compound matters, the Andhras farmers bought land from the Telanganans and made it more productive using newly-discovered industrial techniques. Thus, by 1969, the supposed expiration date for the equity “safeguards” the Telanganans revolted. University students began violent protests that spread like wildfire to other areas and escalated into mob attacks on railroads and government infrastructure. State officials, fearing further protraction of political strife, damned the Andhras people to the status of “outsiders” and caved to the demands of the mob, significantly expanding the reach of equity programs.


Things were no different in the state of Assam, where Bengalis migrated from the land scarce region of Bengal during the colonial era and seized upon the opportunity to make full use of the abundant, idle land in Assam. The Bengali migrants cleared jungles and farmed their newfound land with considerably more care, energy and success than did the Assamese. The Bengali migrants were also much more responsive to the educational opportunities afforded to them in Assam and thus became significantly better represented in educational institutions, government occupations and the professions. As a consequence, the official state language shifted from Assamese to Bengali. The Assamese, however, dating as far back as the mid-nineteenth century, were able to convince the British to revert the official language of schools back to Assamese. This was the first step in what would morph into a pattern of political overreach in order to provide greater “equity” to the Assamese, for whom there were “power” imbalances. So as to redress these supposed imbalances in Assam’s private sector, having already (by virtue of creating linguistic barriers to entry) monopolized political power, the Assamese decreed that their language would be the exclusive language of the state.

During the 1960s, private sector employers were denounced by Assamese politicians and students for hiring too few Assamese employees. These denunciations triggered a slew of rioting and arson, which eventually led to the forcible confiscation of businesses owned by non-Assamese groups who dominated the local economy, so as to provide a more just set of outcomes for the “historically disadvantaged” Assamese. However, and most horrifyingly, the state of chaos did not end there, as in 1983, the Assamese attacked Bengalis, killing 4,000 of them and devastating their living spaces, resulting in a quarter of a million homeless Banglades in Assam at the time. The case of Assam, like that of Andhra Pradesh, represents how the focus on remedying group disparities and disregarding the role that individual merit played in contributing to the promulgation of said disparities, inevitably leads society down a path of unending chaos.

In the state of Maharashtra, the course of events that unfolded were almost identical to those in Andhra Pradesh and Assam. A paramilitary group akin to Hitler’s SS, known as the Shiv Sena, stoked tensions within the state against various “outsiders” who
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dominated the economy of Bombay (Maharashtra's capital). The Shiv Sena employed an array of violent, intimidation scare-tactics in order to compel private businesses into preferentially hiring Maharashtrians. At the time, the situation in Bombay was much the same as it was in other Indian states, where “outsiders” were employed in far greater numbers in professional capacities due to their unmatched levels of productivity and competence in the state. Entrepreneurs from the neighboring Gujarat were the largest group of business executives in Bombay in the middle of the twentieth century and were more than half of all managers. Comparatively, Maharashtrians were virtually non-existent at these high levels and were also not in high demand due to their lack of skills and productive attitudes.

Much like with the critical theorists and identity politicians of the modern day, these employment disparities turned into a major source of resentment of “ethnic discrimination” against indigenous locals by Bal Thackeray, who had founded the Shiv Sena to redress these grievances. Thackeray incited anger amongst the indigenous peoples of Bombay, using his magazine to publish hit pieces on the dominance of “outsiders” and how they had exploited locals to get into high economic positions. The immense popularity that he gained as a consequence, allowed for him to found the Shiv Sena, which became a force of violence in the streets and of political power. The Shiv Sena who had garnered significant political support by focusing on the central issue of instituting preferential hiring policies and quotas for Maharashtrians, soon expanded their range of grievances to focus on anti-Muslim agitation and opposition to foreign ownership of private enterprises. In short, whatever policy issues would appeal to xenophobia and in-group identity, against an ever-increasing list of Maharashtrian “enemies,” would be included as part of their political agenda. Though the policy proposals made by the Shiv Sena were indeed effective in excluding “outsiders” and allowing for Maharashtrians to be employed in greater numbers and higher positions, their policies also tore at the very fabric of society. This extreme polarization sparked a period of savage intergroup violence in Bombay. As Thackeray and his Shiv Sena continued to fragment the population along the lines of oppressed locals against exploitative “outsiders,” the outbreaks of destructiveness only increased in frequency. In a series of such spates of violence in 1994, the official death toll was over a thousand, with the Far Eastern Economic Review reporting:


“These statistics convey little of the real horrors of hordes ‘stopping vehicles and setting passengers ablaze’; of ‘men brought bleeding to hospital who were knifed afresh’; of the autorickshaw driver who ‘decoyed a Muslim couple in a fatal ambush’; of ‘neighbors leading long-time friends to gory deaths’; of women driven mad having ‘seen their children thrown into fires, husbands hacked, daughters molested, sons dragged away,’ and of the 150,000 people hounded out of the city.” 374

Whatever gains Maharashtrians had made by enforcing preferential hiring quotas to benefit their lot prior to 1994, were almost completely negated. It was not only people who fled the state, more than a million jobs also left, as businesses considered Bombay too dangerous a place to continue operating safely. Despite Bombay’s long predominance as India’s pre-eminent commercial and industrial center prior to the outbreak of insurrection, the mass exodus (driven by both anti-outsider sentiment and the insecurity of constant violence) meant that numerous foreign companies shifted their headquarters to Madras and Bangalore instead. Likewise, local businesses owned by non-Maharashtrians took flight out of fear and by 1998, Bombay’s excise and customs revenue plummeted for the first time in the post-colonial era375. These three case studies hence signify the ease with which policies intended to guarantee equal outcomes can so easily cause society to devolve into throngs of xenophobia and brutality.

Even in states where Affirmative Action programs were implemented as they were originally intended, the uptake in set-asides amongst scheduled castes soon became disproportionate. For instance, a 1996 study found that only 6 percent of the untouchable caste actually benefitted from the imposition of “equality of outcome” policies376. The same study also found that “the quota system has eliminated whatever goodwill the upper castes had for the lower castes,” in large part because of the “pervasive overestimation of the amount and effectiveness” of Affirmative Action policies377. Resentment born by upper castes at being literally and metaphorically cast aside by the Indian government in favor of lower castes set the stage for inter-caste violence to run rampant across India.

In 1999, a Human Rights Watch reported that Dalit women were “raped as a form of retaliation” by upper caste men, when there were organized movements among Dalits
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to seek the enforcement of minimum wage laws and other forms of equity-related redress. The loss of educational and occupational opportunities suffered by the upper castes as a direct consequence of Affirmative Action resulted in a massive outburst of inter-caste violence in the state of Bihar in 1987. Following the commission of a grisly murder of two families of “untouchables” by upper caste men, neighboring villages inhabited by members of the higher castes were overrun by almost a thousand “untouchable” men armed with sticks, spears and guns. These higher caste villagers were wrangled from their homes, hacked to pieces and thrown into flames by the “untouchable” assailants who chanted, “We will take revenge” and “Long live the Maoist Communist Center.” Thus, even when Affirmative Action programs were implemented as originally planned, we are able to observe the fact that resentment and violence remain their unintended, yet inescapable, outcomes.

In India’s attempt at achieving “equality of outcomes” through the imposition of Affirmative Action, we see many parallels with the policies that critical theory and their army of identity politicians are promoting today. Just like how the critical theorists call for the readjusting of shares in high-income occupations for minoritized groups, India attempted to forcibly redistribute preferred occupational positions from productive, competent individuals (who had worked to earn them) to the spiteful masses, with devastating consequences. The implicit assumption, held by critical theorists and their cadre, that implementing such oppressive policies will have no adverse consequences, is thoroughly repudiated in the case of India, where unrelenting bloodshed erupted. Even when these equity policies were instituted in the manner in which they were originally intended, chaos still reigned supreme. As we will see in the upcoming paragraphs, the enforcement of equality of outcome policies in Sri Lanka led to even greater social strife which culminated in civil war.

Formerly the British colony of Ceylon, Sri Lanka achieved independence in 1948. Observers from both within and outside the country were quietly optimistic about the country’s prospects for a promising future. Though the two main ethnic groups, the Sinhalese and the Tamils, differed in language, ethnicity and religion, there was ample amounts of goodwill between the two groups, such that the elites of both groups lived together in Westernized enclaves. In addition, the new government was committed to instituting a secular, democratic state which recognized the rights of all citizens. What was most notable about Sri Lanka was that, unlike India, the country had not experienced a single instance of ethnic conflict or disagreement throughout the first half of the twentieth century. As Sri Lankan scholar, K.M. de Silva, described,
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“In striking contrast to other parts of South Asia (including Burma), Sri Lanka in 1948 was an oasis of stability, peace and order. The transfer of power was smooth and peaceful, a reflection of the moderate tone of the dominant strand in the country’s nationalist movement. More important, everyone saw very little of the divisions and bitterness which were tearing at the recent independence of South Asian countries. In general, the situation seemed to provide an impressive basis for a solid start in nation-building and national regeneration.”381

The Ceylon Tamils were the ethnic minority in Sri Lanka, with the Sinhalese forming the overwhelming majority. However, the Ceylon Tamils, in proportion to their small population size, were greatly overrepresented in the professions. As of 1921, Ceylon Tamils, despite constituting only 12 percent of the overall population, made up 28 percent of all lawyers382. In the medical profession, Ceylon Tamils made up the majority of doctors (44 percent), with the Sinhalese only providing 34 percent of doctors or other medical professionals 383. Among civil servants, though the Sinhalese made up the majority, the Ceylon Tamils were still overrepresented relative to their population size384. The outstanding academic attainment among Ceylon Tamils contributed heavily to this success. In 1942, 30 percent of the student body at Ceylon University College were Ceylon Tamils, which was three times their representation in the national population385. In 1946, Ceylon Tamils occupied 30 percent of all government jobs and 40 percent of all judicial posts386. During the year of Sri Lanka’s independence, Ceylon Tamils made up 40 percent of engineers in the government’s irrigation department387.

The seeds of Sinhalese resentment which had been propagated by the Ceylon Tamils incredible success, began to truly flower when Sri Lanka saw an influx of immigration from India (this group would later be known as Indian Tamils in Sri Lanka to draw the distinction between them and Ceylon Tamils). Gujaratis and Chettiar who had immigrated
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from India became traders, businessmen and money lenders. This meant that not only did the Sinhalese not fare as well in universities and professional occupations, but also that they were eclipsed in the business world. By the time Sri Lanka neared independence, the retail, textile and wholesale trades were dominated by Indian Tamils. None of these developments went unnoticed by Sinhalese politicians who were looking for hotbed issues that would mobilize Sinhalese voters. The earliest indications of the oppressive equity policies that would follow came in 1938, while still under colonial rule. The Sinhalese elites at the time convinced the British to pass legislative measures that would restrict the scale to which Indian Tamils could grow their businesses.

Following Sri Lanka’s independence, the resentment at the occupational successes of the Ceylon and Indian Tamils reached fever-pitch amongst the Sinhalese. In an unnervingly similar fashion with today’s critical theorists and identity politicians, the Sinhalese spearheaded a massive push-back against Western culture and language, demanding that the lingua franca of the nation no longer be English and instead be the people’s “own language.” What was cast as Western culture (material and educational success) and the English language, were depicted as serving to unfairly marginalize the Sinhalese. Though in principle Ceylon’s “own language” referred to the two ethnic language of the Tamils and Sinhalese, this very much changed in practice.

Amidst an increasingly aggressive Sinhalese populous and government resistance to the demands that the national language be changed, an ambitious politician, Solomon Bandaranaike, established his own opposition party in 1951. Bandaranaike committed himself to ensuring the implementation of the “own language” policy which, by this time, had metamorphosed into a policy of “Sinhala Only” as the national language. The purpose was clear: By changing the official language of trade, commerce and governance to Sinhala, the successful Tamils whom the Sinhalese resented would be displaced from their well-paying jobs and could thus be replaced by the Sinhalese, without the need for merit.

Though Bandaranaike purported to be a champion of his Sinhalese community, he was not at all representative of those in whose name he spoke stridently. He was Oxford-educated, Christian, and a Sinhalese aristocrat who grew up speaking English and was unable to converse in Sinhala.


politician who, like Bandaranaike, panders to group identity fits his very profile 😊). However, keen to manufacture the image that he was a heroic Sinhalese freedom-fighter, Bandaranaike quickly converted to Buddhism, learnt Sinhala and adopted radical positions on language, religion, and Sinhalese culture392 393. In 1956, following his image transformation, Bandaranaike and his party were elected into office in a landslide victory. Thus began the era of equality of outcome policies that preferentially favored the Sinhalese. Bandaranaike’s first piece of legislation was to forcibly install Sinhala as the language of governance, education and trade394. In spite of the preferential treatment given to Sinhalese students, Tamil dominance at the universities continued for some time. This overrepresentation was especially striking in the faculties of medicine and engineering where the Tamils continued to make up 48 and 49 percent of the student body, respectively. By contrast, the Sinhalese still did not achieve the same standards of academic success as the Tamils and were hence overrepresented in the less-lucrative liberal arts faculties 395. In order to address these persistent outcome disparities, Bandaranaike’s government imposed a series of policies which enforced quotas for the Sinhalese, in order to reduce the Tamils’ prospects for higher education and thereby severely impeding their chances of attaining high-paying careers. This then went a step further as the government enforced a law that would allow Sinhalese university applicants to gain admission by meeting lower standards than those required by Tamil students396.

In 1960, Bandaranaike’s government went yet another step further in their seemingly endless quest to ensure equality of outcome for the Sinhalese. This time, they forcibly took over 2000 Christian missionary schools that had a longstanding reputation of producing Tamil graduates who proceeded to the best faculties. The government stated that they wanted to “ensure equality of educational opportunity to all children” and to provide a kind of education “which is national in its scope, aims and objects and in


conformity with the cultural religious and economic aspirations of the people."\textsuperscript{397} For all the talk of ensuring equality of opportunity, it was evident that Bandaranaike cared not for equality of opportunity and instead sought to achieve Sinhalese hegemony via a concerted set of policies designed to marginalize Tamils for their successes. The final and by far most consequential step Bandaranaike’s government took to achieving his identitarian aims was to erase the section in Sri Lanka’s constitution which guaranteed minority rights to the Tamils\textsuperscript{398}.

Worried about their rapidly declining educational and occupational prospects, the Tamil population took to the streets and, the spirit of Gandhi’s teachings, begun to demonstrate peacefully. The Sinhalese government, however, stoked fears amongst their ethnic group and incited a Sinhalese mob to viciously assault demonstrators. Between 1956 and 1958, a series of debilitating race riots erupted. Seeing the catastrophic consequences of his use of identity politics, Bandaranaike attempted to make amends by negotiating an accord with the Tamils. However, these attempts merely served to shatter the veneer of control that Bandaranaike had over his people as he was assassinated at the hands of a Sinhalese extremist in 1959 for appearing to pander to the “exploitative” Tamils. In the wake of Bandaranaike’s murder, there was a power vacuum in Sri Lankan government. Attempting to fill the void, politicians inadvertently caused even greater social fragmentation by jumping on the bandwagon of Sinhalese group grievances and attempting to outdo one another for the Sinhalese vote\textsuperscript{399}. To compound matters, despite preferential admissions policies installed to favour the Sinhalese and reduce educational opportunities for Tamils, Tamil students (ever resilient) continued to be over-represented in the more lucrative science-based fields. Therefore, when the new government was elected into office, they implemented their most disastrous policy yet. This policy was termed “standardization” and would mean that university admissions decisions would no longer be based upon actual individual scores and instead “standardized” scores that would be given to students relative to other students from his/her ethnic group. This was then supplemented in 1972 by a “district quota system,” to allocate university admissions on the basis of the population in each district. Under these new rules, the proportion of Tamil university students plummeted from 35 percent in 1970 to 19 percent in 1974.

The drying up of Tamils’ economic opportunities became insanely dire, because of their concentration in parts of Sri Lanka with poor geographic conditions which made the
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prospects of economic success without relying heavily on education. Tamil protests to the implementation of the equality of outcome policies fell on deaf ears and the moderate stance that the Tamils took towards political reform fractured. Moderate leadership among the Tamils gave way to the militant extremist group known as the Tamil Tigers in 1975. Thus, civil war in Sri Lanka erupted. The Sinhalese living in Tamil-majority regions found themselves singled out as targets for mob violence. By 1977, 150 Sinhalese had been slaughtered in Tamil-dominated regions, with 20,000 made homeless. Counter-riots erupted in 1981 which led to a worse set of riots in 1983. The riots in both these years bore the hallmarks of being organized by Sinhalese gangs with indifference on the part of both the police and the military. The riots of July 1983, were undoubtedly the most horrifying. As the acclaimed journalist, William McGowan, documents, there were "five days of pillage and slaughter aimed at Tamils living throughout the south and their business property." The explosion of violence occurred on an exceedingly colossal scale in the capital city of Colombo where

"As many as 3,000 Tamils are said to have been killed, nearly 60 percent of the Tamils in Colombo were turned into refugees, and most of Colombo Tamil business community, which had accounted for over half the city’s commercial infrastructure, was ruined. Many Sinhalese burned down their own workplaces, targeting, in particular, Tamil-owned garment factories. Much of the wholesale food district in Colombo was destroyed. The stately Victorian railroad station in the center of the city had to be converted into a morgue to accommodate the corpses.”

By 2002, the civil war that had raged on in Sri Lanka had cost over 64,500 lives. The history of equity programs in Sri Lanka thus represent the most blatant, painful and tragic mockery of the underlying assumption, made by identity politicians and critical theorists, of being able to control the course of events that these policy decisions would inevitably yield. The case of attempting to “equitably redistribute outcomes” in Sri Lanka exemplifies how swiftly generations of peaceful co-existence can be undone. The consequences of equity programs in Sri Lanka further highlight how such developments, once set in motion, are almost impossible to halt without first inflicting a considerable toll on the sanctity of human life.
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In conclusion, whether the pursuit of equality of outcomes was attempted by the institution of communism or Affirmative Action, it was not merely a matter of simply redistributing benefits. Such systems of governance also exacted high social costs, the most hefty of which would undoubtedly be the widespread inhumanity and loss of life born out of intergroup polarization. This holds true in the case of all communist countries (where rural peasants were pitted against the relatively well-off, who were made out to be “exploitative thieves”) and in the cases of the only two countries who went the furthest in implementing true equality of outcomes, Sri Lanka and India (where the less productive and competent ethnic groups were made to believe they had been unfairly “discriminated” against by successful ethnic groups). Nowhere, in the history of mankind, has the institution of equity programs been a zero-sum process, contrary to what the critical theorists insist (that such policies can be implemented with zero or no social cost). In fact, the radical proposals made by critical theorists, Ibram X Kendi in particular bear a striking resemblance to the disastrous policies enacted in India and Sri Lanka. Kendi writes,

“To fix the original sin of racism, Americans should pass an anti-racist amendment to the U.S. Constitution that enshrines two guiding anti-racist principles: Racial inequity is evidence of racist policy and the different racial groups are equals. The amendment would make unconstitutional racial inequity over a certain threshold, as well as racist ideas by public officials (with ‘racist ideas’ and ‘public official’ clearly defined).” The zealot continues: “[The anti-racist amendment] would establish and permanently fund the Department of Anti-racism (DOA) comprised of formally trained experts on racism and no political appointees. The DOA would be responsible for preclearing all local, state and federal public policies to ensure they won’t yield racial inequity, monitor those policies, investigate private racist policies when racial inequity surfaces, and monitor public officials for expressions of racist ideas. The DOA would be empowered with disciplinary tools to wield over and against policymakers and public officials who do not voluntarily change their racist policy and ideas.”

In horrifyingly similar fashion with the Sri Lankan and Indian identity politicians, Kendi indicates his willingness to institute totalitarianism in the name of achieving his ill-conceived version of “equity”. The overtures that Kendi makes to despotism bear the striking facsimile to the promises made by the dictatorial authoritarians from decades past. Kendi is essentially proposing that we plunge ourselves headlong into the abyss of an Orwellian dystopia where autocrats militaristically infringe upon our individual freedoms in order to constantly attain injudicious form of equality between all races. The inordinate amount of power that Kendi’s “experts” would be allowed to wield conjure up

images of Orwell’s Thought Police and Mao’s Red Guards. The consequences of any attempt by identitarians at imposing their imperious worldview has never led to a harmonious, cohesive utopia of any kind. Instead, every attempt at achieving such ill-defined, abstract conceptions of “equity” have always led to the proliferation of dystopian hellscapes where societies have been left devastated. The fundamental reason why these disastrous social consequences are inescapable without exception is because the proponents of such romanticized worldviews believe that man is perfectible. The Communists, Indian and Sri Lankan identity politicians, and today’s critical theorists view man not as individuals (as their perpetual collectivization of individuals based on group identity signifies) but as collective experiments to be constantly refined in the service of attaining utopia. Going back to the quote made by Rousseau on equality as a natural state, those that have instituted (or plan to) equity programs see man as an imperfect experiment in need of desperate correction. Critical theorists see the chaos of life (the unknown) and they loathe it. Thus, they endeavor to impose revolutionary rectification campaigns to eliminate that which they do not know and cannot (or are unwilling to) comprehend; they seek to impose unconscionable amounts of order. As Dr. Peterson describes,

“Order is the place where the behavior of the world matches our expectations and our desires; the place where all things turn out the way we want them to. But order is sometimes tyranny and stultification, as well, when the demand for certainty and uniformity and purity becomes too one-sided.” 406 and “Order, when pushed too far, when imbalanced, can also manifest itself destructively and terribly. It does so as the forced migration, the concentration camp” 407.

When man is viewed as perfectible and not inherently flawed (as we truly are), it follows that we embark on a never-ending journey to achieve the state of perfection that we so desire. Equity, in every system where attempts at its implementation have been made, are therefore insane demands for uniformity and order. It is this imbalance, coupled with the spurious notion that man can arbitrarily control and accurately predict the consequences of their actions, that unavoidably determines the death and destruction which are characteristic of societies where equity programs have been imposed.

The question now is: Why, in spite of the inescapable nature of its dreadful consequences, do critical theorists insist on instituting an equality of outcomes? After all, modern history is replete with examples of societies that have been torn apart by these very attempts at disrupting the inequality that nature has preordained for us. Is it not senseless and irresponsible to repeat the same blunders that our predecessors committed? Of course it
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is. The problem is that the critical theorists just do not care. Sigmund Freud termed this a "repetition compulsion." 408 Freud conceived of "repetition compulsions" as our unconscious drive to repeat the horrors of the past—equality of outcome in this case. People construct their worlds using the apparatus (recognized systems of governance, accepted Truths etc.) they have at their disposal. Faulty apparatus produce faulty outcomes. By extension, repeated use of faulty apparatus, regardless of the manner in which they are applied, will always produce the same set of faulty outcomes. This is why the critical theorists and their mass of devotees who absolutely refuse to learn from the past are currently dooming us all to repeat it. It is also why there is a famous saying that goes, "Insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results."

At this juncture, the critical theorists and their devotees may howl, “We know all this! We are just proposing taking out the radical bits and implementing the good bits!” The corollary of this in modern Leftist politics is “That wasn’t Marxism/ Socialism! We are going to do it the right way!” Here, we see a very distinct parallel between these individuals in the present and the Soviets of the past. They speak with the Kierkegaardian voice of “inauthenticity.” Critical theorists and identity politicians pose a provocative and seductive alternative which they derived from postmodern Marxism. They reject the objective Truth that individual rights are extracted from human nature and reason. Instead, they believe that human beings are innately malleable, that human nature is unfixed and therefore castigate the notion of individual agency as a corrupt lie. Critical theorists posit that man is like Play-Doh and they, alone, have the power to mould a society that is free from social pathologies, without incurring any malevolent consequences. They are therefore in denial (or lie in some of the worst cases) about the ramifications of their propositions and narcissistically presume, much like the communists and Indian and Sri Lankan identity politicians, (in spite of enforcing policies that would undoubtedly sow dangerous levels of resentment as seen from the preceding paragraphs), that in spite of the hazardous levels of resentment their ideology breeds they miraculously have the capacity to quell man’s innate proclivity for destructiveness. This is denial of the highest order.

The psychiatrist and concentration camp survivor, Viktor Frankl, drew a very ominous (and fitting) conclusion about extreme acts of human denial in his classic ‘Man’s Search for Meaning’. He concluded that a deceitful, inauthentic individual existence is the precursor to social totalitarianism 410. Similarly, Carl Jung knew that the moral
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problems that plagued his patients were caused by their own untruthfulness. Freud concluded that “repression” of the truth contributed rather significantly to mental illness and what he termed the “Death Drive” (inclination for destruction). All these thinkers, concerned with the social pathology of denial, arrived at the same conclusion: Lies pervert the structure of Being. The repression of Truth is such a powerful force that it has the capacity to corrupt both the soul of an individual and the soul of a nation, as one form of corruption gives rise to another in a ceaseless cycle that leads straight to carnage and ruination. Deny it as they might, this is what today’s critical theorists, identity politicians and horde of spiteful activists are proposing. As senior fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University and economist, Thomas Sowell, concluded on the imposition of equality of outcome programs around the world:

“False beliefs are not small things, because they lead to false solutions. In the field of medicine, it has long been recognized that even a false cure that is wholly harmless in itself can be catastrophic in its consequences if it substitutes for a real cure for a deadly disease. Proponents of affirmative action cannot console themselves for their false assumptions on grounds that their intentions were good, because social quackery likewise substitutes for real efforts to deal with real problems that can tear a society apart.”

Conclusion for Chapter 3, Part ii
In conclusion, this second sub-chapter on critical theory has shown how the long arm of postmodern Marxism unveils itself in critical theory’s call to apply Derridean deconstruction to all aspects of modern life. Just like Derrida, the critical theorists assert that hierarchical structures emerge only to include the beneficiaries of that structure and marginalize everyone else (who are therefore oppressed).

Deconstruction, manifesting itself in the form of critical theory’s concept of problematization, hold true to Derrida’s infamous motto, “Il n’y a pas de hors-texte” – translated as “there is nothing outside the text,” though his ardent students assert that it instead means “there is no outside-text.” Regardless, both translations give rise to the typically Derridean notion that “everything is interpretation.” This is what makes problematization so potent. It allows critical theorists to interpret every single aspect of the current culture as a consequence of some past Western evil and therefore an indicator of modern oppression. Such an approach is nihilistic in the most extreme terms possible,


negating the idea that distinctions may be drawn between groups of people (e.g. gender income disparities or ethnic educational attainment disparities) for any other reasons apart from that of raw power. Biological differences between men and women? To which the critical theorists will shriek in response, “Oppressive fiction!” Despite the expansive amount of multi-disciplinary scientific literature at hand to indicate that gender differences are overwhelmingly influenced by biology, science is just another Western power play that critical theorists must problematize. Hierarchical status as a consequence of competence and productivity? No, sir, all definitions of competence are made up by those in power to benefit themselves.

Deconstruction, by means of problematization in critical theory, allow the theorists and their adherents to dismiss whole literary, mathematical, scientific and ways of life as built upon racist, sexist, classist or otherwise oppressive foundations. In this sense, critical theory literally take a page out of the postmodern playbook. For example, the postmodernist, Stanley Fish, was notorious for his use of problematization (though it did not have an official name at the time). He labelled all opponents of affirmative action (who notably include several prominent Black Americans like Larry Elder, Thomas Sowell, Jason L. Riley and Walter E. Williams, to name a few) bigots and lumped them in with the white supremacist, Ku Klux Klan414. In similar fashion, another postmodernist, Andrea Dworkin, was infamous for her male-bashing (and arguably laid the seeds from which today’s culture of problematizing males propagated), proclaiming that all heterosexual males were rapists415.

This is the inherent narcissism at play within critical theory. It glorifies its own capacity and its own creations, it claims that anything to exist outside of its domain is a structure of oppression. This means that in the eyes of critical theory and as seen from how it problematizes (deconstructs) everything in terms of power structures, there is nothing important that is left unknown. Theory is the be all, end all. Nothing can compare and if anyone dare challenge it, theorists will endlessly problematize them/ it into oblivion. It is in this spirit that John Milton sought to dramatize Lucifer’s rebellion and subsequent descent from Heaven416.

He trusted to have euquald the most High,
If he opposed; and with ambitious aim
Against the Throne and Monarchy of God
Raised impious War in Heaven and Battel proud


With vain attempt. Him the Almighty Power
Hurled headlong flaming from Eternal Sky
With hideous ruin and combustion down
To bottomless perdition, there to dwell
In Adamantine Chains and penal fire

In Milton's eyes, Lucifer was God's finest creation. However, he begins to fall in love with his own creations, he elevates them and worships them absolutely. He challenges God and is cast out in a raging inferno into the abyss that is Hell. Lucifer, as Milton conceptualized him, is the metaphorical representation of the spirit of totalitarianism. When confronted by his own deficiencies, he does not yield. In fact, he entrenches himself even deeper in his denial. It is a denial that there is still that which is unexplored, that which is as yet undiscovered. It is the reaffirmation of the "life-lie" that faith in the realm of what is known (or what is thought to be known in the particular case of critical theory) is sufficient. Lucifer's denial is what Milton means when he describes rebellion "Against the Throne and Monarchy of God". That is the spirit of totalitarianism that manifests itself in Lucifer (and by extension critical theory): Everything that needs to be discovered has been discovered. Everything will unfold according to plan. All of life's suffering will miraculously vanish for eternity, once the idealized system is adopted.

"It offers the beautiful absolution of personal responsibility: after all, your shortcomings can be blamed on the 'system' rather than on personal choice. More important, this view of human nature offers the possibility of a utopian eschaton in which all human beings will become perfect, their hearts transformed, their identities bound up in the collective, and themselves freed from both the desires of individual inquisitiveness and the judgement of others. The Platonic Republic becomes possible, guided from above." 417

Milton's great body of work was thus a prophecy. A prophecy that has already unfolded in the twentieth century with the communists and their grandiose dreams of utopia. In the present, that prophecy seeks to repeat itself once more, this time in the form of critical theory, which is able to diagnose all of life's great complexities through problematization (and the power it seeks to identify). Much like Lucifer, critical theory also purports to be cognizant of all the possible remedies to cure the brutal cancer that is oppression in the here and now. Here, we see that critical theory has a dark side. An outwardly incorruptible Dr. Jekyll on the surface, with the ungodly depravity of Mr Hyde lying not too far beneath the exterior, occasionally (if only accidentally) revealing its insidious, unfeigned nature.

Deconstruction when applied to redefining words and the formation Newspeak (the term borrowed from Orwell in his description of the English vocabulary as reimagined by the totalitarian Party) has the effect of destabilizing society. If everything we believed in was a mirage, as the act of problematization by the theorists would imply, then it follows naturally that we must indeed tear down old language structures in order for the creation of just society. This is the argumentation employed by critical theorists. Everything, in line with Foucault’s musings, is a consequence of power imbalances and what better way to begin redressing those imbalances then by subverting the very medium of cognition used by the power-hungry megalomaniacs currently in charge. How benevolent of the critical theorists, saving us from those who we did not know we needed saving from!

But are they really benevolent? Highly doubtful. Why do we need to reduce ourselves to the realm of Derridean aesthetic wordplay in order to “save” ourselves? We don’t. Whose terms are these new definitions based upon? That of the critical theorists, who claim white men have a monopoly on language and yet redefine language on their own terms. Perhaps there has been a consensus of some form amongst members of minoritized groups with regards to these new definitions? No there hasn’t. These redefinitions were arbitrarily determined by critical theorists who assumed, self-righteously, that they were appropriate crusaders to represent the interests of all minoritized groups. Their self-indulgence in this case manifests itself two-fold: For one, they assumed that they had somehow been endowed the right to speak for each and every single minoritized group. And secondly, they assumed that the interests of all minoritized groups are uniform. It is this self-indulgence, first appearing in their rationale for enacting problematization and now in believing that they have been anointed by all minoritized individuals as our saviors that ultimately betrays the image of righteousness the critical theorists are attempting to construct.

For this is not righteousness, nor is this virtue. This is not even Aristotle’s conception of vice. It is, in fact, something far more sinister. We saw, in deconstruction via problematization, that bubbling underneath critical theory’s principled surface was its proclivity for totalitarianism. In deconstruction via Newspeak, the intimations that critical theory makes towards despotism become even more apparent. As we are pursuing Jung’s thesis that the motivations behind an action can be inferred from its consequences, let us examine the consequences of redefining language. And who better to inform us of these consequences than the man who warned us of the tyranny that awaited those who allowed language to be debauched, George Orwell. In his dystopian classic, 1984, Orwell depicts the totalitarian Party as actively attempting to redefine language. Winston Smith, the novel’s protagonist, is perturbed by their motivations and questions his colleague, Syme, who is assigned by the Party to compile the latest edition Newspeak dictionary (a dictionary with Party-dictated acceptable terms and any other form of language that would foster free thought erased), about what their aims for redefining language are. Exasperated, Syme explains,
“Don’t you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thought-crime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed will be expressed by exactly one word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten. … The process will still be continuing long after you and I are dead. Every year fewer and fewer words, and the range of consciousness always a little smaller. Even now, of course, there’s no reason or excuse for committing thought-crime. It’s merely a question of self-discipline, reality-control. But in the end there won’t be any need even for that. … Has it ever occurred to you, Winston, that by the year 2050, at the very latest, not a single human being will be alive who could understand such a conversation as we are having now?”

Orwell could not have expressed this sentiment with any more clarity. The only reason why an individual (or in the case of critical theory, a collective) would desire to rip apart and erase language is so alter reality to suit his/her ideological predispositions. By desecrating traditional linguistic structures and implementing an entirely new lexicon, they are able to narrow the range of permissible thought on their terms. “the range of consciousness always a little smaller” and “reality-control” those are the keys to understanding the necessity behind redefining language. Narrowing the structure of rational perception. Building a mental firewall so impenetrable that individuals will not notice the radicalization that is occurring right before their very eyes. That is what the critical theorists seek. The claim that the deconstruction of language is supposed to make language more equitable for minoritized groups is merely a façade for theorists to indoctrinate us with their noxious doctrine. Orwell, himself, in an essay on Newspeak stated as much, explaining: “The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible. It was intended that when Newspeak had been adopted once and for all and Oldspeak forgotten, a heretical thought – that is, a thought diverging from the principles of Ingsoc – should be literally unthinkable.” He continues, “Quite apart from the suppression of definitely heretical words, reduction of vocabulary was regarded as an end in itself, and no word that could be dispensed with was allowed to survive. Newspeak was designed not to extend but to diminish the range of thought, and this purpose was indirectly assisted by cutting the choice of words down to a minimum.” And at this juncture critical theorists and their various social and political agents might protest vehemently, “We are sincere about our fight for minoritized groups!”


Sidebar: Reality Control & the Rewriting of American History

The New York Times, in 2019, under the stewardship of editor, Nikole Hannah-Jones put out the ‘1619 Project’. The purpose of the project was to reframe America’s history, declaring that the founding of the United States took place in 1619 and not 1776 (the date of the actual founding)\textsuperscript{421}. In fact, the newspaper, in conjunction with the Pulitzer Center, compiled a curriculum designed to be taught to schoolchildren; more than one thousand teachers took up the offer to incorporate it into their history syllabus\textsuperscript{422}. Traditional American history has been discarded in favor of this extremely nihilistic, ahistorical approach. As Columbia University’s ethnic studies professor, Frances Negrón-Muntaner asserts, the study of history should “\textit{upend colonial (including white supremacist) epistemologies, institutions, and power structures; and ... generate decolonial narratives, subjectives, and forms of organization.”}\textsuperscript{423} The ‘1619 Project’ thus proceeds in the spirit of Negrón-Muntaner’s absurd conception of historical education, revising much of history in order to fit its authors’ ideologically predetermined anti-Western, anti-capitalist narrative.

Founding Ideals

Let us begin by dissecting the Project’s foundational claim that America was actually founded in 1619 and not 1776. Why that particular year, one might ask? It is because 1619 was the year the first slave landed on American shores. Thus, by revising the date of the founding to 1619, the Project’s authors are able to make the claim that undergirds all the other essays within the Project: \textit{That America is founded in original sin and that the ills plaguing her today are inextricably linked to her irredeemable past}. This means that, as a consequence of her sins, America can thus not be supported on any moral level. Due to how the Project links America’s ills to the modern day, it also means that these sins have seeped into the present and are masked by a veneer of pseudo-democracy.


The authors of the Project themselves stated that 1619 was America’s “true birth year,” that “Out of slavery – and the anti-black racism it required – grew nearly everything that has made America truly exceptional: its economic might, its industrial power, its electoral system, its diet and popular music, the inequities of its public health and education, its astonishing penchant for violence, its income inequality, the example it sets for the world as a land of freedom and equality, its slang, its legal system and the endemic racial fears and hatreds that continue to plague it to this day.” The New York Times declared that it aimed to “reframe the country’s history” by situating slavery at its foundational core. Their true aims here are obvious: create the illusion that America’s founding ideals are inherently evil (rather than rooted in liberty and freedom), in order to then dismantle everything that the country has built by applying that central premise.

Indeed, when we analyze America’s true history, there is no doubt that slavery predated America’s founding. But the existence of slavery before the Declaration of Independence does not mean that America’s founding ideals were predicated on the subjugation of Blacks. Far from it, America’s founding documents, the Declaration and the Constitution served as direct refutations of the institution that was chattel slavery. The Declaration especially served to codify self-evident truths that had been established by the Enlightenment:

“[T]hat all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness; That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

The Declaration of Independence thus serves as the greatest rebuke to the ‘1619 Project’s’ claim that America was founded upon the subjugation of man. The Declaration’s defining credo “all men are created equal” was meant to encompass everyone. This is something the ex-slave and second founding father, Frederick Douglass, recognized. He described the document as containing “great principles” and stated that “The signers of the Declaration of Independence were brave men. They were great men too – great enough to give fame to a great age ... They believed in order; but not in the order of tyranny. With them, nothing was ‘settled’ that was

---

not right. With them, justice, liberty and humanity were 'final'; and not slavery and oppression."  

Indeed, 41 out of 56 of the Declaration’s signatories held slaves and they recognized the moral blot that this created. This is why many of them spoke out against slavery. John Adams stated, “every measure of prudence, therefore, ought to be assumed for the eventual total extirpation of slavery from the United States ... I have, through my whole life, held the practice of slavery in abhorrence.”  

Benjamin Franklin eventually took leadership of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, declaring, “That mankind are all formed by the same Almighty Being, alike objects of his care, and equally designed for happiness... [We] earnestly entreat your serious attention to the subject of slavery – that you will be pleased to countenance the restoration of liberty to those unhappy men who alone in this land of freedom are degraded into perpetual bondage and who ... are groaning in servile subjection.”

Similarly, in spite of being slaveholders themselves, Washington, Jefferson, John Jay and Alexander Hamilton all denounced the morality of owning slaves. In 1778, Jefferson introduced a bill to ban the importation of slaves into Virginia, hoping for slavery’s “final eradication.” In 1777, Vermont banned adult slavery in its constitution; in 1780, Pennsylvania passed the Gradual Abolition Act, designed to

---


bring an end to slavery; in 1783, Massachusetts effectively abolished the practice; in 1804, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey and New Hampshire all moved to eradicate slavery. A further rebuke of the ‘1619 Project’s’ spurious claim would be how in 1787, George Washington signed into law the Northwest Ordinance, banning slaves in new territories which would become Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana and Illinois.

Nonetheless, the harsh realities of slavery could not be fully erased during the lifetimes of the founding fathers. However, as Lincoln noted, it was precisely those founding ideals, enshrined in both the Declaration and Constitution that would allow for the gradual erasure of the diabolical practice, as the aforementioned ordinances indicated. Lincoln stated, “Thus, the thing is hid away, in the Constitution, just as an afflicted man hides away a wen or a cancer, which he dares not cut out at once, lest he bleed to death; with the promise, nevertheless, that the cutting may begin at the end of a given time.”

And so fate would have it, that in spite of his tenuous past with the policy of ownership and colonization, it would be Lincoln to usher in the time to purge America of its greatest sin. In 1858, Lincoln addressed the issue of slavery, declaring, “A house divided against itself, cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure, permanently, half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved – I do not expect the house to fall – but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that


Lincoln did not view the Civil War as a separation from founding principles, but rather as a completion of them. As he would aver on numerous occasions, the Declaration of Independence would not be fulfilled until the institution of slavery had been eradicated in the United States. As president, Lincoln thrusted the Emancipation Proclamation and the Thirteenth Amendment through Congress. In 1866, the House passed the Fourteenth Amendment. By 1869, Congress had passed the Fifteenth Amendment guaranteeing Blacks an equal right to vote. Thus, the process of enshrining the founding principles in codified law was complete and in spite of the dreadful atrocities of her past, freedom and liberty had triumphed in America. The story of America does include the dreadful reality of slavery. However, that is a mere part of her story. The greater overarching narrative is one of hope prevailing over great evil. The story of America is about how founding ideals allowed for the gradual erosion eventual extermination of a cancer that grew increasingly incongruent with the spirit of the nation. 1619 is indeed a part of American history. No one is denying that. However, modern American history, the history that shaped the America that we know today, was not built off of 1619. Instead, modern America was constructed on the basis of hallowed principles that were systematized in 1776.

**Slavery & Capitalism**

Building off of the Project’s central premise, Princeton University’s Matthew Desmond contends, in his essay for the Project ‘American Capitalism is Brutal. You Can Trace That to the Plantation’, that the roots of modern-day American capitalism can be traced back to slavery. He begins by asserting that, “recently, historians have pointed persuasively to the gnatty fields of Georgia and Alabama, to the cotton houses and slave auction blocks, as the birthplace of America’s low-road approach to capitalism.” Desmond asserted that slavery instilled within modern capitalism its innate “brutality” and that we need to reverse course by adopting a whole host of radical socialist economic policy interventions.

---
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The genealogy of capitalism’s inherent evils are presented as though Desmond’s views were definitive. He invoked the imagery of modern corporations where “everything is tracked, recorded and analyzed via vertical reporting systems, double-entry record-keeping and precise quantification,” asserting that “many of these techniques that we now take for granted were developed by and large for plantations.” He continues, “When an accountant depreciates an asset to save on taxes or when a mid-level manager spends an afternoon filling rows and columns on an Excel spreadsheet, they are repeating business procedures whose roots twist back to slave-labor camps.”

The problem with the historical narrative around Desmond’s attempted at tracing the genealogy of double-entry bookkeeping and business measurements is that for Desmond, history revolves around the single axiom of slavery. In reality, these practices of modern-day businesses actually predated plantation slavery by several centuries and whose origins are directly traceable to late medieval Italy’s banking families. Furthermore, the accounting practice of depreciation was not founded in plantation slavery and emerged in large part in the railroad industry as a mechanism for distributing the skewed effects of large replacement orders on machinery that had undergone significant wear and tear.

The application of measurement and accounting methods are not distinctly capitalistic either. This is most evident in how the communist Soviet Union (and most other communist states) depended on the quantification of resource allocation and attempted to map inter-industry relationships via input-output modeling. The use of models, financial tools and accounting methods were thus essential to ensure the realization of the socialist centralized economy of numerous twentieth century communist states and continue to be employed today, in Venezuela and North Korea. Even more erroneous is how Desmond’s own claim is not corroborated by his own source, Caitlin Rosenthal’s ‘Accounting for Slavery’. While Rosenthal does chart how slaveholders applied the use of accounting methods on the plantation, she included a caveat at the beginning of her book, “This is not an origins story. I did not...”
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Desmond’s genealogy of capitalism thus falls apart from the outset as even his main citation is unable to trace a clear path that indicates modern capitalistic practices were adopted from slavery. From the history, it is also clear that today’s practices as with slavery’s go back centuries before the latter’s imposition and stem from a morally neutral source. Nevertheless, Desmond and the Project’s matriarch, Hannah-Jones, never bothered to fact-check their claims and persisted in their thesis that capitalism is the successor to slavery. Having established a spurious genealogy, Desmond now turns to developing a case for the supposed economic implications of plantation slavery. He states, “During the 60 years leading up to the Civil War, the daily amount of cotton picked per enslaved worker increased by 2.3 percent a year. That means in 1862, the average enslaved fieldworker picked not 25 percent or 50 percent as much but 400 percent as much cotton than his or her counterpart did in 1801.”

Desmond’s aims here could not be plainer. He wishes to carry across to readers that it was the “brutality” of “capitalist” practices that allowed masters to extract maximum output from their slaves. The exponential increase in cotton output, according to Desmond, was the result of the union between capitalism and calibrated torture. In his words, “The violence [of slavery] was neither arbitrary nor gratuitous. It was rational, capitalistic, all part of the plantation’s design.” Desmond’s musings on plantation slavery bear an uncanny resemblance to that of the highly contested “New History of Capitalism” (NHC) school. In particular, his essay mirrors that of NHC “historian” Edward Baptist. In his 2014 book, ‘The Half Has Never Been Told’, Baptist advances a similar line of argumentation, referring to how the particular statistic cited above by Desmond was a testament to the fact that slavery was “an economy whose bottom gear was torture,” contending that masters were able to calibrate their torture to maximize cotton yields.

The problem with both Desmond and Baptist’s thesis of “calibrated torture” in maximizing cotton outputs is that it is entirely false. The data is indeed accurate and

---
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they had extracted it from a 2008 paper by economists Alan Olmstead and Paul Rhode. The paper did indeed present the exponential rise in cotton yields, however, after rigorous analysis, the authors of the paper found that the increase was due almost entirely to biological innovation, such as the formulation of hybrid seed strains which were easier to pick and more resistant to disease. As the pair concluded, “Technological changes revolutionized southern cotton production in the 60 years preceding the Civil War. The amount of cotton a typical slave picked per day increased by 2.3 percent per year due, primarily, to the introduction and perfection of superior cotton varieties.”448 This is not to say that slavery was not one of the most deplorable and morally repugnant eras of American history. Nor does this dismiss the unimaginable violence endured by slaves. However, it does cast significant doubt on the thesis that capitalism is a form of modern slavery.

When concerns regarding how Desmond’s central premise was predicated on the flawed theorizing of Edward Baptist were raised to Nikole Hannah-Jones, she tweeted in response, “Economists dispute a few of Baptist’s calculations but not the book itself nor its thesis.” Which is odd, considering the fact that Olmstead and Rhode published two separate and consummate denunciations of Baptist’s book. In 2015, Olmstead along with three other economic historians gave this scathing assessment: “Edward Baptist’s study of capitalism and slavery is flawed beyond repair.”449 In 2018, Olmstead and Rhode published a severe rebuttal of Baptist’s work,

“Recall that Baptist has embraced our data showing a roughly four fold increase in average cotton picking rates over the antebellum years. These data only reported plantation yearly averages. If we turn up the power of our microscope and look at daily data for individual slaves that we used to construct the plantation averages, a whole new world appears that allows us to investigate empirically the effect of current picking on future picking. There is no evidence of ratcheting. Over the course of a year picking rates formed an inverted ‘U’ going up to a peak period and then falling significantly.”450 The pair went on to label Baptist’s empirical theorizing as employing a “faulty methodology.”451 Wellesley economist Eric Hilt labeled


Baptist’s work as overflowing with “specious arguments and failures of analytical reasoning” and whose “neglect of insights from economic history often weaken its analysis and undermines its credibility as social criticism.”

The foremost problem with associating slavery as the genealogical predecessor of capitalism, is that slaveholders themselves rejected capitalism. To the original pro-slavery theorists, the same free markets that the NHC and 1619 Project indict today posed an existential threat to the continued survival of chattel slavery. This is no more evident than in how the most prominent pro-slavery theorist, George Fitzhugh claimed, in 1857, that capitalism was “tainted with abolition, and at war with our institutions.” In order for slavery to continue existing, he proposed that the South must “throw Adam Smith, Say, Ricardo & Co., in the fire.”

As a devout anti-capitalist, Fitzhugh had been on the defensive for quite a while, as his 1854 book ‘Sociology for the South’ declared, ‘Political economy is the science of free society. Its theory and its history alike establish this position. Its fundamental maxim Laissez-faire and ‘Pas trop gouverner,’ are at war with all kinds of slavery, for they in fact assert that individuals and peoples prosper most when governed least.”

In fact, much of the dogma of labor exploitation that we contend with today and which is perpetuated by Desmond and the 1619 Project, was conceived as a justification for slavery by Fitzhugh. He averred,

“It is the interest of the capitalist and the skilful to allow free laborers the least possible portion of the fruits of their own labor; for all capital is created by labor, and the smaller the allowance of the free laborer, the greater the gains of his employer. To treat free laborers badly and unfairly, is universally inculcated as a moral duty, and the selfishness of man’s nature prompts him to the most rigorous performance of this cannibalish duty. We appeal to the political economy; the ethical, social, political and economic philosophy of free society, to the prove the truth of our doctrines. As an ethical and social guide, that philosophy teaches, that social, individual and national competition, is a moral duty, and we have attempted to prove all competition is but the effort to enslave others, without being encumbered by their support.”


If Fitzhugh’s tract sounds eerily familiar, it is because there are alarming parallels between his conception of capitalism’s exploitation and that of a German contemporary, Karl Marx. In effect, Fitzhugh had uncovered the Marxist critique of "surplus value" capitalism over a decade before Marx published ‘Capital’ in 1867. Fitzhugh was also a self-avowed socialist, proclaiming, "Slavery is a form, and the very best form, of socialism," further contending that wage labor would be insufficient in meeting the needs of the laborer due to capitalistic exploitation. This deprivation of the laborer could be resolved by slavery, whose paternalistic catering of necessities to the enslaved, would remove the "greed" of wage exploitation\textsuperscript{456}. The parallels between socialism and slavery are indicative of a common thread of illiberalism. While socialism as defined by Marx did not prescribe slavery in theory, in practice, the only distinction in outcomes between chattel slavery and socialism was whether slavery occurred on the plantation or on the Gulags.

A fine example of capitalism’s role in vanquishing slavery would be the case of Lewis and Arthur Tapper. Arthur had enraged New York’s pro-slavery bloc after inviting the ex-slave and co-founder of the American Anti-Slavery Society, Rev. Samuel Cornish, into his family pew for Sunday Service. The pair, who were already renowned abolitionist philanthropists at the time incurred the wrathful ire of the pro-slavery bloc, who then came out in full force against them. After being mobbed by pro-slavery rioters and forced to close their business, Arthur Tappan & Co.. The journalist, who also happened to convert to abolitionism under the guidance of the Tapper’s, William Leggett, documented how slavery’s defenders were more than happy to incite political violence to force their opposition into submission\textsuperscript{457}. Leggett would later go on to write of how abolition was explicitly linked to laissez-faire capitalism and free markets\textsuperscript{458}.

However, never one to be defeated, Lewis Tappan devised an innovative solution to revive their move against slavery. Lewis created a system for businesses to track and validate the credit-worthiness of potential customers. In 1841, he founded the New York Mercantile Agency. Tappan’s innovation served as a useful instrument for abolitionist business owners to escape the rancorous harassment dealt out by racist mobs as well as evade economic targeting by plantation owners who sought to make abolitionist businesses unviable. Over time, his idea became the standard
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method of verification adopted by modern businesses and lending agencies. Having filled a market gap and turned around his once dismal economic prospects, Tapper and his brother Lewis continued their pro-abolition strides. They continued to serve as generous donors to the abolitionist cause, setting up a network of lawyers to mount legal challenges against the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act, which sought to recapture African Americans in the Northern territories and forcibly return them to the plantation. In addition, the newfound fortunes of the Tappans allowed them to funnel their profits to the Underground Railroad that covertly transported escaped slaves from the antebellum South to the liberalized North. Lewis Tappan was also a major sponsor for Lysander Spooner’s book ‘The Unconstitutionality of Slavery’ and bore the financial cost of printing Spooner’s abolitionist pamphlets.

In attempting to claim that slavery is the lineal ancestor of capitalism, the 1619 Project embarks on a gross practice of neglecting evidence, conveniently excluding the extremely anti-capitalist tilt of the pro-slavery movement and the role that capitalism played in undermining Southern plantation slavery. Desmond’s thesis, that capitalism is a “racist” institution that has carried forth the legacy of slavery centuries after abolition, is thus completely fictitious and requires the omission of the fact that capitalism was actually a great liberator of runaway slaves and the enemy that slaveholders wished to destroy. There can be no direct lineal link between slavery and capitalism, in spite of the 1619 Project’s averments to the contrary, as not only do the facts refute such a spurious claim, but the slaveholders themselves did too. It is no small irony that, just like the desperate slaveholders, those who conceived of the 1619 Project envisage a world where the heirs to Adam Smith will perish and the world will descend into socialist anarchy.

Conclusion


It thus clear what history is to the authors of the 1619 Project (and critical theorists in general): history is not an instrument for the understanding of human nature or the development of a country over time; it is merely a hammer to be employed in the service of mowing down the universality of the Enlightenment. History is merely “fodder for the argument that modern problems are simply the latest manifestation of a deep-seated, incurable philosophic and cultural cancer... History is a weapon not a bond. History isn’t glue – it’s acid.” 463 The goal of critical theory’s conception of history is not to reinforce the values that guide a nation. Rather, they seek to disintegrate those values. The fact that history must always be viewed through the schema of oppression and power structures, where even acts of liberation are cast under the cynical lens of greed, indicates that history is nothing more than a tool to promote division. “After all, if history is a constant source of division – if history is not only divisive but can never even be put behind us, if history is a bleeding artery, seeping sepsis into modernity – then the only answer is amputation.” 464

If every event in history is evil and if those events we previously rallied around are cast as self-serving, then there is nothing left to bind us. The values promoted by the founding fathers are meaningless; the spirit of liberation advocated by Lincoln becomes meaningless; nations are forever defined by their past sins which dictate every event in the present. Orwell’s line “And if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed—if all records told the same tale—then the lie passed into history and became truth. ‘Who controls the past’ ran the Party slogan, ‘controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.’” 465 thus rings true today. The critical theorists have spread like a malignant cancer into our media, politics and social circles. How better to take control then by rewriting the past. The New York Times most definitely controls the media narrative in the present and has used that control to infect history with uncorroborated lies, in their attempt to pervert the minds of their readers. The fact that the 1619 Project was developed into a curriculum to be taught in school reveals their true intentions and betrays their moral grandstanding: every American must be indoctrinated to hate their history and their country.

Again, Orwell explains the purpose of this erasure of history, stating, “Every record has been destroyed or falsified, every book rewritten, every picture has been repainted, every statue and street building has been renamed, every date has been altered. And the process is continuing day by day and minute by minute. History has
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stopped. Nothing exists except an endless present in which the Party is always right.” The message could not be any more resounding: History is replete with never-ending evil; an evil so virulent that it has found its way into every crevice of modern society. Therefore, the racist, patriarchal, homophobic [insert pejorative] system must be torn down! Everything in the present is plagued by the ever-lunging miasma of past injustices! Capitalism must fall! Equity must be prevail! It is only fair! After all, what better way to catalyze the mutilation of the present social order than by tarring it with the same brush as its indefensible predecessor? Orwell concludes in his essay on revionism, “But the special function of certain Newspeak words, of which oldthink was one, was not so much to express meanings as to destroy them.”

But as Jung asserted, motivations can be derived from the consequences of ones actions and we should not allow the cult of critical theory and their band of zealots to obfuscate from the nightmarish consequences of the social order they are attempting to foist upon us all. We already know that the consequences of enacting a policy of uncompromising “equality of outcome” is devastating to any and every society where such a reprehensible experiment has ever been attempted. And it is not an exaggeration that these individuals are steering us towards actual, unrelenting, full-blown revolution. For instance, Ibram X Kendi calls for greater equity in the form of a “revolution against racism” in order for the racist disparities between ethnic groups to be cleansed. In a speech at California State University at Losen Angeles in 2016, the communist zealot, Angela Davis, made it clear that the revolutionary ideals of Marxism vitalize critical theory and by extension social justice, today. Pan-African studies (a specialized field of critical race theory), she said, is “the intellectual arm of the revolution.” Any version of multiculturalism “that does not acknowledge the political character of culture will not, I’m sure, lead to the dismantling of racist, sexist, homophobic, economically exploitative institutions.”

The radical nature of this sentiment is exemplified in how the ‘What We Believe’ section of the Black Lives Matter website calls to “dismantle the patriarchal practice” and “disrupt the Western-prescribed nuclear family structure”.
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This despite the fact that the lack of a nuclear family has been cited by numerous institutions and academics as one of the primary determiners in racial income disparities in America\textsuperscript{471,472}. Furthermore, the nuclear family has proven to be extremely beneficial in ensuring the discontinuation of pernicious social pathologies that disproportionately plague single-parent families. This is because, it was found in 2016, that while the poverty rate for Black Americans stood at 22 percent and that of whites at 11 percent, the poverty rate for black married couples was 7.5 percent\textsuperscript{473}. So if these supposedly anti-racist critical theorists aren’t concerned with actually solving social pathologies that contribute to these supposedly “racist” disparities, what are they actually after? Given their increasingly vociferous calls for the initiation a revolution to bring about equity, and the revelation that the BLM is led by “trained Marxists”, their ideological ambitions are not very subtle. For the benefit of the doubt, however, let us persist in our analysis of their motivations and aims.

Identity politicians groomed by the teachings of critical theory, such as Ilhan Omar, make rallying cries, declaring that, “\textit{We are not merely fighting to tear down systems of oppression in the criminal justice system — we are fighting to tear down systems of oppression that exist in housing, in education, in health care, in employment and in the very air we breathe}” and therefore in typical critical theorist/postmodernist fashion, “\textit{We must begin the work of dismantling the whole system of oppression wherever we find it.}”\textsuperscript{474} Omar is dead serious. In August 2019, Omar called for the protection of a Somali telecommunication company called Hormuud, invoking its “vital services” and “enormous contribution to the economy.” Omar, however, neglected to mention that Hormuud’s founder, Ahmed Nur Ali Jimale, is known to be one of the chief financiers of the notorious terror organization, al-Shabab. Through Jimale, Hormuud has reportedly provided not only technological and logistical support to al-Shabab, it has also provided weapons and ammunition\textsuperscript{475,476}. Omar wants to dismantle the system alright, even if that


means funding terrorists to do finish the job for her. In 2015, six Somali men were arrested while attempting to cross the U.S. border into Mexico in order to join ISIS in Syria. As the case approached trial, Omar petitioned the presiding judge to show “compassion” by providing a lighter sentence for one of the accused facing up to 30 years imprisonment. Omar wrote,

“Such punitive measures not only lack efficacy, they inevitably create an environment in which extremism can flourish, aligning with the presupposition of terrorist recruitment. The best deterrent to fanaticism is a system of compassion. We must alter our attitude and approach; if we truly want to affect change, we should refocus our efforts on inclusion and rehabilitation.” 477

Let’s translate shall we: punishing terrorists causes terrorism, and the best way to prevent radicalization is to include terrorists in our communities and seek to convince them that it would be more fruitful not to terrorize the people they despise. Omar, here, deliberately conflates ex ante (before the event) circumstances with ex post (after the event) outcomes. The radicalization of these individuals did not occur at the time of sentencing, it occurred well before they were arrested and well before they plotted to carry out acts of terror. Indeed, perhaps they grew more resentful after being sentenced, but there is no question that the radicalization occurred before these individuals were nabbed. If it didn’t, they wouldn’t need to be placed on trial and sentenced, because they wouldn’t have been radical in the first place (it’s simple logic really).

Furthermore, the empirical data supporting Omar’s assertion that reintegration of terrorists leads to less terrorism is often contradictory. Despite academics and institutions claiming this to be so, overconfidence in the ability of the controversial program has resulted in devastating consequences for the rest of society. In fact, what empirical evidence indicates is quite the opposite. In 2014, a Minnesota judge presiding over the case of 19-year-old Abdullahi Yusuf, thought very much along the same lines as Omar. The judge gave Yusuf no jail time and an opportunity to join an experimental rehabilitation program for ex-radicals, after he pleaded guilty to attempting to join ISIS. The de-radicalization program that Yusuf was subject to was purported to help “turn a young person under prosecution away from extremist ideology.” The experimental program was cut short, however, as soon after Yusuf was found with a box cutter under his bed and was sent back to prison, due to the fact that he had managed to obtain, what the court deemed to be, a deadly weapon 478.
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In the UK, though academics tout de-radicalization programs as incredibly successful, three men who underwent such programs proceeded to commit acts of terror afterwards. After undergoing de-radicalization in 2017, Usman Khan killed two people in London in 2019, Ahmad Hassan became the infamous Parson’s Green bomber in 2017 and Salman Abedi was notorious for carrying out the Manchester bombing in 2017. Of the 1,400 individuals who underwent de-radicalization between 2003 and 2008, 45 were re-arrested for potential terror activity. As we all know, one terrorist is capable of wreaking insane carnage and hence no matter how small, as long as there are reoffenders, that counts as one too many. If the evidence suggests that this “compassionate” approach to terrorism still breeds terrorists, why would Congresswoman Omar risk public safety by even suggesting it? Well, because she has far more nefarious aims, as her bid to continue funding known terrorist organizations and calls to “dismantle” America (which she immigrated to from Somali) would indicate. Social deconstruction, in the eyes of Ilhan Omar, must be achieved by any means necessary, even if that means the application brute force.

Meanwhile Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has repeatedly pressed for “political revolution,” seemingly paying homage to Mao’s Cultural Revolution. And she seriously means revolution. She wasn’t kidding or hyperbolizing either. How do we know this? The aims for her signature policy, ‘The Green New Deal’ inform us of the fact that she does indeed wish to catalyze a revolution that would upend social order. Cortez does not care about the climate, she’s merely exploiting the collective moral outrage that “capitalism has killed our planet” in order to push her Marxist, equity-based agenda. Cortez’ former chief of staff, Saikat Chakrabarti, while still gainfully employed by the Representative, revealed as much when he spoke to Washington Governor, Jay Inslee, stating, “The interesting thing about the Green New Deal, is it wasn’t originally a climate thing at all. Do you think of it as a how-do-you-change-the-entire-economy thing.” Apart from the Green New Deal’s surface level agenda of eliminating the use of all fossil fuels in America (which has been a political agenda since Al Gore’s presidential bid and is hence not at all original), the underlying agenda of the bill is to
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advance “social, economic, racial, regional and gender-based justice and equality and cooperative and public ownership.”

It’s almost as if, for a climate bill, combatting actual climate change is secondary on its agenda, and its primary focus is instead on furthering critical theory’s ideological aims. Even those once considered moderate voices have begun caving to the demands of the Long March by critical theory. Joe Biden, the presumptive Democrat presidential nominee once known for being a moderate, proclaimed (in keeping with the theme of critical theory and their Marxist political agents) that his presidency would bring forth “revolutionary institutional changes.”

Senior fellow at the Heritage Foundation, Mike Gonzalez, astutely notes,

“As it should be clear by now, the identity battles that have torn up society ... have not been about protecting women, gays, or anyone else, but about tearing society apart in order to install another system. The creation of identity groups has not been a project to unend the hegemonic hold on power of ... white, male America to give subordinate groups a share of the pie. It was a far more ambitious and encompassing enterprise; it was about destabilizing, or ‘problematicizing’ in the words of its entrepreneurs, all social norms. It wasn’t just a patriotic, national identity that was under the gun. Private property, the free market, the family, religion, assumptions not just about sexual roles but about fixed biological sexes – all these verities needed to be destroyed, and individuals, society, and legal authorities had to recognize and affirm new realities. The imperative to make revolution continues.”

Sidebar: The Marxist Foundations of the Anti-Nuclear Family

Having seen the BLM’s proposal to tear apart two-parent homes in order to “disrupt the patriarchal practice,” one might be wondering: Isn't it better if families were kept whole? The obvious answer is yes. Life, on average, tends to be a lot better if children were to grow up in two-parent homes. This idea, that the family unit must be torn apart, did not spring out of nothing. The BLM’s founder said it best when she described herself as a “trained Marxist.” That hellish ideology is where this sentiment originates and this sidebar shall provide an account of how the assault on the nuclear family emerged in Marxism, was transplanted into critical theory and has since been pushed as a mainstream activist agenda worth fighting for.

483 Ibid.


Karl Marx understood that the family unit represented a significant hurdle to his ideology of societal restructuring. Therefore, Marx proposed the destruction of the nuclear family as the necessary preconditions for said restructuring to take place. The Communist Manifesto called for the abolition of the family in order to “replace home education by social,” and lambasted the nuclear family as “bourgeois,” a place of “exploitation of children by parents,” and a place where women are degraded.\textsuperscript{486}

The step-father of Marxism, Friedrich Engels, took a similar line of attack. He wrote in his 1884 work ‘The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State’, “This is the origin of monogamy as far as we can trace it back among the most civilized and highly developed people of antiquity. It was not in any way the fruit of individual sex-love, with which it had nothing what-ever to do; marriages remained as before marriages of convenience. It was the first form of the family to be based, not on natural, but on economic conditions – on the victory of private property over primitive, natural communal property.”\textsuperscript{487} Marriage, he continues, “is based on the supremacy of the man, the express purpose being to produce children of undisputed paternity”\textsuperscript{488} and that “In the family he is the bourgeois; the wife represents the proletariat.”\textsuperscript{489}

Engels quoted Marx, “the modern family contains in germ not only slavery (servitus), but also serfdom, since from the beginning it is related to agricultural services.”\textsuperscript{490} Thus, Engels laid out the blueprint for attacking the nuclear family perfectly for the critical theorists. From Engels, critical theory was able to develop its methods for staging its coup on the nuclear family: Women were enslaved by men; childbirth and rearing were merely a further entrenchment of women’s “serfdom”; romantic love was actually a mask for patriarchal oppression; the family unit was the primary institution by which to continue the promotion of the evil capitalist system. These conclusions about the institution of marriage would serve as the foundations for critical theory’s assault in years to come.

For instance, Engels conclusions served as the framework by which Simon de Beauvoir, the radical feminist, would conceive of her 1949 book ‘The Second Sex,’ where she
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asserts that “women will not be liberated until they have been liberated from their children”\textsuperscript{491} and that infidelity and sexual promiscuity must be normalized among females. This is because of men’s primary tools to ensure the continued subjugation of women is “the tradition of romantic love”\textsuperscript{492}. Legal and individual freedoms, in the eyes of Beauvoir, were insufficient as women remained under the tyranny of men. Therefore, she prescribed in line with the teachings imparted to her by Engels that for true female liberation, women would be required to shed their maternal instincts and cast aside the institution of marriage.

She further argued that women should be barred from even considering motherhood: “No woman should be authorized to stay at home to raise her children. Society should be totally different. Women should not have that choice, precisely because if there is such a choice, too many women will make that one. It is a way of forcing women in a certain direction.”\textsuperscript{493} Here, Beauvoir exudes Orwellian Doublethink. On the one hand she claims that women have a choice between pursuing a career and motherhood; on the other hand if women choose motherhood then it must be because some sinister patriarchal force drove them down that path. Which is it? Do women have choices or are they subject to patriarchal forces? This question is never answered. Nevertheless, Beauvoir returned in 1984 with ‘After the Second Sex,’ stating, this time, in the most explicit terms possible, “I think that the family must be abolished.”\textsuperscript{494}

Kate Millet, a student of Beauvoir’s work, was documented as early as 1969, vowing to “destroy the family,” “destroy the American patriarch,” and “destroy monogamy.”\textsuperscript{495} Soon enough, Millet had gained enough notoriety that Simone de Beauvoir personally identified her as a worthy successor. Not only did Millet drink from the sacred chalice that were Beauvoir’s teachings, she drank directly from the cup of Engels. In her own 1970 book, ‘Sexual Politics,’ she asserted that the great value “of Engel’s contribution to the sexual revolution lay in his analysis of patriarchal marriage and family.”\textsuperscript{496} By treating these supposedly patriarchal relationships “as historical institutions, subject to the same processes of evolution as other social phenomena, Engels had laid the sacred open to serious criticism, analysis and even to possible drastic
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reorganization." 497 Millet further contended that eradicating traditional social institutions were foundational to female liberation, writing that "an end to traditional sexual inhibitions and taboos, particularly those that most threaten patriarchal monogamous marriage: homosexuality, 'illegitimacy,' adolescent and pre- and extra-marital sexuality." 498

By 1984, critical gender and feminist studies were introduced in colleges all over the United States, with such texts on their reading lists as ‘Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoretical Accounts of the Relations Between Men and Women,’ which argued that, “Women’s struggles must be directed immediately against male domination. In order to do this, women must forsake heterosexuality, which divides women from each other and ties them to their oppressors. Women’s bodies are social constructs. Nothing about women is natural. ... [in the] new society, there will only be persons. Men and women will have disappeared [if] feminism is the theory, lesbianism is the practice.” 499 Thus, by the 1980s when the anti-nuclear family movement had entered the college campus, the imperative was no longer just about debasing male-female relationships, it had now morphed into a simultaneous attack on heterosexuality. As the legal scholar, Susan B. Boyd notes, “feminists have suggested that the emphasis on marriage and coupledom stigmatizes alternative models of intimacy, including communal living chosen families that fall outside of the nuclear dyadic model, and non-monogamous and polyamorous relationships.” 500

In 2019, the assault on the nuclear family had exploded into the mainstream consciousness, with the American Psychological Association (APA) launching its Taskforce on Consensual Non-Monogamy to promote “awareness and inclusivity about consensual non-monogamy and diverse expressions of intimate relationships. These include but are not limited to: people who practice polyamory, open relationships, swinging, relationship anarchy and other types of ethical, non-monogamous relationships.” 501 Similarly, the Black Lives Matter Organization has declared that they aim to “disrupt the Western-prescribed nuclear family structure requirement by supporting each other as extended families and ‘villages’ that
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collectively care for one another, especially our children, to the degree that mothers, parents, and children are comfortable.” The BLM take a familiar to that proposed by Engels and the critical theorists: the nuclear family is a symbol of white, Western patriarchal domination and in order to liberate supposedly subordinated groups, there must be an active campaign to erode these hierarchical power structures.

The APA and critical theorist position that in order to affirm other family structures and liberate women, we must destabilize the nuclear family has in fact been attempted before, with devastating consequences. In Soviet Russia, after the Bolshevik Revolution, “Lenin imagined a future when unpaid housework and child care would be replaced by communal dining rooms, nurseries, kindergartens, and other industries.” After the end of the revolution, the Bolsheviks immediately enacted laws to begin their refashioning of society in accordance with their utopian vision. As an anonymous “Women Resident in Russia” wrote in the Atlantic in 1926, the Soviet government “abolished the term ‘illegitimate children’ equalizing the legal status of all children, whether born in wedlock or out of it,” while divorce was made to be “a matter of a few minutes, to be obtained at the request of either partner in a marriage.” The consequences were “chaos,” added the writer. She described men with multiple wives, uncared-for children forced onto the streets, rampant promiscuity, and other ills, to the point that the Soviets were left with little choice but to undo the changes they had enforced and return to the status quo. Even the Soviets were not completely blind to the havoc they had wreaked upon themselves, something, unfortunately, that today’s critical theorists and activists are wilfully ignorant of or simply do not care about.

Additionally, the assault on the nuclear family structure occurs in spite of the fact that Barack Obama acknowledged in 2008 that too many Black fathers “have abandoned their responsibilities, acting like boys instead of men. We know the statistics – that children who grow up without a father are five times more likely to live in poverty and commit crime; nine times more likely to drop out of schools and 20 times more likely to end up in prison. They are more likely to have behavioral problems, or run

---


away from home or become teenage parents themselves. And the foundations of our community are weaker because of it."

So why are organizations that purport to reaffirm the importance of Black lives pushing initiatives that will undoubtedly result in more Blacks being stuck in cycles of intergenerational poverty? Further, why are mainstream associations, like the APA, attempting to debase the nuclear family when, as Obama illustrates, its benefits are so blatantly obvious? As the account of a post-nuclear family society in the Soviet Union illustrates, critical theorists and activists seem to want to fracture society and cause social pathologies to metastasize. They wish to destabilize society in order to later play the victim card and pin the blame for whatever newly emergent disparities as a consequence of some flavor-of-the-month type oppression by the “system,” even though their efforts to erase the nuclear family led directly to those disparities. They therefore wish to make people’s lives miserable in order to generate even greater hostility towards the “system,” all the while acting under the visage of broad-based altruism by proclaiming their aspirations for LGBTQIAAPP+/ female liberation and Black empowerment.

The demands made by critical theory and their identity politicians for revolutionary social upheaval are perilous in the extreme. Theory’s (and by extension identity politicians’) insistence on pursuing the presumptive dogma of social corruption which states that: All individual problems, no matter how superfluous or rare, must be solved by a total cultural restructuring, no matter how radical. This is thus indicative of the fact that critical theory pays no heed to the ramifications of what it pursues. The fact that each person’s private trouble cannot be solved by social revolution, because revolutions are dangerous and wreak havoc on social order (the events at the former state of CHAZ/ CHOP immediately spring to mind), is completely scorned by critical


Theorists and their proponents. As we saw, every attempt to bring forth utopia or a land of “true” equity has led to unending chaos. Therefore, altering the current order with such reckless abandon in the name of an ideological shibboleth (equity in this case) is likely to produce far more suffering than good, given the suffering that even miniscule revolutions inevitably produce. So why do the critical theorists and their political puppets demand so vigorously for their conception of equity, if the outcomes are always so hopelessly disastrous? Let’s take a step back and observe what these zealots have been doing thus far. They have problematized modern society and deconstructed its language, they have then sought to institute wholesale communist-style re-education by redefining language according to their desired ideological bent, and now they want equity, knowing full well that such actions always (ALWAYS!) lead to cataclysmic outcomes. The steps that critical theory take are incremental and the ascent towards their actual radical agenda is very often barely noticeable. This is deliberately so. If the theorists proposed their radical agenda right from the off, they would be rightfully labelled zealots.

Instead critical theory carries out one of the greatest acts of deception in modern times. It hides behind a cloak of righteousness, posturing itself as if it alone is able to guide us to the path of moral righteousness. In order to achieve this abundantly moral utopian fantasy (where everyone is “equal” in terms of power and wealth, where there is no racism or sexism or any other kind of negative -ism), we must collectively raise our cudgels against the current order for it is racist, sexist, homophobic, transphobic, fatphobic, anti-Muslim, and all in all oppressive. Knowing the false dichotomy it has manufactured, critical theory then asks us, “Are you really going to defend that? That which is so repugnant; that which continues to oppress your sons and daughters, your friends and family, really? How can you be so immoral?” The psychology of this can be seen in the second volume of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn’s masterpiece. Solzhenitsyn discussed the conclusion of the Nuremberg Trials and how there are some actions that are so intrinsically terrible that they run counter to the proper nature of human Beings. These actions are overtly evil and there are never any excuses for them. This is a foundational Truth that we hold to be self-evident. Whether consciously or sub-consciously, the vast majority of us know that there are certain acts that can never be tolerated because they originate from a place in Hell.

Critical theorists are aware of this particular aspect of our innate human constitution, therefore it is essential, in order to achieve their ideological ambitions, for them to dehumanize the current order and all of its wondrous creations and thereby reduce it to the status of an oppressive parasite leeching off of innocents to serve its own greed. Once again, critical theory’s program is extremely seductive. Where the founding fathers of the Enlightenment promised rights and freedom – but not handouts – the program of the critical theorists sets no limits on that which can be demanded from government.

Furthermore, it shields its beneficiaries from claims of self-indulgent rapacity by hiding behind the skirts of broad-based group morality and altruism. This never-ending vilification that the current system must endure leaves individuals with very little choice but to abandon ship, lest they wish to be cast in the same heinous Tartarean light as the now indefensible system. This is a power play as old as time. Sigmund Freud conceived of this power play as the insidious role of the Oedipal Mother. Though many psychologists have attempted to undermine this aspect of Freud’s work on psychological manipulation, they only adopt this stance because they take his claims at face value, never bothering to understand the expansive, ancient mythology that buttressed Freud’s work. The Oedipal Mother (which can be applied to fathers as well. It was only represented as female due to the mythos that undergirded Freud’s work.) is the spirit of psychological manipulation. The Oedipal Mother, as described by clinical psychologist, Dr. Jordan B. Peterson,

“makes a pact with herself, her children, and the devil himself. The deal is this: ‘Above all, never leave me. In return, I will do everything for you. As you age without maturing, you will become worthless and bitter, but you will never have to take any responsibility, and everything you do that’s wrong will always be someone else’s fault.’”

The Oedipal Mother is an ancient symbol and can be seen throughout the earliest recordings of folklore. The Mesopotamians conceived of it as Tiamat, the mother of all creation and the female dragon-deity, who moves to bring about the destruction of her own children. Today, we see the Oedipal Mother take shape throughout modern fiction as well. In the fable of Hansel and Gretel, the starving siblings come across a gingerbread house owned by a seemingly kind old woman. The woman offers them sustenance, giving them anything they want, with them never having to even do anything. The old woman continues to feed them, fattening them up and playing into their deepest (food-related) desires. Unbeknownst to them, she is secretly plotting to cook the objects of her doting alive. The case of the Oedipal Mother in the fable of Hansel and Gretel portrays, precisely, the malevolent aims of critical theory. Critical theory wishes to disintegrate our rational functions of cognition, rupture the spirit of individualism that has bound society together for centuries and refuse us the opportunity to access the mature faculty of reason. Critical theory, like the Oedipal Mother, wishes to stunt our capacity for individual agency and free will and instead lulls us into a sense of false heroism. The dogmatic nature


of critical theory persuades us to believe that what it implores to achieve will definitely guide us to the path of righteousness (even though, as previously discussed, ruination is the actual outcome). But far more importantly, like the Oedipal Mother, Tiamat and the witch in Hansel and Gretel, critical theory plays to that which we passionately covet (purity of character in our case) in order to shroud the fact that it is driving us to effectuate social suicide.

Critical theory induces a moral compulsion within us such that we develop a rabid dependency on it to solve the problems of this corrupt oppressive world for us. Critical theory is like opioids, once you take your first hit, it is almost impossible to ditch. We start, like opioid addicts, craving for more, because critical theory presents such a neat summary of life’s complexities that it becomes irresistible. In Wolfgang von Goethe’s great German play, ‘Faust: A Tragedy’, Heinrich Faust is extremely successful (much like current society) yet, he grows resentful and seeks a higher purpose in life. Faust thus makes a pact and trades his soul with the Devil, Mephistopheles, in return for anything he may desire while still alive on Earth. We are Faust, seeking to realize our innermost desires for moral purity and trading it with the Mephistopheles of reality, critical theory, disregarding the fatal consequences that await. In Goethe’s play, Mephistopheles is the eternal adversary of Good, masquerading as a savior to help lift the suffering of Being (human existence) off of Faust’s shoulders. Mephistopheles has a central, defining credo515:

*I am the spirit who negates
and rightly so, for all that comes to be
deserves to perish, wretchedly!
It were better nothing would begin!
Thus everything that your terms sin,
destruction, evil represent –
that is my proper element.*

Goethe considered this hateful sentiment – the foundational component of vengeful human destructiveness – to be pivotal to understanding that the evil of humanity often manifests itself in the most benign of manners. And this is exactly what critical theory and their armada of theorists, activists and identity politicians are guilty of. They are Mephistopheles. It is undeniable that any individual who attempts to incite anarchy, regardless of how much altruistic rhetoric is slathered on to create the veneer of moral righteousness, is corrupted by the lust for power. Why else would the critical theorists and identity politicians be so obsessed with power, as to actively identify it in every crevice of society, if they did not wish to hoard it for themselves? As much as they can deceive us (and even themselves), the history of their ideology informs us of both their

motivations and the outcomes they seek. The proverbial skeleton in critical theory's altruistic closet is that there is no unity at the end of the destruction it wishes to wreak. Just like in the Soviet Union, there will only be still more destruction. Just like in Sri Lanka, the revolution will consume its architects. No modern utopia will be erected after the razing of the Enlightenment philosophy, modern science and objectivity, traditional institutions (family and the judiciary), and history. Tribalism will descend upon us and supplant unity. The glue of dissent that currently binds disparate factions of critical theory will simply melt away. All that will be left are polarized groups existing in a fragmented society, savagely competing to further their own collective group interests.

3(iii) Erasing the Individual & Collectivizing the Masses

Critical theory, having thrown objectivity and the scientific method out of the window, problematized every aspect of modern culture into the void, deconstructed language on its own terms and planted the seeds of revolution, now requires an army to initiate its Disintegrationist ideology. Since it has already stoked inter-group tensions by pitting women against men, ethnic minorities against ethnic majorities, the disabled against the able, members of the LGBTQQIAAPP+ community against heterosexuals, critical theory thus depends upon an ideological glue to allow all these individual grievance groups to form a coalition in solidarity against the racist, heteronormative, white, Western patriarchy. Enter intersectionality, the paragon of critical theory. Intersectionality allows the various victim groups constructed by critical theory to consolidate against an ever-expanding list of oppressors. As Patricia Hill Collins describes,

"Intersectionality is a way of understanding and analyzing the complexity in the world, in people, and in human experiences. The events and conditions of social and political life and the self can seldom be understood as shaped by one factor. They are generally shaped by many factors in diverse and mutually influencing ways. When it comes to social inequality, people's lives and the organization of power in a given society are better understood as being shaped not by a single axis of social division, be it race or gender or class, but by many axes that work together and influence each other. Intersectionality as an analytic tool gives people better access to the complexity of the world and of themselves."\(^5\)

In the eyes of critical theorists, disparities are automatically the result of discrimination, which is often relabeled under canonical terms like "privilege," "systemic racism," or "patriarchalism." Hence, the critical theorists, having established that oppression is so malignant within society, proceed to harness the powers of intersectionality in order to enlarge the range of possible oppressions weighing a particular individual down. Intersectionality can thus be construed as a framework employed by critical theorists to coerce various identity groups to no longer conceive of their supposed oppression as

existing along a single domain, but rather that they must now view oppression as existing across a multivariate of domains. Critical theorists thus use intersectionality as an instrument to cement their calamitous logic: Since individuals are inherently unequal, any form of inequality in society is proof of systemic oppression and intersectionality allows individuals to declare themselves victims of societal injustice by fusing various grievance groups and thus metastasizing these pernicious injustices. This is evident from how Crenshaw writes,

“According to the dominant view, a discriminator treats all people within a race or sex category similarly. Any significant experiential or statistical variation within this group suggests either that the group is not being discriminated against or that conflicting interests exist which defeat any attempts to bring a common claim. Consequently, one generally cannot combine these categories. Race and sex, moreover, become significant only when they operate to explicitly disadvantage the victims; because the privileging of whiteness or maleness is implicit, it is generally not perceived at all.”

The intersection of an individual’s in-group victim membership therefore defines him/her. Intersectionality suggests that every society is structured in a hierarchy of victimhood, in which a designated victim could exist in multiple categories of victimhood simultaneously. The logic of intersectionality, as applied by Crenshaw, suggests that if an individual were to exist within various grievance groups at the same time, that individual is conferred with insurmountable disadvantage. Likewise, within the intersectional framework, a lack of grievance group membership or the fewer grievance groups one can identify with confers definite privilege. In fact, intersectionality makes it such that there is no longer a need to even examine the data on claims of victimization before determining whether a particular grievance group has indeed been subject to such oppression. Instead, intersectional critical theorists simply conflate disparities as concrete evidence of victimization. Further, critical theory makes the blanket assumption that any individual who is not a heterosexual white male has experienced some form of oppression. Intersectionality can thus be seen as having adopted and modified standpoint epistemology, which claims roughly that one’s position (with respect to critical theory’s assumed systemic power dynamics of white heterosexual male on top) determines the possibilities for one’s right to speak and status as a knower of the realities of critical theory’s various -isms (racism, sexism, able-ism, patriarchalism etc. etc.), which in turn reflexively define one’s relationship to dominance and oppression. This

was Theorized by Patricia Hill Collins as a “Matrix of Domination” in her 1990 book, *Black Feminist Thought*.518

Though initially conceived as a legal proposal by Kimberlé Crenshaw, intersectionality devolved very rapidly into a form of self-victimizing. On its face value, Crenshaw's proposition that an individual could be faced with the duality of sexism and racism simultaneously was worth further consideration. However, by her second paper on the topic, it became clear that she never intended for intersectionality to be embraced as a mere legal principle and instead sought to wield it for the furthering of (*in her own words*) "identity politics."519 As Mike Gonzalez defines it, identity politics refers to the "deliberate creation of pan-ethnic and other identity groups; the idea that members of this panoply of collectives should get compensatory justice; the culture of victimhood all of this engenders."520

Intersectionality means, in the words of critical theorist and diversity trainer, Robin DiAngelo, "*positionality must constantly be engaged.*"521 What this means is that one must cultivate an awareness of the various ways in which one’s group identities intersect to confer privilege and create oppression. According to DiAngelo, one must acknowledge these in all situations and reflect (*and preferably act*) upon their relevance in all behaviors, especially social interactions. This is considered an ongoing and lifelong practice and is not negotiable522. Of note, it requires recognizing that in all social interactions, there are systemic power dynamics (*like racism, sexism, heterosexism, etc. etc.*) that are in play and must be acknowledged by the relationally dominant participant (*as it is Theorized that the relationally oppressed person is aware of them automatically*).

As convincing and self-important as the ideology of intersectionality makes itself out to be, it is, however, constructed off of three highly egregious premises. The first false premise that intersectionality is built off of is probably the most glaring one: (1) *that all forms of societal disparities are a consequence of systemic oppression and that the very existence of disparities serves to reinforce its thesis of pervasive subjugation of various grievance groups.* The second false premise is (2) that individuals, by virtue of being born
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into a particular collective identity group (that is not white male heterosexual), are immediately assumed to be systemically oppressed. The final false premise and arguably the less noticeable but most important one, is that intersectionality is extremely collectivist in nature and operates on the basis of identity politics. (3) Intersectionality thus presumes that it is not only providing an accurate representation of the victim groups whose grievances it purports to safeguard, but that these diverse groups are able to coexist without any friction.

False Premise [1]

Intersectionality assumes systemic oppression as axiomatic and uses disparities between various individuals/identity groups as evidence of said oppression. Intersectionality creates the illusion that barring any oppression, the outcomes amongst individuals and social groups would tend to be equal. The fatal flaw here is that this critical conception presupposes that there are no other consequential factors that contribute to the emergence of group/individual disparities apart from societal injustices. As mentioned earlier (in the section on equality), even a mother’s nutritional habits during pregnancy have lasting effects on a child’s IQ. Thus, it is extremely erroneous to make the presumption that all disparities are a consequence of patriarchalism, racism, sexism, heterosexism etc. When we go outside the confines of intersectionality’s dogmatic interpretation of what induces disparities, we find that there are in fact many morally neutral, naturally occurring phenomena that give rise to significant disparities between individuals/identity groups. These include but are not limited to: geography, age, physicality, culture and family structure.

Geography matters, for instance, because isolated populations tend to possess lower IQs. Sub-groups of isolated white populations have lower average IQs than the average IQs of Black Americans. Such geographically isolated white communities include the Appalachians residing in the hills or mountains, those living in the Hebrides islands off Scotland, and in canal boat communities in England. These communities, unlike Black American communities do not have access to formal education, grocery stores, public transportation or any of the modern amenities that are taken for granted today.


The geographic isolation that plagues such white sub-groups results in a lack of exposure to the vast expanse of knowledge available in developed settings and thus causes, on average, lower intellectual development among those residing in such communities. These disparities in average intellectual development amongst members of geographically isolated communities are thus a consequence of nature dealing a bad hand and not a result of intersectionality’s conception of overarching systemic injustice. Furthermore, given that these geographically disadvantaged communities are overwhelmingly white, how then can they be characterized by intersectionality as being implicitly “privileged” by virtue of their whiteness?

Geographic isolation also has played a hefty role in limiting the socioeconomic progress of various populations across the world during various periods of historical time. For example, when the Spanish set sail across the world, they discovered the isolated Canary Islands in the 15th century. There, the Spaniards found a native population of Caucasian descent, described to be living as people had lived thousands of years earlier during the Stone Ages. In any case, the geographer, Ellen Churchill Semple, found that those residing in North Africa were thousands of years more advanced than the Caucasians of the Canary Islands. The immense correlation between severe geographic isolation and a dearth in socioeconomic development has also been found in other similarly secluded natural settings, such as mountains, jungles and deserts.

Additionally, geographic differences, sometimes highly inconspicuous to the naked eye, can have a massive bearing on human outcomes. One of the most remarkable examples of this would be how, in the 19th century, Ireland was stricken by a famine caused by the failure of the potato crop. At a time when potatoes were the principal food of the Irish, the severe lack of supply resulted in deaths by starvation and disease related to malnutrition. It was estimated that out of a population of 8.5 million people at the time, over a million lives had been claimed by the famine. However, across the Atlantic, the

very same variety of potato was grown in the United States, with no crop failure. Due to this disparity in outcomes in the yield of potatoes, observers decided to trace the root of the problem. It was found that the fertilizer used to plant potatoes contained a fungus which flourished in the mild and moist climate of Ireland, but not in the hot and dry summer climate of Idaho and other potato-growing regions of the United States.\textsuperscript{535, 536}

Without even having to consider the role of oppression, it would thus appear as though nature, by way of geography, has had a hand in creating striking disparities between various social groups, in terms of average intelligence, economic prosperity and even the chances of survival of entire populations.

The age of an individual or the average age among various social groups can also result in the propagation of individual and group disparities. Individuals with the highest income levels are aged between 45 and 54 years old.\textsuperscript{537} Discounting the existence of the billionaire class, who make up a minute percentage of the world’s population, most individuals thus reach upper income brackets after having risen from lower income levels over the course of their careers. Reaching one’s highest earning potential is thus a matter of natural career progression for most individuals, indicating that those occupying the highest income brackets are merely a lifetime class who have worked their way up the ranks within their respective occupations. As Sowell discerns,

\textit{“Despite heady rhetoric about economic disparities between classes, most of those economic differences reflect the mundane fact that most people start out in lower-paid, entry-level jobs and then earn more as they acquire more skills and experience over the years.”}\textsuperscript{538}

This is why the average sum of accumulated wealth is disproportionately concentrated among elderly households. In the United States, households headed by those aged 70 to 74 years old have the highest average wealth of any age bracket. Though the average income of households headed by individuals 65 years or older is less than half that of households headed by individuals aged 35 to 44 years old, the average wealth of these older households is nearly thrice the wealth of households headed by individuals aged 35 to 44 years old. Similarly, wealth held by older households is more than 15 times the
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wealth of households headed by people under 35 years of age 539 540. This accounts for how age can contribute to individual disparities in accumulated wealth.

Age can also serve to spawn disparities between identity groups. In the United States for example, the median age of Japanese Americans is 51 and the median age of Mexican Americans is 27 541. Recalling the aforementioned statistic on how most high income wage earners are merely a lifetime class aged 45 to 54, is it at all surprising that the median income of Japanese Americans is higher than that of Mexican Americans? How likely then is it (given the median age statistics) that America’s Japanese and Mexican ethnic groups would have the same proportions of their populations equally represented in occupations, institutions or activities that require long years of education or job experience? Is it not surprising if Mexican Americans are not as well represented as the Japanese Americans in the professions, or managerial positions, for which long years of education and work experience are usually required? How many 27-year-olds of any ethnic background meet the requirements for being equity partners at law firms, head physicians at hospitals or CEOs at major corporate entities? Even if America’s Japanese and Mexicans were absolutely identical in every other aspect of life besides age, they would nevertheless differ significantly in incomes and other age-related outcomes. The reality, however, is that racial, ethnic and other social groups are rarely, if ever, identical in everything else. Furthermore, age differences can also serve to explain a significant portion of the gender wage gap. For instance, a study conducted by the Industrial and Labor Relations Review found that “the gender gap in compensation among top executives was at least 45%.” 542 However, a considerable portion of that had to do with the relative age of male and female executives. When the study took age into account, the gender wage gap shrunk at a remarkable rate: “Women in the sample were much younger, and had much less seniority on the gender gap seems to be reflected in the size of companies women managed. All in all, we find that the unexplained gender compensation gap for top executives was less than 5% after one accounts for all observable differences between men and women.” 543 The inequities that are produced as a consequence of age differences therefore make the prospect of equal outcomes even
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more improbable, and disparities in outcomes even more questionable as automatic indicators of some form of invisible structural oppression.

Physicality also has considerable bearing in producing social inequities, this is no more evident than in the world of sports. In recent years there has been an uproar amongst female athletes demanding that they be paid the same wages as men. They justify this demand by purporting that there are no differences in the level of competitiveness in the male sports world and female sports world. As a consequence of the fact that the wages in the sporting world still overwhelmingly favor men, female athletes have rallied, asserting that they are being oppressed. However, when we take a look at the various sports, themselves, the differences in physicality (and by extension competitiveness) between genders could not be more stark. For instance, in 2017, the U.S. Women’s Soccer first team, the best women’s football team in the world, got thumped 5-0 at the hands of fifteen-year-olds who played for the F.C. Dallas youth team. In similar fashion, the Australian women’s national team, ranked 7th best in the world, lost by a score line of 7-0 against the Newcastle Jets under-15 boys’ team. The differences in physicality between men and women translate to very noticeable differences in the level at which a sport is played. This holds true in other sporting fields as well. In tennis, Serena Williams, arguably the greatest female player of all time, claimed in 1998 that no male player outside of the top 200 could beat either her or her sister, Venus. Karsten Braasch, ranked 203rd in the world at the time, stepped up to the task. He beat Serena 6-1 and then proceeded to beat Venus 6-2. At the end of the exhibition, Serena stated, “I didn't know it would be that difficult. I played shots that would have been winners on the women's circuit and he got to them very easily.” However, one notable exception in tennis, was


when Billie Jean King, then female world number one and aged 29, beat Bobby Riggs, then aged 55\textsuperscript{550}. Though it is important to note that Riggs had also beaten three-time champion and then-world number one, Margaret Court, in straight sets earlier that year.

In the Rio 2016 Olympics, the gold medallist 100m women’s sprinter clocked a time of 10.71\textsuperscript{551}. The slowest men’s finalist clocked a time of 10.06\textsuperscript{552}. There are also stark physical differences amongst players in the National Basketball Association (NBA) and players in the Women’s National Basketball Association (WNBA). For instance, only six WNBA players have managed to dunk the basketball, totalling 20 dunks in the league’s 24-year history\textsuperscript{553}. By comparison, Spud Webb, one of the shortest NBA players ever at 5’7”, had more dunks than the WNBA combined in his 12-year NBA career\textsuperscript{554}. The average height of players in the WNBA is 6-feet (with most of them being unable to dunk)\textsuperscript{555}. Remarkably, NBA players like Nate Robinson (5’9”), Allen Iverson (6’0”), Spud Webb (5’7”) and a couple of others have made careers out of being able to dunk the basket.

The reason athletic ability is so important in sports, is because it increases the entertainment value of the sport itself. With greater entertainment value comes greater marketability and greater viewership, which inevitably generate greater profit margins. This is why the 2014 FIFA World Cup raked in over 3.2 billion viewers globally, which was more than triple the global audience of the 2019 FIFA Women’s World Cup. This disparity in viewership translated directly to advertising revenue and consequently to a disparity in the remuneration for participating players. “The Women’s World Cup brought in almost $73 million, of which the players got 13%. The 2010 men’s World Cup in South Africa made almost $4 billion, of which 9% went to the players.”\textsuperscript{556} A
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similar trend appears in basketball where the average regular-season attendance at WNBA games in 2018 was 6,769 per game\textsuperscript{557}, while the NBA recorded an average of 17,897 attendees per regular-season game\textsuperscript{558}. Just like with football, the viewership disparities between the NBA and WNBA have translated to disparities in profit generation. \textit{In 2018, NBA commissioner, Adam Silver put out a statement declaring that the WNBA had made a net loss of $10 million on average, per year since its inception}\textsuperscript{559}. The NBA, on the other hand, generated a combined league revenue of $8.76 billion in 2018\textsuperscript{560}. Inequities produced in the sporting world are by and large a consequence of the naturally occurring, biologically determined phenomenon known as physicality. No one determined the outcomes in this arena, but nature itself. Hence, there is absolutely no precedent for the argument of oppression to be made in the case of the wage gaps in sports, seeing as how the compensation that athletes receive is entirely dependent on their physical capabilities which serve to generate interest and revenue.

Culture also plays an important role in shaping inequitable outcomes. Some groups of people have nurtured cultures that have become very overtly hostile to the individual successes of others of the same ethnicity. For instance, there are differences among groups in how their own academically high-achieving members are regarded by other members of the same group. A survey conducted on 90,000 white, Black and Hispanic junior high school and high school students from 175 schools in 80 American communities, found that Black students whose grade-point average reached 3.5 or higher had fewer friends of their own race than Blacks with lower grade-point averages\textsuperscript{561}. As Sowell observes,

\begin{quote}
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“Such negative reactions by fellow black students to those among them who were higher achievers in school have been characterized as a rejection of those who were stigmatized as ‘acting white’ – that is, behaving in ways that were equated with disloyalty to their race."\textsuperscript{562}

Given the hostile culture that has developed towards high achievers, is it thus any wonder why an empirical study conducted by researchers at the National Bureau of Economic Research found that grouping high academic achievers with those of the same ilk and separating them from those who were performing poorly improved the academic performances of these high-ability students – especially high-ability ethnic minority students\textsuperscript{563}? Furthermore, a study conducted by researchers at John Hopkins University by concluded that, “Schooling in a homogenous group of students appears to have a positive effect on the achievements of high-ability students' achievements, and even stronger effects on the achievements of high-ability minority youth.”\textsuperscript{564} In other words, ethnic minority students with high abilities improve the most when placed in an environment with other high ability students, rather than being educated in the presence of other students of lesser ability. This is consistent with John McWhorter’s and John Ogbu’s, a Black professor at Columbia University and a Nigerian-American professor at UC Berkeley respectively, conclusion that an anti-intellectual Black subculture reduces Black students' performances well below what they are actually capable of\textsuperscript{565} \textsuperscript{566}. This culture of aggression and antagonism towards high-performing students is by no means confined to Black Americans. For instance, among Hispanic American students, those with a grade-point average of 4.0 averaged three fewer friends of their own ethnicity than did white students with the same grade-point average\textsuperscript{567}. Similar cultures of negativity and aversion to educational achievement among peers have been found among Maoris in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{562}


Zealand, Burakumin in Japan, the white underclass in Britain \textsuperscript{568} and Malays in Singapore\textsuperscript{569}. Dr. Theodore Dalrymple described the situation among England’s white underclass, stating,

“If you don’t mend your ways and join us, they were saying, we’ll beat you up. This was no idle threat: I often meet people in their twenties and thirties in my hospital practice who gave up school under such duress and subsequently realize that they have missed an opportunity which, had it been taken, would have changed the whole course of their lives much for the better. And those who attend the few schools in the city that maintain very high academic standards risk a beating if they venture to where poor white stupids live. In the last year I have treated two boys in the emergency room after such a beating, and two others who have taken overdoses for fear of receiving one at the hands of their neighbours.”\textsuperscript{570}

Nor were such events limited to males either, as Dr. Dalrymple observed, “Many of my intelligent patients from the slums recount how, in school, they expressed a desire to learn, only to suffer mockery, excommunication, and in some instances outright violence from their peers. One intelligent child of fifteen, who had taken an overdose as a suicidal gesture, said she was subjected to constant teasing and abuse by her peers.”\textsuperscript{571} Likewise, in America and other parts of the world, lower socioeconomic class school children who seek out better educational outcomes are seen by members of their ethnic groups as race traitors and are often meted out similar ostracism, verbal abuse and physical violence\textsuperscript{572} \textsuperscript{573} \textsuperscript{574}.

It is thus clear that certain groups do not value educational achievement or the behavior that leads to greater academic success. Consequently, these groups create cultures of anti-intellectualism that target successful members of these groups. Due to the existence

\textsuperscript{568} Ibid, p. 380n.


\textsuperscript{570} Dalrymple, T., 2001. Life At The Bottom: The Worldview That Makes The Underclass. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, p. 69. See also p. 188.

\textsuperscript{571} Ibid, p. 158.


and perpetuation of such corrosive anti-intellectualism amongst various social groups, even students who enter academia with the same potentialities and capabilities will inevitably suffer from adverse educational outcomes. This is because students subjected to such cultures operate within an atmosphere of vastly different social responses from their peers, during a phase of life when peer responses tend to matter more than they would at other phases of life.\textsuperscript{575} \textit{These disparities in educational attainment are due to the emergence of a culture where perceived intellectual elitism must be dealt with overt hostility and disgust.} Not only does such a culture suppress the abilities of academically inclined students, it also further cements the fallacy amongst already lagging students that their rejection of academia is something to be celebrated. How then can we blame disparities in academic outcomes on some obscure “oppression,” when the very individuals who are supposedly “oppressed” are in fact their own oppressors? Additionally, how can critical theorists and their adherents claim that certain social groups, which have perpetuated cultures that are conducive in spurring academic success, are “privileged,” when they are merely behaving in rational manner? To further pigeonhole individuals who have risen above hostile, anti-intellectual cultures as espousing “internalized privilege” only serves to vindicate those who are members of the belligerent culture. In other words, by vilifying success and acquitting those who perpetuate attitudes of antipathy towards academic success, critical theorists and their devotees are only doing disadvantaged communities a disservice and entrenching them further in cycles of unbreakable immobility.

But of course, the irrational logic of intersectionality will label such a characterization of certain groups as “stereotyping,” “prejudiced,” or “racist.” It is as if, in the eyes of the intersectional critical theorists, there cannot possibly be any deviations in behavioral patterns among various social groups. And such deviations are actually entirely attributable to some form of malevolent “oppression.” The critical intersectionalists are able to surmise such fatuous conclusions in spite of the fact that parents within social groups that take fatalistic attitudes towards education have, themselves, encouraged their children to socialize outside of their groups in a bid to inculcate more positive academic attitudes within their children. This is evident from how “Some parents note with pride that their children have mostly Chinese friends, because they mix with fellow Chinese students at school and avoid Malay company in the neighbourhood. In the process of attempting to gain social mobility through education, it is not only non-studious children who must be avoided but Malay children in general, since non-studiousness is a trait taken by Malays to characterise Malays as an ethnic group.”\textsuperscript{576}


As has been discussed extensively on a number of occasions in previous chapters, differences in family structure can lead to the development of inequalities between various individuals. Thus far, this text has focused on the adverse effects of fatherless homes in the Black community. Such patterns hold true to society in general as well. Children in father-absent homes are four times as likely to be poor. Children raised in fatherless homes are also at much greater risk of developing dependence on drugs and alcohol which leads eventually to addiction. Conversely, children living with married biological parents are less likely to develop anxiety, depression and juvenile delinquency than children living with one parent or non-biological parents. Children in single-parent families are also twice as likely to commit suicide. There is no doubt that children growing up in single-parent families have it harder. However, it is also unquestionable that there is no case where society can be blamed for the affairs of individual families. This makes the social vision of systemic oppression proposed by intersectional theorists even more erroneous, seeing as how they have openly declared war on the family. It would appear as though they wish to distract us by creating a dystopian fantasy where every disparity can be blamed on heterosexual white males, while they work covertly in the background to propagate even more social misery. Nowhere is this more obvious than their attempts at destabilizing the nuclear family structure. Considering that the intersectional theorists assert that every disparity is a consequence of oppression, as they employ their strategies to generate even greater disparities, they will hence be able to generate even greater animosity towards the social groups that their ideology has villainized.

The theory concocted by intersectionalists asserts that disparities can be immediately deemed as evidence of some pernicious, yet invisible form of societal injustice and oppression. However, “Draw a line down the middle of any room, and you will find group disparities in income, IQ, education, and age. Such disparities are not the result of societal discrimination. They are the result of statistical probability.” As this section has illustrated, even in the absence of biased treatment by way of a tyrannical class of white males, disparities between individuals and social groups always emerge. Geographic isolation, differences in physical capabilities, age and even family structure are so far out of any individual or collective’s gamut of control that the resultant disparities that arise cannot be ascribed (whether in part or whole) to an overarching system of oppression. In the case of the anti-intellectual culture that has spawned amongst certain social groups, the disparities in attainment that ultimately ensue are the


responsibility of those who propagate, aid and abet the flourishing of such cultures. As Sowell concludes,

“Education is just one of many areas where the seemingly invincible fallacy of presupposing background probability of equality of outcomes defies both evidence and logic. Major demographic differences between different groups within nations, and between one nation and another – with median ages differing by a decade, or two decades or more – give an air of unreality to sweeping expectations of equal outcomes among groups or nations, and sweeping outrage when such expectations are not fulfilled.”

Why does intersectionality choose to only focus on race, sexual orientation, gender, disability and (more recently) body weight? The harsh reality is that there are a whole host of other factors that contribute significantly to the formation of disparities. The historical time in which one was born comes to mind and so do individual and group preferences. In fact, in the true spirit of intersectionality, one could go on endlessly fractionating areas of life that result in disparities in outcomes and one would realize that there are an infinite number of categories that may advantage or disadvantage certain individuals. If we were to continue this pursuit of carving society up along the lines of the “privileged” and the “oppressed,” we will eventually find that, contrary to what critical theorists propose, there is no neat way to subdivide and sort individuals.

The process by which we can claim that an individual can be categorized as “oppressed” in one aspect and “privileged” in another can continue for all eternity and we would still have no concrete answer as to our “positionality” within the Great Oppression Hierarchy. The only viable solution to this conundrum of interminable differences between individuals and groups is one that was conceived centuries ago, first by the founders of the Enlightenment and then by America’s founding fathers. That solution is to treat every individual as unique; as possessing traits that will prove advantageous in certain endeavors and disadvantageous in others. As Mahatma Gandhi wisely put it, “It is beneath human dignity to lose one’s individuality and become a mere cog in the machine.”

**False Premise [2]**

The role of intersectionality is to collectivize various individuals under the umbrella of a particular identity group. This means that ethnicity (i.e. Japanese) must be negated and replaced with racial categories (i.e. Asian), it means that all women are the same in spite of their marital status, and it also means that homosexuals are but a single constituent in the overarching and ever-expanding LGBTQIAAPP+ community. To the intersectional

---

theorists, one cannot claim an identity without being categorized under a broader collectivist edifice. This means that individual heritage and cultural mores are eradicated, replaced instead with a grotesque amalgamation of diverse traits made homogenous. Further intersectionality asks us to embrace these newly constructed identity groups as a reflection of our entire identity.

The Oedipal Mother of intersectionality, Kimberlé Crenshaw, makes this plain when she states, “*We all can recognize the distinction between the claims ‘I am Black’ and the claim ‘I am a person who happens to be Black.’*” She asserts that the former is positive and empowering as it focuses primarily on group identity. As she terms it, the former “*becomes not simply a statement of resistance but also a positive discourse of self-identification, intimately linked to celebratory statements*.” On the other hand, she castigates the latter for attempting to view the individual as being more than his/her predestined racial category. In Crenshaw’s eyes, this latter conception was a striving for universality that was completely misguided. Individuality, to Crenshaw, devalued the role of oppression in an individual’s life and must be cast aside in favor of identity politics which organized groups within an overarching matrix of oppression. She writes, “*I am a person who happens to be Black,* on the other hand, *achieves self-identification by straining for a certain universality (in effect, ‘I am first a person’) and for a concomitant dismissal of the imposed category (‘Black’) as contingent, circumstantial, nondeterminant.*” Thus we see that intersectionality, as is a common theme among critical theories, conceives of minoritized groups as being perpetually oppressed. To Crenshaw, we must thus abandon the liberal conception that we are unique individuals and instead revert to a tribalized worldview where we are merely tiny fragments existing in an expansive architecture of identity groups that intersect in terms of relative oppressions and grievances. Intersectionality is thus a call to oust individual autonomy and agency and supplant it with the politics of grievance. Intersectionality’s efforts at purging the existence of individual traits are no more evident than in how Crenshaw asserts that “*intersectionality offers a way of mediating the tension between assertions of multiple identity and the ongoing necessity of group politics.*” An individual’s identity must be tied to their group categories and must be expressed in an intersectional way. Group politics is a necessity and must be made paramount. The erasure of unique, individual sociocultural backgrounds allows intersectional theorists the platform to reduce life to a gross simplification: *individuals, by virtue of being born into a particular collective identity group (that is not white*.
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male heterosexual), are immediately assumed to be doomed to an eternal existence of systemic oppression.

The fundamental problem with intersectionality’s proposed framework of the politics of identity and group balkanization is that the individual sub-groups existing within these larger identity groups do not experience oppression equally and in some cases, not at all. The Asian American community is a fine example of why the intersectional postulation, that group-based oppression is immediate, could not be further detached from reality. White Americans earn a median household income of $65,902 per annum. By contrast, Indian Americans (not to be confused with Native Americans) are among America’s top 10 percent of wage earners, generating an annual household income of $123,453. Hmong Americans too, earn a considerable amount above the median, generating $67,372 annually. Likewise, Japanese Americans earn $80,036 annually. This is an overwhelmingly consistent trend amongst Asian Americans. Chinese Americans make $91,944, Taiwanese Americans make $105,736, Korean Americans make $92,074.

Economic success is not limited to Asian Americans that originate from developed nations either. Asian Americans who hail from the third-world also enjoy considerable economic success. Filipino Americans make $82,328, Indonesian Americans make $74,497, Cambodian Americans make $67,766, Vietnamese Americans make $67,331, Laotian Americans make $65,958 and Thai Americans make $65,357. Given that the vast majority of Asian Americans experience economic success at comparable or higher rates than whites, how can they be considered oppressed in the modern day? Indeed, Asian Americans, too, were historically oppressed. Under the Alien Land Law of 1913, them from owning land and property in more than a dozen American states until the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Similarly, during World War II, following the

---


bombing of Pearl Harbor, more than 120,000 Japanese Americans faced mass internment. Indians are a similarly oppressed group, having had to endure centuries of enslavement from as early as the 8th century and only ending in 1843. However, the historical injustices that have been dealt to Asian Americans do not seem to have served as a lasting impediment to their economic success today.

The same can be said for the Middle-Eastern community in the United States. Despite Linda Sarsour and Ilhan Omar making the community’s plight out to be untenable, Middle Eastern Americans, by and large, have actually managed to enjoy considerable rates of economic success. The average Middle Eastern household, in 2010, generated a higher median income ($56,433) than the average American median household income ($51,914). When we sub-divide the Middle Eastern community into their respective ethnic groups, we find that Lebanese Americans earn a median annual household income of $67,264. Iranian Americans, likewise, benefit from significant economic prosperity with over 30 percent earning a median annual household income between $100,000-199,999. The most notable aspect of these findings is that the Lebanese and Iranian American communities account for close to two-thirds of the United States’ Middle Eastern population. This means that an overwhelming majority of Americans who are of Middle Eastern descent experience far greater economic prosperity than do white Americans. How then is it fair to earmark them as an oppressed group?

Furthermore, the intersectional oppression framework as conceived by today’s social justice advocates and critical theorists grows even more specious when we analyze the incomes of women of differing marital statuses and child-bearing patterns. A study conducted by the Employment Policy Foundation in the U.S. attempted to control for the effects of child-bearing and part-time and full-time work to ascertain the size of the gender wage gap. It found “that the gender pay gap is 5 percent for part-time workers age 21-35 without children, under 3 percent for full-time workers age 21-35 without


children, and that there is no pay gap for full-time workers age 21-35 living alone." Most notably the study did not take into account differences in educational level or types of occupation. That gender wage gaps are so small without even taking these factors into account casts significant doubt on the thesis of pernicious patriarchal oppression.

To cast even more doubt on the intersectional conception of oppression, the political scientist, Warren Farrell, found that among college-educated, never-married individuals who were employed on a full-time basis, with no children and who were between 40 and 64 years old – beyond child-bearing years – men averaged $40,000 in annual income, while women averaged $47,000 a year in income. What Farrell noted in his book had actually been part of a larger ongoing trend that first made itself known towards the tail-end of the ‘60s. In 1969, before the extension of Affirmative Action to include women in the U.S., academic women who had never married earned more than academic men who had never married. Granted, married academic women with or without children earned less than men. In 1971, single women (in general this time) who worked continuously since high school generated a higher income than did men of the same description. After the period of Affirmative Action in the United States had passed, in 1994, male law school graduates commanded an average annual starting salary of $48,000 a year, whereas female law school graduates commanded a starting salary of $50,000 a year. The intersectional assumption that all women face an equal measure of patriarchal oppression cannot possibly be true given that there are women who structure their lives in such a way that allows them to earn more than their supposed male oppressors. Are these never-married women beneficiaries of a patriarchal system? Have they internalized the patriarchy that is supposedly only applicable to men?

A similar conclusion can be drawn about individuals of non-heterosexual orientation. *Vice*, in 2017, reported that lesbian women and gay men made more than their heterosexual counterparts. The average annual pre-tax earnings for lesbian women aged 25 to 64 was $47,026. Straight women within the same age range earned an annual income of $39,902. Likewise, gay men in the same age category averaged an annual pre-tax income of $59,618, whereas straight men made an annual pre-tax income of

---


Despite heteronormativity being portrayed as an unfathomable source of oppression towards individuals within the LGBTQIAAPP+ community, it would appear as though that same iniquitous oppression somehow has an antithetical impact on income. It is thus extremely peculiar that Robin DiAngelo and Ozlem Sensoy would make the assertion that "the other intersections of oppression, classism and racism affect the gay community," given that the two most populous identity groups within the LGBT community are in fact beneficiaries of said classist "oppression." Considering the multitudinous dimensions from which oppression seemingly subjugates members of the gay community, it is absolutely mystifying that members of this community have managed to overcome these insurmountable odds and economically outperform their vile oppressors.

Furthermore, when we fractionate intersectionality’s various identity groups into their original sub-groups, we find similar results amongst the Black community. For instance, it is notable that despite slavery in Brazil ending decades after slavery in the U.S., Black immigrants from Brazil generated a median household income of $55,000 in 2013, which was higher than the median household income of Americans in 2013 ($52,000). Similarly, immigrants from the West Indies (Caribbean) who were also shackled in bondage under British colonial rule, have managed to routinely outperform Black Americans who were born in America. Forty years ago, Thomas Sowell observed, "West Indians in the United States have continued to hold sizable advantages over American Negroes in incomes and occupations." This trend still holds true today. Furthermore, Black immigrants to America are disproportionately represented in America’s elite institutions. In fact, Nigerian immigrants to America have enjoyed greater material and academic prosperity than Black who were born and raised in America. Nigerian Americans had a median annual household income of $62,351 in 2015 which was well above the national average of $57,617. Nearly twice as many Nigerian


Americans hold graduate degrees (61 percent) as compared to the national average (32 percent).\textsuperscript{601}

All this is in spite of the fact that Nigerian Americans, too, underwent an era of colonial slavery. Furthermore, despite the end of slavery in Nigeria coming in 1808, decades before it was abolished in the U.S., British colonial rule of Nigeria continued well into the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{602} What makes the success of Nigerian American immigrants even more remarkable is that these individuals were raised in and migrated to the U.S. from an environment of considerable destitution.\textsuperscript{603} The harsh reality is that Nigeria is a nation riddled in chaos. As the London Economist Intelligence Unit put it, the nation has seen a “\textit{sharp rise in sectarian and communal violence}” since 1999, which is said to “\textit{stem from the release of pent-up anger and frustration following years of authoritarian military rule}.”\textsuperscript{604} Wouldn’t the intersections between past racial injustices, the oppression faced growing up under an authoritarian regime and the structural racism in the U.S. (\textit{which should be amplified given the intersection between the melanin content of their skin and their status as immigrants}) serve as more austere barriers to the success of Nigerian immigrants into America than the intersection between structural racism and classism that confronts Black Americans?

Robin DiAngelo and Ozlem Sensoy inform us that “\textit{Facing oppression in one area of social life does not ‘cancel out’ your privilege in another; these identities will be more or less salient in different situations.}”\textsuperscript{605} When we account for this, we realize that Black Americans are considerably more \textit{“privileged”} than Nigerian immigrants into America given that the former were able to benefit from growing up in an environment that provided them with a higher standard of education, services and overall material conditions. In fact, it would be difficult to pinpoint any specific aspect of life where Nigerian immigrants can be deemed, by any rational standard, to be availed with greater \textit{“privilege”} than Black Americans. It should therefore be concluded, without a hint of doubt, that Nigerian immigrants, based on the criterion that intersectional theorists set,

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
are unbelievably oppressed in contrast with Black Americans. However, Nigerian immigrants to America, just like Asians Americans, never-married American women, Middle Eastern Americans, gay Americans and lesbian Americans seem to transcend these indomitable intersections of oppression and do exceedingly well for themselves, both academically and economically. Despite critical theory condemning them to obtaining dire outcomes, Nigerian immigrants to America have somehow proven impervious to the intersectional matrix of oppression that critical theorists inform us is such an omnipotent force in subjugating minoritized groups.

Furthermore, even when we analyze Blacks as a monolithic group, the "implicit oppression" thesis still doesn't quite hold up. A study conducted by researchers from Harvard and Stanford found that the income disparities between Blacks and whites in America were predicated “entirely” on the differences in outcomes between Black and white males. In other words, Black women “earn slightly more than white women conditional on parent income.” The study also found “little or no gap in wage rates or hours of work between black and white women.” 606 This hence makes it quite incomprehensible as to why Crenshaw would place heavy primacy on the need to continually “articulate the interaction of racism and patriarchy generally,”607 given that the intersections of these two particular variants of oppression do not seem to have as sinister an effect on outcomes (between Black and white women) as Crenshaw so desperately feels the need to belabor. Indeed, it is entirely possible that a Black woman could face racism and sexism simultaneously. No one is denying that. However, the fundamental assertion that this oppression is an onerous feature of the lives of Black females is incongruent with the income data that indicates their economic outcomes are immune to the effects of such pernicious forms of oppression. It is even more bewildering then that Crenshaw would proclaim to Time magazine that “data show that white women’s median wealth is somewhere in the $40,000 range. Black women’s is $100.” 608 Even if we were to analyze this odd pronouncement from a historical perspective, it holds no weight. Between 1939 and 1960, Black women saw the median income rise by 418.7 percent, whereas the median income of white women increased by only 275.3 percent over that same period.609


As we have seen thus far, critical theory assumes that the various grievance identities it has constructed are adequate in representing individuals that originate from wildly different social contexts. Intersectionality thus posits that group differences are inconsequential and it is able to paper over these by providing an expansive framework by which individuals of differing social milieus (e.g. Jamaican or Nigerian) can identify themselves as (e.g. Black). Intersectionality asserts that while the cultural context of an individual may differ from person to person, individuals who belong to an intersectional grievance group originate from a shared existence of oppression and can thus be aggregated together. It is on the backdrop of this theorizing that the vast disparities between ethnic groups within the Black community are dismissed, allowing theorists like USA TODAY’s diversity chair, Michael McCarter (himself a Black man), to claim that “Black is an ethnoracial identifier that is inclusive of the collective experiences of the Black U.S. population, including recent immigrants. Capitalizing Black reflects an understanding and respect that is consistent with how many Black people and Black publications describe the people and descendants of the African diaspora and reflects a rich range of shared cultures.”

How is it possible that someone from the Bahamas shares a culture with someone who emigrated from Lagos? The very fact that the term used to describe people of African origin is “diaspora” should indicate that they share nothing in common apart from the pigmentation of their skin. To even postulate that these two groups, with immensely different cultural backgrounds, share a culture is indicative of the vindictive spirit that is inherent within most critical theorists. Additionally, the intersectional claim that we should place the “collective experiences of the Black U.S. population” at the forefront of discussions could not be further detached from reality. The label “collective experiences” aims to categorize individual ethnic groups under the auspices of unified group oppression. However, it deliberately preterms the fact that even if we assume that the individuals within these ethnic groups all experience life the same way, there still exist glaring outcome disparities among the ethnic groups that are being crudely lumped together. This forceful fusion of vastly different ethnic groups under the all-encompassing umbrella of “collective experiences” is nothing more than a duplicitous stratagem by the intersectional theorists and social justice advocates to increase the body count within their grievance groups.

As Ibram X Kendi has informed us, any disparity between identity groups is an indication of overt discrimination against the group with more disparate outcomes. However, critical social justice theory has realized that the relative numerical size of such “discriminated” groups is rather inconsequential. Strength is found in numbers and it is

therefore of the utmost importance that the critical theorists perform an obscene sleight of hand: the uniqueness of individuals originating from differing sociocultural conventions must be eliminated to facilitate the anchoring of individuals within preordained grievance groups. According to intersectionality, there are no distinctions between never-married women and married women; both are equally oppressed women. There are no distinctions between Japanese Americans and Hmong Americans; both are equally oppressed Asian Americans. There are no distinctions between Nigerian immigrants and American-born Blacks; both are equally oppressed Blacks. There are no distinctions between gay Americans and trans Americans; both are equally oppressed members of the LGBTQQIAAPP+ community. Without the artificial creation of catch-all identity categories, much of intersectionality’s claims would falter. Intersectionality is after all just an attempt to advocate the “necessity of group politics” of oppression. If individual enclaves are allowed to exist outside the broader framework of oppression, then group politics would become wholly redundant.

Again, we inevitably return to intersectionality’s war on the individual. An individual existence is objectionable to the intersectionalists as it presumes that individuals are able to transcend cultural biases and overcome oppressive power structures. This, to the intersectional theorists, is a perverse ideology that must be dismantled. The liberal conception that values the individual most of all, assumes that individuals can be greater than the sum of their parts. For example, though one might be a Black trans female, liberalism as conceived of by the Enlightenment, informs us that there is more to this particular individual than the identity categories she has membership in. Lionel Shriver, the Armenian novelist explained that “merely being Armenian is not to have a character as I understand the word.” She continued: “Being Asian is not an identity. Being gay is not an identity. Being deaf, blind, or wheelchair-bound is not an identity, nor is being economically deprived.” The Enlightenment, and notably Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., saw this as the most effective method of combatting the prejudices that are inherent within man. By emphasizing individual interests and achievements, the Enlightenment sought to diminish the adverse effects that may result from inheriting certain racial, sexual or gender identifiers. Pluckrose and Lindsay put it beautifully when they write, “liberalism sought to remove social expectations from identity categories – black people being expected to do menial jobs, women being expected to prioritize domestic and parenting roles, and so on – and make all rights, freedoms, and opportunities available to all people regardless of their identity, there was a strong focus on the individual and the universal and a deprioritization of identity categories.”


deleterious the effects of said oppression were. Intersectional social justice took a dim view of the liberalized worldview, regarding such notions as at best naïve and at worst putting forth a wilful refusal to acknowledge the foundational prejudices that plague society. As a consequence, intersectional social justice informs us that to be virtuous is to assume power imbalances and discrimination to be miasmatic, hovering above us everywhere and at all times. Enlightenment liberalization masked these hideous faces of reality with egalitarian promises of equality before the law and the safeguarding of individual liberties. Intersectionality thus provides purveyors of social justice with the adequate framework to meticulously root out the Enlightenment’s false promises. As Patricia Hill Collins and Sirma Bilge assert,

“Social justice may be intersectionality’s most contentious core idea, but it is one that expands the circle of intersectionality to include people who use intersectionality as an analytic tool for social justice. Working for social justice is not a requirement for intersectionality. Yet people who are engaged in using intersectionality as an analytic tool and people who see social justice as central rather than as peripheral to their lives are often one and the same. These people are typically critical of, rather than accepting of, the status quo.”

Intersectionality takes an activist worldview, striving to achieve its devotees’ conception of public good that seeks to dismantle power hierarchies based on race, gender, class and sexual orientation. It is hence not in intersectionality’s favor if individuals continue to be tethered to any arena of life that connects them to their individuality, including their ethnic categories. As Linda Chavez wrote in her book ‘Out of the Barrio,’ “The history of American ethnic groups is one of overcoming disadvantage, of competing with those who were already here and proving themselves as competent as any who came before. Their fight was always to be treated the same as other Americans, never to be treated as special, certainly not to turn the temporary disadvantages they suffered into the basis for permanent entitlement.” Individuals within ethnic groups, especially immigrant ethnic populations, tend to adopt the liberal view that in spite of their bleak initial circumstances, their perseverance and sense of individual agency will allow them to triumph in the face of hardship. As has been evinced in the prior paragraphs, immigrants into the U.S. tend to do better than native ethnic groups, or at least attain outcomes which belie the expectations set by critical theorists. Most immigrant populations have, thus far, chosen not to wallow in the self-pity of being a member in an aggrieved victim group and have chosen instead to carve out their own destinies. In fact, most immigrants choose to adopt a liberalized mainstream identity over an in-group grievance identity. As the American immigrant, Tunku Varadarajan, writes for the Wall


Street Journal, the leftist “compulsion to create ever more categories of victimized minorities by adding ‘immigrants’ to the list of the maltreated serves neither immigrants nor the country” and is incongruent with the fact that “Every immigrant reaches a point where he feels—or wants to feel—that he’s overcome obstacles and has earned his pride (without having it handed to him in the guise of victimhood).” Therefore, we see that intersectionality refuses to confess to its own theoretical flaws and must suppress these foundational misconceptions by forging broad synthetic group identifiers.

Critical theorists and the purveyors of intersectionality’s crude identity politics insist on believing the world as constructed by racist, heterosexist and patriarchal structures of power. They demand that we need to re-evaluate hierarchies of power because these malevolent forces are “embedded in our thought processes and social structures.” Thus, the world’s diverse range of ethnic groups must be eradicated and collectivized under stipulated grievance groups that are able to operate within intersectionality’s “matrix of oppression.” Intersectionality, when viewed in this light, is nothing more than a smorgasbord of illiberal ideas coupled with a nihilistic worldview, which places victimhood at the heart of its ideological anatomy. This nihilism, this fatalism informs us of intersectionality’s genealogical roots. As Crenshaw illustrates, intersectionality’s ideological substructure is influenced by postmodernism. She states, “I consider intersectionality to be a provisional concept linking contemporary politics with postmodern theory.” Thus within intersectionality, we observe the manifestation and open application of the nihilistic postmodern project in a contemporary setting. Intersectionality first adopts the Foucauldian Weltanschauung that the world is in an endless state of conflict, where oppressors utilize power structures to subjugate the oppressed. This is evident in how Crenshaw asserts,

“While the descriptive project of postmodernism of questioning the ways in which meaning is socially constructed is generally sound, this critique sometimes misreads the meaning of social construction and distorts its political relevance... But to say that a category such as race or gender is socially constructed is not to say that that category has no significance in our world. On the contrary, a large and continuing project for subordinated people – and indeed, one of the projects for which


postmodern theories have been very helpful in thinking about – is the way power has clustered around certain categories and is exercised against others.”

According to one of the fathers of postmodern Marxism, Michel Foucault, the world is overcome by an “omnipresence of power.” Foucault writes that “Power is everywhere not because it embraced everything, but because it comes from everywhere.” For Foucault and purveyors of his school of thought, power manifests itself on all societal levels. This leads to dominant groups exercising power for the purpose of subjugating marginalized groups. Foucault asserted that power functions in this manner “not because it has the privilege of consolidating everything under its invincible unity, but because it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another.”

Crenshaw has clearly consumed her Foucault, seizing upon his dogmatic view that the pursuit of power is the unjust principal driving force in the world. Intersectionality, like Foucault, selects power as a single, arbitrary domain of comparison. Then, it contrasts the individuals it seeks to convince with groups that are truly stellar within that domain. It takes a final step by using this seemingly unbridgeable gap between minoritized groups and its target group (white, male heterosexuals) as evidence for the fundamental injustice of life. Finally, intersectionality posits that these structures of power must be torn down in order to provide minoritized groups with adequate restitution for the depravity that has been dealt unto them at the hands of white male heterosexuals.

In order to achieve this latter end, intersectionality embraces Derridean deconstruction. Recognizing, like Derrida did, that individuals were too confident in their ability to shape the course of their lives, intersectionality thus deconstructed individuality and any aspect of life that furthered an individual’s sense of autonomy. Intersectionality followed this up with methodically squaring the circle by reconstructing identity with victimhood as its cynosure. Once these grievance groups have been erected, intersectionality imbues them with meaning and a localized purpose: individuals are to see themselves as victims, which bestows upon them value and makes them eligible for compensatory, retributive justice. Intersectionality is the intellectual laboratory that applies structuralism, poststructuralism and deconstructionism to enact the crude mutation of individual ethnic groups under the monstrous behemoth of grievance groups. The hero of postmodernism, Friedrich Nietzsche, diagnosed the psychology of intersectionalists quite aptly. Nietzsche’s concept of “Ressentiment” is similar to the English notion of
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resentment,’ except that it has an added “curdled bitterness, more seething and poisoned and bottled up for a long time.” Nietzsche applied ressentiment in the context of developing his renowned account of “master morality” and “slave morality,” in ‘Beyond Good and Evil’ and in ‘Genealogy of Morals’. Master morality as conceptualized by Nietzsche is the morality of the adventurous, vigorous and strong. It is the morality of assertiveness and purposefulness, where individuals take the reins over their existences. Master morality is the morality of individuals who are unafraid of the chaos posed by the unknown and choose to charge ahead instead of shrinking away.

As Nietzsche describes it, men who espouse master morality “feels himself to be the determiner of values, he does not need to be approved of, he judges ‘what harms me is harmful in itself’, he knows himself to be that which in general accords honour to things, he creates values. ... In the foreground stands the feeling of plenitude, of power which seeks to overflow, the happiness of high tension, the consciousness of a wealth which would like to give away and bestow – the noble human being too aids the unfortunate but not, or almost not, from pity, but more from an urge begotten by superfluity of power. The noble human being honours in himself the man of power, also the man who has power over himself, who understands how to speak and how to keep silent, who enjoys practising severity and harshness upon himself and feels reverence for all that is severe and harsh.” Those who command master morality strive to walk their own path and place the burden of being responsible and autonomous entirely on themselves. Their ability to take the reins of control over their own lives fills them with a sense of accomplishment and power. Power in being able to face up to one’s own fears, power to take ownership of one’s flaws; not the tyrannical power conceived by the postmodernists and critical theorists.

Slave morality is the morality of the weak, those who embrace victimization and are averse to venturing forward into the realm of the unknown. Weaklings, in Nietzsche’s eyes, are chronically passive because they fear the strong. The weak hence grow increasingly frustrated as they cannot reach the same heights as the strong. They become envious and bitter and secretly begin to self-loathe for being so cowardly and weak. He describes, “Suppose ... those uncertain of themselves and weary should moralize: what would their moral evaluations have in common? Probably a pessimistic mistrust of the entire situation of man will find expression, perhaps a condemnation of man together with his situation. The slave is suspicious of the virtues of the powerful: he is sceptical and mistrustful, keenly mistrustful, of everything ‘good’ that


is honoured among them – he would like to convince himself that happiness itself is not genuine among them.” However, as Nietzsche notes, no individual can endure the burden of existing with such an intense hatred of him or herself. Thus, the weak manufacture a rationalization – a rationalization that informs them that they are morally righteous because they are weak and passive. “consistently with slave morality, a breath of disdain finally also comes to be attached to the ‘good’ of this morality – it may be a slight and benevolent disdain – because within slaves’ way of thinking the good man has in any event to be a harmless man ... Wherever slave morality comes to predominate, language exhibits a tendency to bring the words ‘good’ and ‘stupid’ closer to each other.” Being on the side of the weak and downtrodden is virtuous and the opposites of this are evil – independence is evil, material success is an indication of one’s inherent evil and so is taking ownership of one’s own shortcomings.

This is the purpose of intersectionality’s perverse practice of collectivizing identities under a mammoth architecture of intersecting group oppression. They are the epitome of slave morality. They refuse to wrest the reins of control over their lives and instead vilify anyone else who does. The well-constituted are tyrants who have oppressed the intersectionalists and the collective grievance groups they purport to represent. By collectivizing us into victim groups, intersectionality seeks to eradicate independence and the need for personal accountability. In place of those values, intersectionality moralizes and gives prestige to taking the aggrieved position. To the intersectional social justice devotees, the only way to lay claim to the moral high ground is through collective victimization and self-flagellation. As Nietzsche discerns, “The strange narrowness of human evolution, its hesitations, its delays, its frequent retrogressions and rotations, are due to the fact that the herd instinct of obedience has been inherited best and at the expense of the art of commanding. If we think of this instinct taken to its ultimate extravagance there would be no commanders or independent men at all ... They know no way of defending themselves against their bad conscience other than to pose as executors of more ancient or higher commands... or even to borrow herd maxims from the herd’s way of thinking and appear as ‘the first servant of the people’ for example, or as ‘instruments of the common good’. On the other hand, the herd-man in Europe today makes himself out to be the only permissible kind of man and glorifies the qualities through which he is tame, peaceable and useful to the herd as the real human virtues.”
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Intersectionality demands that individuality be demonized, that we must supplant the liberal conception with the championing of victimhood and the politics of group grievance. The critical theorists and social justice advocates who preach intersectionality provide a subversive, yet highly seductive, view of society as a nefarious actor. Undermining unionism, intersectionalists provide an alternative grounded in grievance group solidarity. Intersectionality is a vociferous call to arms for social justice advocates against the current social order. Society is constructed by inflexible, rigid power hierarchies that must be disintegrated by uprooting the system entirely. Therefore, membership in historically victimized groups serves as the adhesive to bind together an anti-Unionist coalition. The seductive metaphysics of intersectional social justice posits that no one should be made culpable for their failures, because failure is systemic. All disparity can be attributed to the system. In fact, every failure becomes “an additional brick in the wall of evidence against the system.”629 The intersectionalists, of course, offer pharisaic amnesty in the form of coalitional politics that lavishes individuals, who identify with an ever-expanding list of intersectional grievance groups, with the moral superiority to seek retributive justice. However, and mercifully for the rest of us who have not bought into this crowd derangement, intersectionality has failed to recognize just how volatile the peace among the individual constituents of grievance groups really is.

**False Premise [3]**

Intersectionality assumes that its juggernaut coalition of grievance groups can coexist harmoniously with one another. The problem with this assumption is that intersectionality’s devotees have lumped ethnic, gender and other minoritized groups together with such imprudence that they failed to notice that, as with all coalitions, the antecedent harmony is a façade and the internal frictions between various groups create a festering undercurrent of volatility waiting to erupt.

One of the most obvious sources of discord within the intersectional framework would undoubtedly be the response of various grievance groups to the LGBTQIAAPP+ community. It should be common knowledge to most, that there is pronounced opposition to those who are not heterosexual within the Muslim community. 65 percent of French Muslims found homosexual activity to be unacceptable. Acceptance of homosexual activity was non-existent amongst UK Muslims630. In 2016, 52 percent of British Muslims said that they though homosexual activity should be made illegal. Only 5


percent of the British population shared the same views\textsuperscript{631}. In Singapore, the Singapore Islamic Scholars and Religious Teachers Association (PERGAS) announced that it does not support the repeal of Section 377A of the Penal Code, which criminalises sex between men\textsuperscript{632}. A 2013 Pew Research Center survey of Muslims in 36 countries with a significant Muslim population or majority, asking about their views on homosexuality. In 33 out of the 36 countries, more than 75 percent of those surveyed answered that homosexuality was “\textit{morally wrong},” and in only three did more than 10 percent of those surveyed believe that homosexuality was “\textit{morally acceptable}.”\textsuperscript{633} The Middle East Media Research Institute reported that when asked on how Islam should treat those in the LGBT community, Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi, one of the world’s leading Sunni clerics and chairman of the European Council for Fatwa and Research, stated, “\textit{Some say we should throw them from a high place, like God did with the people of Sodom. Some say we should burn them, and so on. There is disagreement. . . . The important thing is to treat this act as a crime.”}\textsuperscript{634}

Similarly, in recent years a notable number of feminists who previously supported the gay rights movement have come out against the new-fangled gender elements of the LGBT struggle. As is customary of all who disagree with the politically correct, woke wing of social justice, these feminists have since been cast out and decried as Trans-Exclusionary Radical Feminists (TERFs). Those who have found themselves unceremoniously dumped into TERF territory include the likes of Maya Forstater who lost her job at a think tank for twee\textsuperscript{635}. The list of TERFs also notably include the likes of feminist pioneer Germaine Greer\textsuperscript{636} and since-cancelled


cultural darling J.K. Rowling. The latter's concerns stemmed from the representation of biological men, identifying as women, competing in women's sports. Podcaster and Fear Factor host, Joe Rogan, shared those concerns several years prior when Fallon Fox (a biological man) was allowed to compete against biological women in the UFC and ended up breaking the skulls of two women. Rogan, on his podcast, stated, "She calls herself a woman but... I tend to disagree. And, uh, she, um... she used to be a man but now she has had, she's a transgender which is (the) official term that means you've gone through it, right? And she wants to be able to fight women in MMA. I say no f***ing way. I say if you had a d*** at one point in time, you also have all the bone structure that comes with having a d***. You have bigger hands, you have bigger shoulder joints. You're a f***ing man. That's a man, OK? You can't have... that's... I don't care if you don't have a d*** any more... You can't fight women."

There is also tension between ethnic minority communities and the LGBT community. Homophobia amongst Asian communities has also been reported as higher than the average rate in the West. Black voters voted two to one against Houston's Equal Rights Ordinance to prevent discrimination based on gender identity and sexuality, and in California, 70 percent of African American voters voted to ban same sex-marriage.


“Everyone in the car resents the Ts,” Chappelle says. “The Ts are making the trip take longer.” What was particularly perplexing about the entire debacle was that in spite of trans activists and leftist commentators steadfastly denouncing him, his Netflix special ‘Sticks and Stones’ still managed to be a roaring success among viewers. This was evident in the special’s rating on popular television and movie reviewing site, Rotten Tomatoes. Despite 17 critics giving him an aggregated score of 35 percent out of a hundred, 40,746 audience reviewers gave him an aggregated score of 99 percent (that is to say extremely hilarious).643 As the 40,746 audience members would have noted, Chappelle did not have any animus toward the “alphabet” community, he merely wished to hone in on the fact that the notion of unity within said community is a sham created to further a particular narrative.

For the most part, Chappelle’s postulations were true. There is indeed discord that has been suppressed within the confines of the LGBT community. Significantly, a faction of those identifying as lesbian, gay and bi drew up a change.org petition demanding that the T” and other alphabets be dropped from their agenda. An organization known as LGB Voices was responsible for spearheading the movement to “stop representing the transgender community” as they felt that trans “ideology is not only completely different from that promoted by the LGB community (LGB is about sexual orientation, trans is about gender identity), but is ultimately regressive and actually hostile to the goals of women and gay men.” What this sect of the gay rights movement found most troubling about the trans ideology and the boundless mushrooming of gender identity categories was that

“by persuading parents and health professionals to diagnose children as young as four as transgender, despite considerable research that shows that more than 90 percent of children who express ‘gender dysphoria’ at a young age grow out of it by adolescence and, in most cases, grow up to be well-adjusted gay men and women; ideologically, it runs counter to traditional LGB and feminist philosophy – whereas feminists and gay men/women advocate for expanding and re-defining gender concepts, the trans movement is regressive, insisting upon re-asserting and codifying classic gender concepts of what is masculine and what is feminine.”644

In 2019, the gay, former deputy contributors editor for the Washington Examiner, Brad Polumbo, wrote for Quillette:


“None of these bizarre neologisms have any resonance to those of us who joined the gay-rights movement simply to affirm and protect the basic rights of people to be who they are and love who they choose without stigma or legal sanction. We’ve been forced to watch the simple moral logic of non-discrimination be transformed into a self-parodic alphabet soup of invented identities.”

Earlier that year, gay author, Andrew Sullivan, wrote in New York Magazine:

“The truth is that many lesbians and gay men are quite attached to the concept of sex as a natural, biological, material thing. And gay men are defined by our attraction to our own biological sex. We are men and attracted to other men. If the concept of a man is deconstructed, so that someone without a penis is a man, then homosexuality itself is deconstructed. Transgender people pose no threat to us, and the vast majority of gay men and lesbians wholeheartedly support protections for transgender people. But transgenderist ideology — including postmodern conceptions of sex and gender — is indeed a threat to homosexuality, because it is a threat to biological sex as a concept.”

Similarly, Douglas Murray, a gay British columnist and bestselling author, dedicated two whole chapters in his 2019 book, ‘The Madness of Crowds’, to the internal turmoil that plagued the LGBT community. Most notably, he concluded in his chapter entitled ‘Trans’:

“If L and G and B are uncertain elements in the LGBT alphabet, then the last of those letters is the least certain and most destabilizing of all. If gay, lesbian and bi are unclear, trans is still very close to a mystery and the one with the most extreme consequences. It is not that there are demands of equal rights – few people think anyone should be denied equal rights. Instead, the preconceptions and assumptions are what cause the problems. The demand that everyone should agree to use new gender pronouns and get used to people of the opposite sex being in the same bathrooms is at the relatively frivolous end of the spectrum of demands. Far more serious is the demand that children be encouraged towards medical intervention over a matter that is so incredibly unclear – and the age at which such children will be encouraged in this way will only keep going down.”


Intersectionality portrays itself as being in possession of a consensus among minoritized groups. The reality, however, is far more sobering: there is absolutely no consensus amongst these constituent elements. Intersectionality claims to provide an undivided, cooperative front of oppressed grievance groups. In reality, as we have seen above, that unity is mere window dressing and occurs only on a tacit level. When we hold a microscope up to the identity categories carved out by intersectionality, they are fractured and mired in internal strife. We see this most evidently in the bedlam that the interests of the LGBT community have created among the other intersectional grievance groups. Intersectional theorists and social justice advocates assert that their framework is suitable in representing the interests of Muslims, conveniently neglecting the fact that their framework also champions the LGBT community, something that large swathes of the Muslim community oppose. Intersectional theorists and social justice advocates assert that their framework is suitable in representing the interests of minoritized racial groups, whilst precluding the fact that a considerable proportion of individuals within those groups subscribe to traditional values incongruent with the messaging of the LGBT community. Intersectional theorists and social justice advocates assert that their framework is suitable in representing the interests of women, yet it has begun to riotously disavow any woman who challenges their gender orthodoxy, typecasting them as bigots. Intersectional theorists and social justice advocates assert that their framework is suitable in representing the interests of gays, lesbians and bisexuals, but in the wake of the activist world’s newfound fetish of gender fluidity, those sexual categories have become afterthoughts. However, when those who identify as gay, lesbian or bisexual cry foul, the same charlatans who claimed to champion their rights vilify them as “extremists.”

The rifts within the intersectional framework begin to further unmask themselves when we analyze the positions that various grievance groups maintain. For instance, not many women are willing to identify themselves as feminist. In 2016, the Fawcett Society conducted a survey to find out what proportion of the British population identified as ‘feminist.’ The survey uncovered the fact that only 9 percent of British women used the term ‘feminist’ to describe themselves, while only 4 percent of British men did. Indeed, the vast majority of those surveyed supported gender equality. In fact, more men than women were in favor of such a policy position (86 percent of men to 74 percent of women). However, a plurality of those surveyed still refused to adopt the ‘feminist’ label. The results of the survey were undoubtedly disappointing for the Fawcett Society, who then trotted out a spokeswoman to put a positive spin on their findings. She claimed that Britain was a nation of “hidden feminists” and how “The simple truth is that if you

want a more equal society for women and men then you are in fact a feminist.” 649 A truly odd pronouncement under the circumstances, considering that when participants in the survey were asked what word first popped into their heads when they heard the word ‘feminist,’ the single most popular word that came to mind was ‘bitchy.’ 650 Intersectional social justice advocates that the word “women” be spelled “womxn”. For instance, the Wellcome Collection – a museum and library in London – published a tweet for an event that featured the social justice spelling of “womxn”. The organization justified the spelling, stating, “we feel that it is important to create a space/venue that includes diverse perspectives” 651. Similarly, King’s College London fellow, Dr. Clara Bradbury-Rance, asserted that the social justice spelling “stems from a longstanding objection to the word woman as it comes from man, and the linguistic roots of the word mean that it really does come from the word man.” 652 Many women, however, have rejected such an absurd proposition. The founding Director of The Culture Capital Exchange, Suzie Leighton, tweeted, “I’ll be a womxn when men become mxn. Until then jog on and stop eroding women’s rights.” 653 Similarly, Marina Hyde, a journalist for the left-leaning British newspaper, The Guardian, tweeted, “If the Wellcome Collection can’t get their next lot of collaborators to agree to use the term mxn, they will have failed to create a space/venue that includes diverse perspectives. Your move, guys” 654. In a similar vein, Labour MP, Jess Phillips, tweeted, “I’ve never met a trans woman who was offended by the word woman being used, so I’m not sure why this keeps happening. As if internet dissent now replaces public policy. I get what they are trying to do but why is it only women not men where this applies.” 655 These were from prominent female figures, there were in fact hundreds of women who took to Twitter to express their disgust for the social justice expression.
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There even exists a schism amongst feminist, gender studies scholars as well. For instance, Andrea Dworkin is of the opinion that men and women are in constant, brutal conflict and that the act of sexual intercourse between male and female partners is actually a covert form of male oppression. Dworkin writes, “The normal f*** by a normal man is taken to be the act of invasion and ownership undertaken in a mode of predation.” ⁶⁵⁶ This special insight into the predatory nature of male psychology is confirmed by the sexual experiences of women. As Dworkin writes, “Women have been chattels to men as wives, as prostitutes, as sexual and reproductive servants. Being owned and being f***ed are or have been virtually synonymous experiences in the lives of women. He owns you; he f***s you. The f***ing conveys the quality of ownership: he owns you inside out.” ⁶⁵⁷ In Dworkin’s deranged world, the act of intercourse between partners is a form of patriarchal oppression and the act of procreation a form of chattel slavery. The feminist author, Camille Paglia, on the other hand, has eviscerated such an unhinged take on male-female relations, going further to lambaste the feminist movement for denigrating the role of motherhood. She wrote, “Feminist ideology has never dealt honestly with the role of the mother in human life. Its portrayal of history as male oppression and female victimage is a gross distortion of facts.” ⁶⁵⁸ Paglia noted that the three females who she felt personified women in the twentieth century, namely Germaine Greer, Katharine Hepburn and Amelia Earhart, did not bear any children of their own. She writes:

“All these women were childless. Here is one of the great dilemmas facing women at the end of the century. Second-wave feminist rhetoric placed blame for the female condition entirely on men, or specifically on ‘patriarchy’… The exclusive
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focus of feminism was on an external social mechanism that had to be smashed or reformed. It failed to take into account women’s intricate connection with nature—that is, with procreation.” Or why “in this era of the career woman, there has been a denigration, or devaluing of the role of motherhood.”659

The positions taken by ethnic minority communities are in fact highly divergent to those prescribed by intersectional social justice advocates. For instance, intersectional social justice advocates that individuals of Latino/Hispanic origin be referred to as “Latinx”, which is gender-neutral and thus would not require for the distinction between Latino men and Latina women. The problem, however, is that most “Latinx” do not use the term. A Pew Research Center survey conducted in August 2020 found that 76 percent of the “Latinx” population were blissfully unaware that they were now supposed to refer to themselves as “Latinx”. Additionally, only 3 percent of the “Latinx” population actually use the term to identify themselves. The remaining 20 or so percent of the “Latinx” population who have heard of the term choose not to adopt it.660

Pew’s poll was consistent with the findings of progressive think-tank ThinkNow’s own research survey on the popularity and usage of the term by Latinos. The researchers at ThinkNow had found, in 2019, that “Only 3% of 18–34 year-old respondents in our poll selected the term as their preferred ethnic label. This was roughly the same as the 2%

of 35–49 year-olds. No respondents over 50 selected the term. In other words, 97% of millennial and Gen-Z Latinos prefer to be called something other than ‘Latinx.’" 661 Instead, they found that a plurality of respondents self-identified as either Latino or Hispanic. The Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior at Yale, Cydney Dupree, found that conservatives were more likely to address ethnic minorities and whites similarly. By contrast, Dupree found that liberal white progressives were exponentially more likely to modify their speech patterns and “patronize minorities stereotyped as lower status and less competent.” 662 As a point of fact, the Latino community have come up in arms against the move to make Spanish culture “woke” and “gender inclusive”. The deputy editor for Latino Rebels, Hector Luis Alamo, described the term as “the bulldozing of Spanish.” 663 In 2018, the Real Academia Española, the official linguistic body that upholds the integrity of the Spanish language, formally rejected the term “Latinx” and all other supposedly “inclusive” iterations of Spanish language 664. Two Latino students from Swarthmore college, Gilbert Guerra and Gilbert Orbea, disparaged the use of the term, stating, “This is a blatant form of linguistic imperialism — the forcing of U.S. ideals upon a language in a way that does not grammatically or orally correspond with it.” The pair go on to make the case that this woke bastardization of Spanish is incomprehensible to anyone who is not fluent in the English language: "Perhaps the most ironic failure of the term is that it actually excludes more groups than it includes. By replacing o’s and a’s with x’s, the word ‘Latinx’ is rendered laughably incomprehensible to any Spanish speaker without some fluency in English. Try reading this “gender neutral” sentence in Spanish: ‘Lxs niñxs fueron a lx escuelx a ver sus amigxs.’ You literally cannot, and it seems harmless and absurd until you realize the broader implication of using x as a gender neutral alternative. It excludes all of Latin America, who simply cannot pronounce it in the U.S. way. It does not provide a gender-neutral alternative for Spanish-speaking non-binary individuals and thus excludes them. It excludes any older Spanish speakers who have been speaking Spanish for more than 40 years and would struggle to adapt to such a radical change. It effectively serves as an American way to erase the Spanish


language. Like it or not, Spanish is a gendered language. If you take the gender out of every word, you are no longer speaking Spanish. If you advocate for the erasure of gender in Spanish, you then are advocating for the erasure of Spanish.” 665

This dissimilitude in sentiments between ethnic minorities and intersectional social justice advocates can also be observed among Black Americans. Arguably since the Ferguson riots, there have been calls among intersectional social justice warriors to defund law enforcement across the United States. These calls only grew more vociferous in the wake of George Floyd’s death 666. On the surface, by merely looking at social media footage of the chaos at BLM riots and analyzing coverage by the mainstream media, one would not be remiss in thinking that there was hidebound solidarity amongst Black Americans to eradicate American law enforcement 667. This, however, could not be further from the truth. In fact, according to a Gallup poll conducted in August 2020, only 19 percent of Black Americans wanted police officers to spend less time in their area 668. Further, only 22 percent of Black Americans favor abolishing the police with over 90 percent favoring police reforms that would improve police relations with the communities they serve and preventing or punishing abusive police behavior 669. This is should not be a surprise when we consult the data from a recent Pew poll conducted in early August 2020, which indicates that close to six-in-ten (59 percent) registered American voters say that the recent rise in violent in major American cities is a serious concern 670. The need for a constant police presence in Black communities, again, becomes completely understandable when we realize that two-fifths of Black Americans feel unsafe walking in their neighborhoods at night. The percentage of those who felt unsafe in their own neighborhoods climbs to nearly fifty percent when we merely analyze the
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views held by Black women. Black Democrat lawmakers have come out against their the social justice and the larger Democratic party agenda to defund police departments. The Democrat councilwoman representing West Bronx, Vanessa L. Gibson, referred to her constituents when she said “They want to see cops in the community ... They don’t want to see excessive force. They don’t want to see cops putting their knees in our necks, but they want to be safe as they go to the store.” These sentiments were echoed by Laurie Cumbo, a Black councilwoman from Brooklyn, who compared calls to defund the police to “colonization” pushed by white progressives and social justice radicals. Robert Cornegy Jr., a Black councilman also from Brooklyn, called the move to abolish the police “political gentrification.” Newark New Jersey’s Mayor, Ras Baraka, decried defunding the police a “bourgeois liberal” solution to address alleged “systemic racism.” This therefore proves that in spite of the rigmarole that the violent BLM rioters and intersectional social justice devotees besiege us with, the overwhelming majority of Black Americans do not want less policing in their area nor do they want to defund police departments.

Intersectional social justice purports to have an oligopoly over minoritized groups. It takes on the mantle of championing the rights of minoritized groups in order for them to be liberated. It assumes that oppression is implicit and that the grievance groups it claims to uplift will unequivocally endorse its positions on public policy and social issues. As we have seen, intersectional social justice knows little about the needs of the groups it claims to represent and has no stranglehold over positions taken by those same groups. The British scholar, Helen Pluckrose, concurs, stating, “It is clearly misguided to assume that by listening to intersectionals, we are listening to women, people of color, LGBTs and the disabled. We are, in fact, listening to a minority ideological view dominated by people from an economically privileged class who have had a university education in the social sciences and/or the necessary leisure time and education to study intersectionality, critical race theory, queer theory and critical analyses of ableism.” Intersectional social justice professes its innate desire to dismantle the patriarchy, destroy white supremacy and affirm minoritized grievance groups. It declares that the system is oppressive, egomaniacal and imperialistic, further denouncing it for scorning the needs of social justice’s various grievance groups. Their arrogance in having the audacity to effectively be a proxy for minoritized groups, however, belies the fact that


they are the true imperialists. Furthermore, their emphasis on identity-based oppression inevitably marginalizes those who are actually suffering from severe privation. New York University historian, Linda Gordon, summarized working-class contempt towards social justice theories such as intersectionality, writing, “A poor white man associates intersectionality with being told that he has white privilege: ‘So when the feminist told me I had “white privilege,” I told her that my white skin didn’t do shit.’ He explains: ‘Have you ever spent a frigid northern-Illinois winter without heat or running water? I have. At 12 years old were you making ramen noodles in a coffee maker with water you fetched from a public bathroom? I was.”

Intersectional social justice posits that anyone who disagrees with their social prescriptions is a misogynistic, racist, white supremacist, homophobic, transphobic. It would thus appear that a considerable proportion of the Black, female, LGBT and Latino community fit the description for all of these pejoratives. Intersectionality dons the façade of having a monocratic grasp over the various grievances and talking points espoused by members of minoritized groups. This has become abundantly clear over the past few years. We see this in the meteoric rise of Black conservatives like Larry Elder and Coleman Hughes, in the heightened spotlight on conservatives in the LGBT community given to individuals such as Andrew Sullivan and Douglas Murray, and even in conservatives who tick intersectional boxes like Blaire White (trans female), Candace Owens (both Black and female) and Rob Smith (gay and Black). The colossal hold that intersectional social justice claims to have over accurately representing the views of the grievance groups it champions is a complete and utter falsehood. In reality, intersectional social justice has compressed together a consortium of identity groups (which it created in the first place) while simultaneously overlooking the fact that the coalition it put together is embroiled in factionalism. Even if we were to ignore all the false premises that form the intricate architecture of intersectional social justice, merely analyzing it on its core premise – of necessitating identity politics by alloying various grievance groups in a collective struggle against the oppressive hegemonic system – alone indicates that its undergirding foundations are too volatile and overwrought to ever be feasible. Intersectional social justice conceives of itself as erecting Eden for the oppressed. Yet, the cohesion intersectional social justice achieves will be ephemeral at best, if it is exerted any further, the chasms that are already appearing within its ideological substructure will metastasize into an irreparable fissure that will prove cataclysmic to any hope of reforming a cohesive union.

**Conclusion for Chapter 3, Part iii**
The critical feminist theorist, Judith Lorber saw intersectional theory as the glue to bind and add a veneer of refinement to the coarse theories that existed prior. She writes,
“feminist social science has devised research designs and methodologies that have allowed the standpoints of the oppressed and repressed women throughout the world to come to the forefront, and which reflect increasingly sophisticated intersectional analyses of class, racial ethnicity, religion, and sexuality.”

This heightened degree of sophistication to previously unrefined theories probably serves as the reason why social justice now demands that intersectional analyses be made mandatory and must be adopted decisively. The top-down patriarchal-capitalist overlords that were depicted by radical feminists as the ultimate oppressive force against women became less plausible with the increase in freedoms granted to women. Likewise, with racial and LGBT activism, top-down oppression was on the wane and apart from sporadic invidious instances of prejudice, the marked increase in freedoms served as a rebuke of the original activist thesis. Intersectional social justice theory not only provided an effective method to bind these grievance groups, but also gave new “insight” into the oppressive power thesis. Thus, allowing these strains of social justice to remodel their failing theoretical models into something more scopic and less falsifiable by organizing against systemic power rather than the obsolete top-down power archetype. Pluckrose and Lindsay observe, “We often observe this kind of shift to a more ‘sophisticated’ and nebulous model when people are highly personally and ideologically committed to a theoretical approach that is clearly failing. This phenomenon was first described by Leon Festinger, in his study of UFO cults, and led to a development of the concept of cognitive dissonance. Festinger observed that highly committed cultists did not abandon their beliefs when the predictions of the cult failed to manifest – when the UFO never came. Instead, the cultists resolved this undeniable contradiction by claiming the event had occurred, but in some unfalsifiable way (specifically, they claimed God decided to spare the planet as a result of the faith of the cultists.)”

Traditionally, social justice activism has viewed power as part of a broad top-down strategy imposed by white male heterosexuals from capitalistic societies. However, the era of gay rights, Civil Rights and female suffrage have made this approach somewhat antiquated. Indeed, homophobia does still run roughshod over many parts of the globe, as does racism and sexism. However, it is becoming increasingly untenable to view most white male heterosexuals as colluding against the interests of racial, sexual and gendered minorities seeing the great advances that have been made. Intersectionality, however, offers social justice the perfect opportunity to retain its grievances – white male heterosexual domination legitimizes and perpetuates its own power at the expense of minoritized groups – while redefining said grievances “in terms diffuse enough to be a matter of faith, requiring no evidence: social constructions, discourses, and socialization. The Foucauldian idea of a diffuse grid of power dynamics that


constantly operates through everyone through their unwitting uses of language fit the bill perfectly.”

From everything we now know about intersectionality, it can be concluded that the use of this critical theory in advancing social justice has absolutely nothing to do with ameliorating the grievance of the groups that are supposedly being represented and everything to do with curbing individuals’ sense of agency. Intersectional social justice operates under the guise of inclusivity, serving as a sanctuary for aggrieved members of society to seek refuge and assemble against the corrupt system. In reality, intersectional social justice is hostile to individuals belonging to victim groups who refuse to relinquish their own sense of agency. The identity politician and Massachusetts Representative, Ayanna Pressley, declared as much at the 2019 Netroots convention in Philadelphia. Pressley disavowed any individual who disapproved of identity politics, stating, “From whatever lived experience or identity you represent, if you are not prepared to come to the table and represent that voice, don’t come. Because we don’t need any more brown faces that don’t want to be a brown voice; we don’t need any more black faces that don’t want to be a black voice. We don’t need Muslims that don’t want to be a Muslim voice. We don’t need queers that don’t want to be a queer voice.”

Pressley, like the intersectional social justice devotees whose worldview she extolls inverts the since-abandoned racialized hierarchy of the past, thereby creating a regressive moral caste system where one is bestowed with greater prestige for being able to claim more intersectional oppression. As the liberal writer, George Packer, puts it, “the new progressivism for all its up-to-the-minuteness, carries a whiff of the 17th century, with heresy hunts and denunciations of sin and displays of self-mortification,” cannot be overemphasized. “The atmosphere of mental constriction in progressive milieus, the self-censorship and fear of public shaming, the intolerance of dissent – these are the qualities of an illiberal politics ... It took me a long time to see that the new progressivism didn’t carry my own politics further than I liked. It was actually hostile to principles without which I don’t believe democracy can survive.”

One of the foremost byproducts of intersectional social justice and the subsequent identity politics that it engenders is that of the moral status of those guilty of being insufficiently attuned to the cause and those who glorify social justice’s warped conception of morality. The sociologists, Bradley Campbell and Jason Manning defined the practice of grievance mongering as “a culture of victimhood” in which “the aggrieved actively seek to attract and mobilize the support of third parties.” Self-victimization thus morphs into “a way of attracting sympathy, so rather than emphasize either their strength or inner
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worth, the aggrieved emphasize their oppression and social marginalization ... People increasingly demand help from others, and advertise their oppression as evidence that they deserve respect and assistance.” Campbell and Manning hit the nail on the head when they uncovered the fact that the entire purpose of intersectional social justice is that it is “concerned with rallying enough public support to convince authorities to act.”

Having granted moral superiority to those who are willing to self-identify as being in an aggrieved position, intersectional social justice upends the very fabric of reality, assuming not that we are individuals shaped by various cultural identities, but instead that we are those identities. Campbell and Manning observe that “This only increases the incentive to publicize grievances, and it means aggrieved parties are especially likely to highlight their identity as victims, emphasizing their own suffering and innocence. Their adversaries are privileged and blameworthy, but they themselves are pitiable and blameless.” In what can only be considered a masterstroke, intersectional social justice enacts that which Nietzsche forewarned: those of slave morality will debase those of master morality by formulating a rationalization that their weakness is virtuous while the well-constituted are reprobate. This is the fundamental problem that plagues intersectionality and the identity politics it advocates. It shackles us to our identities, impugning upon the need for individual agency and thrusting us into a fixed dogma of self-victimization. The fetishizing of victimhood, on the other hand, has devolved into a mad race to the bottom, with various grievance groups competing fiercely to lay claim to the ultimate status of oppression which would situate them at the most elite tier in the Great Oppression Hierarchy. This has led to gay white men and non-Black people of color – typically depicted as grievance groups – being asked to recognize their antiblackness and relative privilege. Such divisions have also been fostered amongst Blacks, as there is an insistence on the need for lighter-skinned Blacks to confess their privilege over darker-skinned blacks due to their proximity to whiteness. Trans men, though widely recognized as being endowed with victim status, still benefit from
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their patriarchal male privilege and must therefore focus on amplifying the voices of trans women, who are doubly oppressed by a lethal combination of the patriarchy and cisnormative society. Gays and lesbians are cast out of these victim tribes if they declare that they are not attracted to trans men and women, which is deemed to be the commission of the carnal sins of transphobia and misgendering. More recently, Asians and Jews have been effectively stripped of marginalized status and must defer to Black voices due to their economic success which is a hallmark of “internalized whiteness.”

The critical theorist and Marxist fanatic, Angela Davis, called for the systemic reformation of identity: “Diversity without changing the structure, without calling for structural formation, simply brings those who were previously excluded into a process that continues to be as racist, as misogynist as it was before.” Simply put, in order to safeguard from the highly oppressive system, individual agency must be denied to individuals in favor of in-group victimhood. After all, Robin DiAngelo does sermonize, “To challenge the ideologies of racism such as individualism and color blindness, we as white people must suspend our perception of ourselves as unique and/or outside race. Exploring our collective racial identity interrupts a key privilege of dominance – the ability to see oneself only as an individual.” By negating personal responsibility, intersectional social justice’s narrative of victimization serves as a convenient pretext for the ceding of control over one’s life to government and the simultaneous diminution of individual rights and freedoms. This government, however, will not operate in the traditional sense. It will not serve to protect our individual rights and freedoms, instead it acts as the complete antithesis of how a proper government should conduct itself. The sole purpose of the government, as conceived by intersectional social justice, is to calculate resource allocation based on grievance group identification. Private property and opportunities will no longer be determined by market forces, with the most


competent and productive of individuals receiving the most lucrative share; they will instead be prioritized for people who can demonstrate the greatest degree of intersectional victimhood. Where our current culture promises individual rights and freedoms – promising to safeguard the rights of individuals to pursue their own adventures, but not guaranteeing handouts – the program of intersectional social justice sets no boundaries on that which can be demanded or codified as rights to be guaranteed by governments. As Ben Shapiro elucidates, this therefore “means that using Rawlsian logic, government intervention becomes never-ending, since as it turns out, there will always be disparities between human beings.” He continues, “The Disintegrationist philosophy therefore leads to this extraordinarily destructive logic: we must have ... unequal rights, because people are not inherently equal; any inequality in society is proof of inequality of opportunity. No system can survive under this logic: inequality of outcome is a feature inherent to humankind. But that’s precisely the point. The system must be destroyed. Equality before the law most knuckle under.”

The overwhelming faith that must be placed in governments and the demolition of individual responsibility represent a far-cry from traditional liberal values. Where Unionist liberalism promoted the spirit adventure and urged daring and optimism, intersectional social justice supplants those ideals with a debilitating sense of pessimism and resignation. Furthermore, as we have explored prior to this, apportioning such hefty amount of faith in government is misguided to say the least, especially since the social justice version of government is meant to enforce discrimination and prejudice towards those who are guilty of critical theory’s form of white supremacism and internalized whiteness. Under the cultural conditions imposed by intersectional social justice, overcoming social divisions becomes an impossibility. Instead, by fueling grievances and molding social pariahs in the form of “activists,” intersectional social justice only serves to engender bitter social disunion. Far from being a map to utopia, intersectional social justice is a one-way ticket to a dystopian future that even Orwell and Huxley would never have dared to imagine. As Arthur Schlesinger put it, “If separatist tendencies go unchecked, the result can only be the fragmentation, resegregation, and tribalization of ... life.” This future provoked him to ask, “In the century darkly ahead, civilization faces a critical question: What is it that holds a nation together?”
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Chapter 4: Incentives & Consequences

Thus far, this book has served to outline the toxic vision that social justice has for our society. This chapter shall examine the various incentives for the various actors to clamor for the phenomenon of modern social justice ideology as well as the immediate consequences of believing in and peddling this dogmatic view of the world. We will analyze why individuals within society are so caught up in social justice ideology, why institutions – both educational and media – have begun kowtowing to the Church of Social Justice, and why politicians campaign along the lines of far-Left identitarianism. Additionally, this chapter will take a look at the chain reactions that allowing this toxic vision to fester have set in motion – from what is going on at American college campuses to the alarming effects that fostering victimhood and illiberalism have on society.

Individual Incentives & Consequences

Individuals who have purchased stock in the cult of social justice are driven primarily by the desire to be noble and altruistic. Unlike the other host of bad actors who have contributed to the rise and legitimization of this noxious ideology, it must be said that the individuals who partake and advocate for social justice are actually well-intentioned. There is an innate inclination among us, as homo sapiens, to prioritize fairness. It is one of our greatest strengths to judge the fairness of a given situation. However, with the advent of modern social justice ideology it has also become our Achilles heel. Most individuals who have entered the cult of social justice are generally concerned with ensuring that barriers to accessing opportunities is distributed as evenly as possible throughout our social hierarchies. Given that inequality is a fact of life, however, the social justice ideologues – namely the activist and theorist bunch – play a dastardly sleight of hand by conflating outcomes with processes. They inform us that the presence of disparate outcomes is evidence of fatal flaws that exist within our procedural frameworks. They inundate us with the supposed ‘fact’ that the current conception of justice – distributive (people get what they deserve based on input) and procedural (the process by which things are attained and rules are enforced is as fair as possible) – is a mirage. Such notions of justice are mere masks for pervasive structural injustices. The cultists tell us that we must, being the moral and good individuals that we are, dismantle the system so as to effectuate true justice. The ecstatic glow of moral certainty that is baked into social justice ideology serves as the moral undercurrent that guides the precepts of individuals who have been reeled in. The unfalsifiability of social justice and its mountains of academic literature make it extremely difficult, from a moral perspective, to distance oneself from. As humans, we are all hardwired to be drawn to that which is morally assertive. This opens us up to moral manipulation. A cause is worth believing as long as its driving forces – philosophy, policies or individuals – are able to create the veneer of morality in our eyes. Social justice literature is thus dumbed down and largely free from academic rigor or complexity, it is simple and straightforward even for the
layperson who doesn’t major in critical theory, to compel us (individuals striving for virtue) to serve the metanarrative that has been constructed by reifying social justice theory. The culmination of this indoctrination is the development of a culture where ideological adherents, just like cultists and religious zealots, feel that they are the anointed; the liberators of the world from the tyranny that previous generations have wrought upon us. It should thus come as no surprise that when an analysis of American political tribalization was conducted, it found that individuals who take as gospel the World According to Social Justice (described by the study’s authors as “progressive activists”) are “skeptical of traditional authority and norms. They see those values as being established by socially dominant groups such as straight white men, for their own benefit. Progressives … seek to correct the historic marginalization of groups based on their race, gender, sexuality, wealth and other forms of privilege.”

Virtually none of those analyzed believe in the power of individual agency as only 2 percent disagreed with the statement “people’s outcomes are outside of their control” and more than 90 percent believe that both men and white people start out with an advantage. Only 5 percent were proud of America’s history and those belonging to this political tribe were overwhelmingly white (80 percent) and “have strong ideological views, high levels of engagement with political issues, and the highest levels of education and socioeconomic status” out of all political tribes analyzed. Despite the fact that this particular tribe only constitute a minute segment of the U.S. population (8 percent), “they have an outsized role in political discourse … [and] they are highly sensitive to issues of fairness and equity in society, particularly with regard to race, gender and other minority identity groups.” It can hence be observed that it is the most economically and educationally privileged who make the most pronounced and vociferous claims of victimization. A passage from George Orwell’s journalistic masterpiece, ‘The Road to Wigan Pier,’ exemplifies the sanctimonious attitude that individual devotees of the social justice cult have adopted:

“Of course everyone knows that class-prejudice exists, but at the same time everyone claims that he, in some mysterious way, is exempt from it. Snobishness is one of those vices which we can discern in everyone else but never in ourselves. Not only the croyant et pratiquant Socialist, but every ‘intellectual’ takes it as a matter of course that he at least is outside the class-racket; he, unlike his neighbours, can see through the absurdity of wealth, ranks, titles, etc. etc. ‘I’m not a snob’ is nowadays a kind of universal credo. … And yet all the while, at the bottom of his heart, everyone knows that this is humbug. We all rail against class distinctions, but very few people


seriously want to abolish them. Here you come upon the important fact that every revolutionary opinion draws its strength from a secret conviction that nothing can be changed.”  

And so, this holds true. The activist types and casual adherents to social justice see themselves as morally superior members of society. They alone are precluded from the wretchedness of participating in this racist, sexist, classist system of ours. To be labelled any particular social justice pejorative is seen as the ultimate form of sin and the culture of victimhood that this ideology has bred results in a moral panic. Individuals clamor to be on the right side of history, lest they seek to be social outcasts. This has deranging effects when it is allowed to escape into the mainstream. We see this in the development of outrage pornography. Like porn addicts, the activist types and their devotees hanker over the latest controversy which allows them to extoll their sanctimonious self-righteousness. Individuals – students and activists – see themselves as rebelling against a corrupt system imposed upon them by the tyrannical capitalists; they see themselves as rebelling against their parents’ generation, which has failed to achieve racial, sexual and gender equity during the era of Civil Rights and post-Civil Rights; they see themselves as rebelling against capitalism that has dislocated minoritized groups, that do not give them a fair share, and that has led to systemic injustices; and they see themselves as idealistically pushing for the liberation of minoritized groups which would naturally lead to the establishment of utopia. “The old ones don’t even want to understand that we young people even exist. They defend their power to the last. But one day they will be defeated after all. Youth finally must be victorious. We young ones, we shall attack. The attacker is always stronger than the defender. If we free ourselves, we can also liberate the whole working class. And the liberated working class will release the Fatherland from its chains.”

The Nazi propaganda minister, Joseph Goebbels, wrote that on the need for a youth uprising in Germany. This attitude is captured by today’s youth who buy into social justice ideology. Unlike Goebbels and the Nazis, the youth of today are not merely concerned with the liberation of the worker and have instead extended the need for liberation to any grievance group that can claim victimhood status. This sense of self-righteousness that has been fomented in the youthful purveyors of social justice has pierced the veil of reality and penetrated the mainstream. This is evident from the recent race-based controversy at the University of Southern California. Professor Greg Patton was discussing the use of filler words during his online class and set off a racial tripwire when he described the Chinese filler “那个” (pronounced naiger). This led to Black students in his MBA class threatening to drop it rather than “endure the emotional exhaustion of carrying on with an instructor that disregards cultural


The university pandered to the demands of these campus ideologues, suspending Patton and "offering supportive measures to any student, faculty, or staff member who requests assistance." This form of racial pandering by social justice advocates extends even further into the realm of lunacy as individuals proclaim their hatred of the pigmentation of their own skin. Pop-star Demi Lovato wrote, "So here I am, sitting in a home that I was able to afford with the money that I have from singing, while people of color are fearing for their lives every day," she continued. "All I knew was that I hated that I shared the same skin color as the people accused of committing heinous crimes against Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, George Floyd and many, many other Black lives." Society's newfound addiction to virtue-signaling outrage is a result of a basic principle of moral psychology, that is "morality binds and blinds." This is a useful tool for when social justice sows an us-versus-them mentality. In this tribalized mode of cognition, we blind ourselves to the obvious flaws that plague our ideological precepts. As Jonathan Haidt and Greg Lukianoff point out, "Tribalism is our evolutionary endowment for banding together to prepare for intergroup conflict. When the 'tribe switch' is activated, we bind ourselves more tightly to the group, we embrace and defend the group's moral matrix, and we stop thinking for ourselves."

This adoption of in-group identification consequently produces profound paranoia and hostility towards those who have not submitted themselves to the same ideology. In 1978, the sociologist, Albert Bergesen, mapped out the common features that typify witch trials. He observed that witch trials arose with great rapidity. They seem to “appear in dramatic outbursts; they are not a regular feature of social life. A community seems to suddenly find itself infested with all sorts of subversive elements which pose a threat to the collectivity as a whole.” Witch trials involve charges of crimes against


the collective, “The various charges that appear during one of these witch-hunts involve accusations of crime committed against the nation as a corporate whole.”705 The final aspect of witch hunts as described by Bergesen was that the offenses that lead to the levelling of charges are often trivial or worse fabricated: “These crimes and deviations seem to involve the most petty and insignificant behavioral acts which are somehow understood as crimes against the nation as a whole. In fact, one of the principal reasons we term these events ‘witch-hunts’ is that innocent people are often involved and falsely accused.”706 In order to account for the evolution of witch hunts in the climate of modern social justice, Haidt and Lukianoff add a fourth feature to Bergesen’s list. They realized that when charges of heresy are raised against individuals who have infringed upon the commandments of social justice, there is a heightened level of fear among peers of the accused who will throw him or her to the wolves instead of defending the accused: “When a public accusation is made, many friends and bystanders know that the victim is innocent, but they are afraid to say anything. Anyone who comes to the defense of the accused is obstructing the enactment of a collective ritual. Siding with the accused is truly an offense against the group, and it will be treated as such. If passions and fears are intense enough, people will even testify against their friends and family members.”707 The addiction to outrage that social justice has instigated among its youthful devotees has created a cultural milieu where every day on social media is filled with a manic craze to scrutinize the posts of others and expose them for breaching today’s social norms. Purveyors of social justice are encouraged to publicize their virtue by calling out the past sins of others, regardless of the veracity of these sins, at the expense of others. After the sin has been paraded, individuals pile on to demonstrate their virtue by grandstanding, while those who have the audacity to defend the actions of these villains are shot down by a mob of delirious social justice advocates. Celebrities like J.K. Rowling, Kevin Hart708, Eddie Murphy709,
Drew Brees and most recently Adele are some of the high-profile names to have made the mistake of crossing social justice tripwires. Indeed, these individuals will survive the storm of social justice, yet, when the mob comes for the average Joe, the consequences are far more debilitating. Lives are ruined, careers lie in tatters, relationships are frayed. All this, for the momentary euphoria that fills social justice devotees who are lionized for carrying out the act of humiliating others (oftentimes friends and family). As Ben Shapiro notes, “All of this has been raised to the level of religious observance. That new woke religion comes along with the creed of political correctness, with the priesthood of media elites, with sin and absolution and sainthood defined by the mob. No longer does man labor to serve a father in heaven; now he serves to win praise of his cultural betters. The new church persecutes heretics and rewards true believers. Those who dissent are subjected to witch trials or public confessions. Mob mentality actually provides its own ersatz social fabric – we find solidarity with one another in tearing down those who violate the ever-shifting lines of political correctness. The mob doesn’t want to discuss an unpopular view; they want to silence it. The mob doesn’t want an explanation; excuses make them angrier. The mob doesn’t want an apology; blood in the water encourages a feeding frenzy. While it’s certainly true that, as Tocqueville pointed out, social sanctions can be good – they can reinforce virtue and disincentivize vice – the social media mob is now so overzealous that we have moved beyond virtue and vice, into the realm of pure intimidation of mainstream ideas. Our social strictures were once reserved for larger issues. Now they accompany minor failings – or no failings at all, since the lines of appropriateness change randomly, seemingly without pattern or consistency. When the boundaries of the Overton window shrink in jarring fashion, without rhyme or reason, the simplest solution becomes silence.”

This is why the mob of Black Lives Matter (BLM) agitators were able to harass and demean individuals leaving the Republican National Convention (RNC) for the sin of being white, Republican or both. Being white or male or heterosexual or Republican has been bestowed the same status as that of a racial slur. Worst of all, if one is all those things together, one is guilty of perpetuating a myriad of cardinal sins that range from complicity in structural racism to patriarchalism. A video circulated online following the RNC showed a group of BLM rioters descend upon an elderly couple who were crossing the street. One rioter, in particular, threw his hands in the face of the couple and proceeded to yell at them, before


flipping them off\textsuperscript{713}. A separate video depicted an elderly man being assaulted by another mob of BLM rioters with one rancorous rioter using a bullhorn to shriek, “\textit{Get the f*** out!}” in the man’s ears\textsuperscript{714}. Another incident of mob harassment after the RNC involved rioters hurling homophobic slurs at a group of gay men. Brandon Straka, one of the men who was harassed, stated that the rioters had hurled a drink and cup at him, spit at his friend, Mikey Harlow, and physically accosted his companion, Libby Albert. A video of the incident that surfaced on social media confirmed Straka’s account and showed BLM agitators hurling anti-gay slurs at the group\textsuperscript{715}. The most notable example of this severe crowd derangement, however, was reserved for Republican Senator of Kentucky, Rand Paul. CBS News captured the incident on film where those harassing Senator Paul and his wife could be heard screaming, “\textit{Say her name!}” and demanding that Paul acknowledge Breonna Taylor’s death. When Paul refused to accede to their demands, they jeered him with chants of “\textit{White silence is violence!}” The greatest irony behind the entire fiasco surrounding Paul’s exit from the RNC was the fact that Senator Paul had already acknowledged the tragic circumstances behind Ms. Taylor’s death. In fact, Senator Paul had codified Ms. Taylor’s name into law by authoring and serving as the main sponsor of the “\textit{Justice for Breonna Taylor Act}” that outlaws no-knock warrants like the one granted to officers on the night of her death\textsuperscript{716}. This is social justice in its final form. It is vociferous, it is rancorous, and it is the complete antithesis of its previous iterations that actually strived for universality and shared decency. This is the culmination of indoctrinating a population with lies about racism, patriarchalism and heterosexism. Facts no longer matter, only the narrative and the feelings it intends to induce do.

Despite most people in the modern day having the benefit of individual agency and the opportunity to pursue their own happiness, we see that social justice advocates make the state of the world out to be an oppressive hellscape. The vast progress that has been made since the turn of the millennium appears to be for naught, as the state of the world has never been worse. The good having triumphed over the evil predations of communism created a vacuum and, in that time, society became confused, identifying oppression where it does not exist. The literary giant, Fyodor Dostoevsky, perfectly depicts this sense
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of restlessness that dogs individual devotees of social justice, “Now I ask you: what can be expected of man since he is a being endowed with such strange qualities? Shower upon him every earthly blessing, drown him in a sea of happiness, so that nothing but bubbles of bliss can be seen on the surface; give him economic prosperity, such that he should have nothing else to do but sleep, eat cakes and busy himself with the continuation of his species, and even then out of sheer ingratitude, sheer spite, man would play you some nasty trick. He would even risk his cakes and would deliberately desire the most fatal rubbish, the most uneconomical absurdity, simply to introduce into all this positive good sense his fatal fantastic element.” Dostoevsky, here, points out that man is restless, that no matter how much success we have achieved, we will eternally be ungrateful. This holds true today, where individual purveyors of social justice ignore the tremendous progress that we have made in our pursuit of a more just society and instead choose to endlessly problematize.

**Incentives & Consequences in Educational Institutions**

This section of the chapter will chart the rise of social justice within academic institutions and what happens when they are allowed to fester unimpeded. The social psychologist at San Diego State University, Jean Twenge, illustrates in her book, ‘iGen,’ how kids are growing up much more slowly today than they did a few decades prior. As Twenge notes, activities that are commonly associated with marking the transition from childhood to adulthood are occurring much later in the lives of today’s kids – for example, having a job, driving a car, drinking alcohol, going out on dates and being in committed relationships. Members of today’s youth, “iGen” as Twenge terms them, wait longer to carry out all of these transitional activities and then do less of them than did members of previous generations. Instead of engaging in these activities, the teens of today spend their time alone, on screens. Of note, the noxious combination of helicopter parenting, parental concerns for their child’s safety and the seductive appeal of mobile phones means that iGen arrive on college campuses having accumulated far less unsupervised time and far fewer offline experiences than any other generation. As Twenge states, “18-year-olds now act like 15-year-olds used to, and 13-year-olds like 10-year-olds. Teens are physically safer than ever, yet they are more mentally vulnerable.” Twenge further notes that most of these trends occur across social classes, races, and ethnicities. Being stuck in adolescence for a longer period of time means that kids nowadays are more fragile in their reactions to various external social schemata, responding to external influences in ways that may not be optimal for their development.
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stimuli with demands to be kept safe. The lack of face-to-face interactions among the youth of today have been identified by Twenge, et al. as the chief drivers of youths’ inability to react adequately to external stimuli. They write, “It is worth remembering that humans’ neural architecture evolved under conditions of close, mostly continuous face-to-face contact with others (including non-visual and non-auditory contact; i.e., touch, olfaction), and that a decrease in or removal of a system’s key inputs may risk destabilization of the system.” This was corroborated by the fact that the adverse effects of social media usage were not as noticeable among highly sociable kids, that is kids who spend more time than average in face-to-face interactions. Consequently, there has been a sharp rise in rates of anxiety and depression experienced among adolescents today. According to data from the 2016 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, nearly one out of every five adolescent girls reported symptoms that met the criteria for having experienced a major depressive episode in the previous year. A large survey of university counseling centers found that only 37 percent of students in 2009 and prior years had complained about anxiety— which was roughly on par with rates of complaints on depression and relationship issues. However, beginning in 2010, the percentage of students who had filed anxiety complaints started to increase rapidly. By 2013, it had reached 46 percent and climbed to 51 percent in 2016. The years which saw marked increases in students reporting anxiety concerns coincide with substantial rises in rates of self-injury and suicide among college students.

In response to the burgeoning mental health crisis that has begun to take ahold of today’s youth, college campuses across the U.S. have chosen to coddle their students and attempt to institute safe spaces and trigger warnings to prevent “interference with students’ ability to function.” Twenge points out that members of iGen are “obsessed with safety.” Their focus on “emotional safety” leads many to believe that “one should be safe not


just from car accidents and sexual assault but from people who disagree with you." In their landmark book, 'The Coddling of the American Mind,' CEO of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), Greg Lukianoff, and the social psychologist and Thomas Cooley Professor of Ethical Leadership at New York University, Jonathan Haidt, described college campuses as cultivating "safetyism." Safetyism "refers to a culture or belief system in which safety has become a sacred value, which means that people become unwilling to make trade-offs demanded by other practical and moral concerns. ‘Safety’ trumps everything else, no matter how unlikely or trivial the potential danger. When children are raised in a culture of safetyism, which teaches them to stay ‘emotionally safe’ while protecting them from every imaginable danger, it may set up a feedback loop: kids become more fragile and less resilient, which signals to adults that they need more protection, which then makes them even more fragile and less resilient. The end result may be similar to what happened when we tried to keep kids safe from exposure to peanuts: a widespread backfiring effect in which the ‘cure’ turns out to be a primary cause of the disease.”

Nick Haslam, an Australian psychologist, laid out the vast expansion of the psychological definition of "safety" to include "safety from ideas" and "emotional safety." He found that the scope of the definition had expanded in two directions: creeping "downward," to apply to less severe situations, and "outward," to encompass new but conceptually related phenomena. College campuses are guilty of perpetuating "concept creep" and expanding the boundaries of "safety." An example of this is how, in 2014, Oberlin College posted guidelines mandating that faculty members use trigger warnings to "show students that you care about their safety." The college exemplified a conflation between safety and feelings, which was made obvious by how faculty members were urged to acquiesce to the preferred gender pronoun ("zhe" or "they" instead of "he" or "she"), because using an incorrect pronoun to address a student "prevents or impairs their safety in a classroom."

---


Similar events have occurred at colleges across America, one of the more notable ones was featured in an essay by Judith Shulevitz in *The New York Times*. In 2015, Brown University was gearing up for a debate between two feminist authors, Wendy McElroy and Jessica Valenti, on the social justice topic of "rape culture." Valenti adopted the typical social justice stance that the oppression of women is endemic within Western culture and sexual assault normalized. McElroy, however, set off the social justice landmine having disputed the claim made by Valenti by contrasting the United States with countries where rape is indeed endemic and tolerated. She argued, for example, that in parts of Afghanistan "women are married against their will, they are murdered for men’s honor, they are raped. And when they are raped they are arrested for it, and they are shunned by their family afterward. Now that’s a rape culture." McElroy proceeded to use her own lived experience with trauma and sexual violence (she was brutally raped as a teenager and was left blind in one eye after being viciously beaten by a boyfriend) to evoke pathos and add cogency to her argument about how it was untrue and unhelpful to tell American women that they live in a rape culture. However, as one Brown student informed Shulevitz, "Bringing a speaker like that could serve to invalidate people’s experiences." This, the student said, could be "damaging." The student, Katherine Byron, proceeded to launch a campaign to disininvite McElroy to prevent her from causing grievous harm which would supposedly be inflicted upon the masses by her speaking out against the existence of rape culture. Though McElroy did not get her invitation rescinded, Christina Paxson, the president of Brown, steadfastly denounced McElroy and her views and also acted swiftly to set up a competing talk – without debate – that would allow students the opportunity to listen to musings of how America was indeed a rape culture and not be confronted by an alternative viewpoint. However, the establishment of a competing talk did not entirely put the issue to bed as it was argued that McElroy’s presence on campus could have the debilitating effects of causing students to be “triggered” and retraumatized. Thus, Byron worked with other Brown students to set up a "safe space" equipped with Play-Doh, coloring books, calming music, cookies and students and staff purportedly trained to deal with this form of "trauma." The threat of McElroy’s presence on campus was not merely limited to the revival of painful past experiences; it was also the threat to deeply held personal beliefs. As student, Emma Hall, put it, "I was feeling bombarded by a lot of viewpoints that


really go against my dearly and closely held beliefs." 734 These are just two benign examples of safetyism on college campuses. Though ludicrous in nature, they are increasingly becoming the norm. The problem with safetyism, however, is that it is based entirely on a fundamental misunderstanding of human nature and the dynamics of trauma and recovery. In order for recovery from a traumatic event to take place, it crucial that survivors routinely experience cues and reminders of the experience and that this must be woven into the fabric of their daily life. As Haidt and Lukianoff put it, “Avoiding triggers is a symptom of PTSD, not a treatment for it.” 735 The director of clinical training at Harvard’s Department of Psychology, Richard McNally, concurs with this view, stating, “Trigger warnings are counter-therapeutic because they encourage avoidance of reminders of trauma, and avoidance maintains PTSD. Severe emotional reactions triggered by course material are a signal that students need to prioritize their mental health and obtain evidence-based, cognitive-behavioral therapies that will help them overcome PTSD. These therapies involve gradual, systematic exposure to traumatic memories until their capacity to trigger distress diminishes.” 736

The need to reify and affirm students beliefs on college campuses leads to curriculum being tailored to achieve these ends. Consequently, the barrier that previously separated rigorous scholarship and activism has been blown to smithereens. Once upon a time, it was considered a failure of teaching to extoll a partisan ideological perspective. Educators were once expected to set aside their own political precepts in order to form an approach that was as objective as possible. Teaching, in the age of safetyism, however, aims to introduce social justice activism into academic curricula. Teaching, as a career, is now nothing more than a political act where only the politics that aligns itself with the viewpoints of students is deemed permissible – identity politics as defined by social justice in this instance. In college majors, it is now completely acceptable for educators to adopt the social justice ideological position and use that lens to examine all material, without ever making an attempt to falsify this interpretation by including disconfirming evidence or alternative perspectives. As Pluckrose and Lindsay point out, “Now scholars can openly declare themselves to be activists and teach activism in courses that require students to accept the ideological basis of Social Justice as true and produce work that supports it. … While scholars can, of course, be activists and activists can be scholars, combining these two roles is liable to create problems and, when a political stance is taught at university, it is apt to become an orthodoxy, which cannot be questioned. Activism and education exist in fundamental tension – activism presumes to know the truth with enough certainty to act upon it, while education is

734 Ibid.
conscious that it does not know for certain what is true and therefore seeks to learn more." 737 A particular paper in 2016 in Géneros: Multidisciplinary Journal of Gender Studies favorably likened women's studies to HIV and Ebola, advocating that it spread its version of feminist ideology like an immune-suppressing virus, utilizing reborn student-activists as carriers. 738. Safetyism is extended to even the classroom setting where students who disagree with the content taught in class are viewed as threats who have the potential to marginalize and risk the safety of students belonging to minoritized groups. Barbara Applebaum adopts this concept of teaching, openly promoting the shutting down of student disagreement. She gives the example of a male student, who questioned the gender wage gap, “Allowing him to express his disagreement and spending time trying to challenge his beliefs often comes at a cost to marginalized students whose experiences are (even if indirectly) dismissed by his claims.” 739 This form of education teaches students to see the world through the binary prism of oppressors and the oppressed. The social justice education that has become a commonplace feature of college campuses encodes these power binaries directly into the cognitive schemas: Life thrusts us into a gruesome conflict between good people and evil people. This is the feedback loop that institutions of higher learning have established. Students entering into college campuses are mentally fragile, the universities in their attempt to protect students from experiencing harm have instead erected an activist-based, social justice curriculum which does nothing to challenge students' ideological precepts. The culmination of this educational feedback loop is that the incessant pandering and indoctrinating of social justice theories serves to cement the preconceived narratives of oppression that exist in students' minds.

Education in the modern day teaches students to see more aggression in what would normally be deemed ambiguous interactions, to take more offense, feel more negative emotions, and avoid questioning their initial interpretations by solidifying them. The education of social justice teaches students that intention is no longer of any consequence and thereby to find more things offensive (leading students to experience more negative impacts) and that whoever jockeys an idea they find offensive are “oppressors” who have committed acts of bigotry against them. Social justice education fosters feelings of victimization, anger, and hopelessness in students who have their precepts of the world as hostile, tyrannical place affirmed. As Haidt and Lukianoff observe, “If someone wanted to create an environment of perpetual anger and intergroup conflict, this would be an effective way to do it. Teaching students to use the least generous interpretations


possible is likely to engender precisely the feelings of marginalization and oppression that almost everyone wants to eliminate. And, to add injury to insult, this sort of environment is likely to foster an external locus of control. The concept of ‘locus of control’ goes back to behaviorist days, when psychologists noted that animals (including people) could be trained to expect that they could get what they wanted through their own behavior (that is, some control over outcomes was ‘internal’ to themselves). Conversely, animals could be trained to expect that nothing they did mattered (that is, all control of outcomes was ‘external’ to themselves).”

The climax of students being indoctrinated by social justice education is that the sense of entitlement that is cultivated amongst them. That any view or idea that they deem to be contravening the norms of equity as laid out by social justice must be categorized as violent and met with an equal amount of intimidation and literal violence. Returning to Brown University, protests erupted in November of 2015 where students stormed the president’s office and presented their list of demands to her and the provost. At one point, the provost, a white male, says, “Can we just have a conversation about...?” but is interrupted by students hollering “No!” One protestor asserts that, “The problem they are having is that heterosexual white males have always dominated this space.” When the provost points out that he was in fact gay, the student who offered the explanation behind the group’s interruption stutters and continues, seemingly undeterred by the fact that women and gay men are by definition of their social justice standards oppressed groups, “Well, homosexual … it doesn’t matter … white males are at the top of the hierarchy.”

The tactics of intimidation and harassment employed by students obsessed with the dual goals of ensuring ideological safety and furthering social justice is in no way limited to the Brown campus. Erika and Nicholas Christakis, former professors at Yale University, know this all too well. Erika, then a lecturer at the Yale Child Study Center and associate master if Silliman College, wrote an email questioning the Yale administration on whether it was appropriate to give guidelines as to what kind of Halloween costume would be allowed on campus. In her email, Erika praised the university’s “spirit of avoiding hurt and offense,” but was troubled that “the growing tendency to cultivate vulnerability in students carries unacknowledged costs.” She expressed her concern about the institutional “exercise of implied control over college students,” and invited the community to reflect on whether, as adults, they could resolve disagreements.
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amicably and set social norms together. She wrote, “Talk to each other. Free speech and the ability to tolerate offense are the hallmarks of a free and open society.” The email, however, did not go over well with a student body that had been hardwired to identify offense in every social interaction. It was thus why they deemed what rational minds would consider a well-reasoned and rather innocuous email as an invitation to infringe upon social justice norms and encourage the donning of racist Halloween costumes. A few days after the email had been sent, a group of 150 students had gathered outside the Christakis’ home and written statements like “WE KNOW WHERE YOU LIVE” in chalk. When students began demanding that Nicholas apologize for and renounce his wife’s email, he came out to the courtyard in an attempt to listen and engage in open dialogue with them. In fact, Nicholas actually pandered to the woke mob that had descended upon his place of residence by apologizing to them for causing pain. However, things took a turn when he refused to renounce his wife’s email. The student protestors labelled the couple “racist” and “offensive,” accusing them of “stripping people of their humanity,” “creating an unsafe space,” and enabling “violence.” They swore at him profusely, criticizing him for “not listening” and for not remembering students’ names. In a particular scene that went viral, one rabid student screamed at him, “Who the f*** hire you? You should step down! It is not about creating an intellectual space! It is not! It’s about creating a home here ... You should not sleep at night! You are disgusting!” The following day, the president of the university sent out a mass email acknowledging students’ pain and said that the university was committed to “take action that will make us better.” The university eventually pressured both the


Christakis’ to resign, with Erika later revealing that many professors had expressed support for them in private, but were unwilling to defend the couple publicly for fear of retribution and that it was “too risky.”[748] The cult of safetyism coupled with an activist curriculum allow students to “form their own mental prototype, a schema with two boxes to fill: victim and oppressor. Everyone is placed in one box or the other.”[749] Victimhood grants students’ virtue and the power to push back against an oppressive system in order to achieve social justice. Such events have been occurring on college campuses with alarming frequency and in the overwhelming majority of cases, college administrators capitulate to their students’ demands for safety from ideas and the need for equity (which is basically social justice Newspeak for getting someone you disagree with to shut up). UC Berkeley was overrun by violent Antifa protestors in 2017[750] when Milo Yiannopolous was set to speak on campus. Professor Brett Weinstein was chased out of Evergreen State College when he crossed the ever-shifting equity goalpost[751]. These are some of the more notorious incidents which indicate that an education based upon coddling and pandering to students’ ideological presuppositions serves as a potent mix which risk the actual physical safety of faculty members and invited speakers.

**Media & Political Incentives & Consequences**

In the wake of George Floyd’s tragic death, the U.S. media and Democratic politicians have pounced, latching on to a toxic narrative of “systemic racism in policing” and America in general. Based on the coverage of alleged racist policing in the United States by media bigwigs like Don Lemon of CNN and Rachel Maddow of MSNBC, one would not be remiss in thinking that Black people are being executed willy-nilly by white supremacist police officers. In fact, the vast majority of U.S. media outlets have run with the theme that all of the cases where white police officers are seen to be using force against Black suspects is evidence of racist police practices. This is, of course, in spite of the fact that racial motivations have yet to be ascertained in all of these cases. The media focus in on the


[750] Antifa protestors knocked down a light generator, shot commercial-grade fireworks into buildings and at police officers, smashed ATMs; set fires, dismantled barricades and used bats to break windows. They also threw rocks at police officers and hurled Molotov cocktails at the building where Milo was speaking. The resultant property damage exceeded $500,000 for the university and town.

eight or so minutes in which officer Derek Chauvin kneeled on the neck of George Floyd and without hesitation determined that it was an act of overt racism. The media intentionally seek to elicit outrage by portraying Blacks as being vulnerable to execution at the hands of white supremacist officers. We are told that such occurrences happen “all the time.” In what is now one of the most notorious cases of media malfeasance regarding the “racist policing” narrative is the 2014 case of Michael Brown who was shot while attempting to grab an officer’s firearm. This spawned the now infamous “Hands Up. Don’t Shoot.” Slogan which was attributed to Brown by CNN reporter Sally Kohn752. Similar events, that fit the narrative of endemic police racism have been spun by the media as more evidence of their evidence-free postulation. In 2014, when John Crawford was shot for carrying a BB gun with the front sawed off to make it appear realistic, the media’s talking heads proclaimed it an act of racist policing. In 2015, when Sam Dubose was shot dead for attempting to evade a traffic summons, the media declared it an act of racist policing. In 2016, Philando Castile was shot dead when reaching under his waistband for his license and registration at a routine traffic stop. This was deemed by the media as an act of racist policing. That same year, when Alton Sterling was shot dead as he was being detained in front of a convenience store for unruly conduct, the media denounced it as an act of racist policing.

Based upon this evidence alone, it does indeed seem that the media narrative of endemic racism towards Blacks within American police departments appears to be true. The media, however, have committed the cardinal sin of tossing aside inconvenient facts that disrupt their narrative. The fact that such incidents are by no means limited to Blacks flies completely under the radar of America’s largest media institutions or if reported receives little to no attention from talking heads. For instance, in 2016, a white man by the name of Tony Timpah resisted arrest and was subsequently knelt on for thirteen minutes. Timpah suffocated to death. In a case similar to that of John Crawford’s, a white man by the name of Daniel Shaver was shot dead by the police in 2016 for waving a pellet gun outside of his motel window. In 2015, in a manner almost akin to that of Sam Dubose, a white man by the name of Michael Parker was shot dead while trying to escape a ticket for a moving violation. In 2016, a white man, Dylan Noble, was shot dead under the exact same circumstances as Philando Castile. That same year, Brandon Sterling, white, was shot dead, just like Alton Sterling, in a convenience store for trying to avoid an arrest warrant753. Do we say the names of these alleged victims of police brutality with the same reverence as those who are worshipped by the media? Do we even know the names of these individuals? The likely answer to both questions is a resounding “No.” The narrative


the media spin of a broken system that gives rise to racist cops grows even more spurious when we consult the actual data on policing in the United States. What is all too often neglected by the media are the numerous empirical studies which demonstrate that Black arrests and incarceration rates reflect their own behavior and not some metanarrative of systemic bias in the criminal justice system. “Contrary to frequently voiced accusations and despite voluminous literature intent upon demonstrating discrimination at every turn, there is almost no reliable evidence of racial bias in the criminal justice system’s handling of ordinary violent and non-violent offenses,” wrote University of Pennsylvania Law Professor Amy Wax. “Rather, the facts overwhelmingly show that blacks go to prison more often because blacks commit more crimes.”754 A 2016 paper released by Harvard’s youngest ever tenured professor of economics, Roland Fryer, who had said he expected to discover racial bias in police shootings, instead found that “blacks are 23.8 percent less likely to be shot at by police relative to whites” and that “Hispanics are 8.5 percent less likely” to be shot at than are whites755. Examining more than 1,300 shootings since the year 2000, Fryer found that officers were “47.4 percent less likely to discharge their firearms before being attacked if the suspect is black” than if the suspect is white756. One economist in particular has calculated “that police are six times as likely to be killed by black civilians than black civilians are to be killed by police.”757 In 2019, there were over 375 million police interactions with the community. 1,003 of those interactions ended in civilians being fatally shot. 405 of those victims were white, 250 were black, 163 were Hispanic. 309 of those white “victims” (76.2 percent) were armed with a loaded gun or knife. Of the Black civilians shot by police in 2019, 199 (79.6 percent) were carrying a weapon. As Kimberly Kindy and Kennedy Elliott found, “In three-quarters of the fatal shootings, police were under attack or defending someone who was. The officers were often lauded as heroes... 28 percent of those who died were shooting at officers or someone else. Sixteen percent were attacking with other weapons or physical force, and 31 percent were pointing a gun.”758 As senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, Jason L. Riley, described it, “Police shootings have fallen precipitously since the 1970s. Upward of 95% of black homicides in the U.S.
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don’t involve law enforcement. Empirical studies have found no racial bias in police use of deadly force, and that the racial disparities that do exist stem from racial differences in criminal behavior. The problem isn’t a shortage of data but a race-based narrative that is immune to any data that challenge it.”  

The message the media sends is clear: any contradictory evidence must not be surfaced as the narrative must endure.

The media insistence on pursuing the false narrative of an epidemic of racist police violence against Black communities, is exemplified in how they demonize law enforcement officials, even when evidence of an absence of racism is brought to light. This is most striking in the case of Jacob Blake in Kenosha, Wisconsin. The media ran cover for Mr. Blake, allowing his attorneys to promulgate a false narrative of Mr. Blake as the victim of unjustified police use of force. As Blake’s attorney, B’Ivory LaMarr informed CNN’s Wolf Blitzer, “I think it’s the common strategy that police departments use in these type of circumstances. It’s always trying to justify murder for misdemeanors.”

Another of Blake’s attorneys, Patrick Salvi Jr., asserted that the evidence the Kenosha PD put forward of Blake having started the altercation was “overblown.” He went on to further assert that “When they say that Mr. Blake initiated the physicality (and) Mr. Blake put an officer in a headlock that does not comport with the video from the passenger’s side of the car that shows police essentially beating him.”

The report and most of CNN’s broadcast work has essentially boiled down to rejecting evidence that law enforcement agencies put forth. This rejection of evidence, in turn, leads to the championing of a narrative which absolves criminals of all culpability for their circumstances. Contrary to attorney, Benjamin Crump’s account, which was extensively promoted by the mainstream media, the Kenosha PD were not in fact responding to Blake’s “attempts to break up a fight between two women.” The police were in fact responding to a criminal complaint against Blake, made by his ex-girlfriend, which alleged that “at about 6AM she was woken up by the father of her children, Jacob Blake, herein known as the defendant, standing over her saying, ‘I want my shit.’ As LNB lay there, on her back, the defendant, suddenly and without warning, reached his hand between her legs, penetrated her vaginally with a finger, pull it out and sniffed it, and said, ‘Smells like you’ve been with other men.'”

---
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further alleged that he had physically assaulted his ex around twice a year for the past eight years and that he also has a problem with alcoholism. As a consequence of these allegations made on 3rd May 2020, Blake was formally charged on 6th July 2020, with an official warrant being put out for his arrest on charges of felony third-degree sexual assault, misdemeanor trespassing, and disorderly conduct connected to domestic abuse. On the day of Mr. Blake’s shooting, his ex-girlfriend had once again made a 911 call against him, this time alleging that he had broken into her home and taken her keys. In the call, his ex-girlfriend claimed that she felt threatened by his unwarranted presence in her home and that she had no idea what he intended to do with her keys. The chronology of events laid out by the viral social media video and media coverage of the incident were also called into serious question when the Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) reported that Jacob Blake had a concealed weapon on the floorboard of his car.

“Kenosha Police Department officers were dispatched to a residence in the 2800 block of 40th Street after a female caller reported that her boyfriend was present and was not supposed to be on the premises,” the department said. “During the incident, officers attempted to arrest Jacob S. Blake, age 29. Law enforcement deployed a taser to attempt to stop Mr. Blake, however the taser was not successful in stopping Mr. Blake.” The department added that “During the investigation following the initial incident, Mr. Blake admitted that he had a knife in his possession, DCI agents recovered a knife from the driver’s side floorboard of Mr. Blake’s vehicle. A search of the vehicle located no additional weapons.”

Also downplayed by the media is the incident report by the Kenosha Police Union which indicated that the officers had made multiple attempts to use non-lethal force against Jacob Blake. The statement by the Kenosha Police Union outlined the timeline of events in chronological order:

- Mr. Blake was not unarmed. He was armed with a knife. The officers did not see the knife initially. The officers first saw him holding the knife while they were on the passenger side of the vehicle. The “main” video circulating on the internet shows Mr. Blake with the knife in his left hand when he rounds the front of the car. The officers issued repeated commands for Mr. Blake to drop the knife. He did not comply.
- The officers initially tried to speak with Mr. Blake, but he was uncooperative.
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The officers then began issuing verbal commands to Mr. Blake, but he was non-compliant.
- The officers next went "hands-on" with Mr. Blake, so as to gain compliance and control.
- Mr. Blake actively resisted the officers' attempt to gain compliance.
- The officers then disengaged and drew their tasers, issuing commands to Mr. Blake that he would be tased if he did not comply.
- Based on his non-compliance, one officer tased Mr. Blake. The taser did not incapacitate Mr. Blake.
- The officers once more went "hands-on" with Mr. Blake; again, trying to gain control of the escalating situation.
- Mr. Blake forcefully fought with the officers, including putting one of the officers in a headlock.
- A second taser (from a different officer than had deployed the initial taser) was then deployed on Mr. Blake. It did not appear to have any impact on him.
- Based on the inability to gain compliance and control after using verbal, physical and less-lethal means, the officers drew their firearms.
- Mr. Blake continued to ignore the officers' commands, even with the threat of lethal force now present.

The narrative that has been spun by the media around the Jacob Blake case are nothing but a web of lies, intended to stoke outrage and elicit anger from viewers. This form of media malfeasance, unfortunately, is not limited to the case of Jacob Blake and is in fact part of a larger ongoing trend where members of the media sequester pertinent pieces of information so as to uphold the initial narrative that they have created. For instance, though it is unquestionable that Derek Chauvin's use of force on George Floyd was excessive to the highest degree, the media have turned a blind eye to new evidence that cast serious doubt on the prognosis that Mr. Floyd died of asphyxiation. New court documents have uncovered two memorandums, dated May 26 and June 1, that suggest Chief Hennepin County Medical Examiner Dr. Andrew Baker concluded George Floyd likely died from a fentanyl overdose and found "no physical evidence suggesting" that he died of asphyxiation. "AB (Andrew Baker) said that if Mr. Floyd had been found dead in his home (or anywhere else) and there were no other contributing factors he would conclude that it was an overdose death," says Dr. Baker. The other memorandum, dated June 1, showed that Dr. Baker indicated that Mr. Floyd had a pre-existing heart condition and three illicit substances in his system, one of which was fentanyl. According to Dr. Baker, “Floyd's level of fentanyl was 'pretty high,' and a potentially 'fatal level.'”

This particular finding of Dr. Baker's is seemingly corroborated by a recently leaked video

---

by the Daily Mail which shows Mr. Floyd complaining of respiratory issues well before he was placed in the carotid hold. In the video, Mr. Floyd can be heard saying repeatedly that he was “going to die” and that he had severe difficulty breathing. At best, these new details add nuance to a complicated case. At worst, they serve as a complete repudiation of the media’s categorization of facts. Indeed, it still remains true that Derek Chauvin should be punished for his excessive use of force. However, the media, having leveraged Wisconsin’s attorney general into levelling second-degree murder charges against Chauvin acted with reckless abandon, have now left room for an officer who abused his position of authority to be acquitted of all charges. This same impropriety was exhibited by the media in the case of Michael Brown. Despite being cleared of charges by Barack Obama’s Department of Justice who found that he acted in self-defense, officer Darren Wilson continues to be maligned by the media till this day, while Michael Brown has been anointed with sainthood. None of these facts receive the same amount of coverage as the tilted initial reports made by the media. No matter how much evidence there is to indicate that the United States criminal justice system does not suffer from an epidemic of systemic racism, the media will pay no heed. Instead, they supplant facts with biased coverage in the service of a narrative that they know will keep eyes glued to their multi-billion-dollar networks. Again, the message is clear: the narrative, no matter how inaccurate, must survive.

The absolutely atrocious, lopsided coverage that policing in the United States has received, results directly in the formation of a hostile culture towards law enforcement. Worse still, in the larger sense, the premise that Blacks are entrenched in a system of endemic racism creates a culture where whites are villainized. Politicians, in particular Democrat politicians, have seen the heightened rhetoric surrounding racism and racist policing as an opportunity to campaign along the lines of identity politics. Elizabeth Warren introduced legislation that would declare racism a “public health crisis.” She said in a statement, “It is time we start treating structural racism like we would treat any other public health problem or disease ... My bill with Representatives Lee and Pressley is a first step to create anti-racist federal health policy that studies and addresses disparities in health outcomes at their roots.” Member of the Squad, Ayanna Pressley, stated that “With the COVID-19 pandemic unveiling and exacerbating racial disparities in health outcomes, it is time we recognize and treat structural racism


and police brutality as the public health crises that they are." Democrat Presidential nominee, Joe Biden, announced a racial economic equity plan that would get to the heart of "systemic racism" that Black Americans face. In a recent ad campaign for the upcoming election, Biden's running mate, Kamala Harris, stated, "Part of the point of freedom is to be free from brutality, from injustice, from racism and all its manifestations." While the media ignited a dumpster fire with their false narrative of systemic American racism against Blacks, Democrats have essentially been pouring gasoline over that fire. Chief among them, Joe Biden, doused an oil tanker filled with gasoline over the flames of racial animosity when he said in the wake of the Jacob Blake incident, "What I saw in that video makes me sick," and "Once again, a Black man – Blake – has been shot by police in broad daylight with the whole world watching." The combined efforts of the media and Democrats at fanning the flames of racial scorn towards white Americans has divided the nation, with violent protests erupting all across major American cities. In their effort to pander to the radical Leftists who seek their own warped conception of retributive social justice, the media and Democrats have since embarked on an active campaign to excuse the violence that they provoked. The response from the media and Democrat politicians have essentially taken two tracts: one, the riots are peaceful and reports of them being violent are fiction, and two, the rioters and looters are justified in their actions as the nation needs to have a reckoning on race in order to self-correct.

Taking the first tract, CNN decided to run the chyron that the riots in Kenosha, Wisconsin, were "Fiery But Mostly Peaceful" while their on-the-ground reporter stood in front of a heap of burning cars and buildings. Once more, CNN, this time in a segment with Wolf Blitzer, ran the chyron "8pm Curfew Ordered After Violent Protests Over Police Shootings Of Unarmed Black Man In Wisconsin," ignoring the since-debunked claim


about whether Blake was armed, the word violent magically disappeared within a matter of seconds and the chyron then read “8pm Curfew Ordered After Protests Over Police Shooting Of Unarmed Black Man In Wisconsin.” CNN anchor, Chris Cuomo, used airtime on his show to take the second tract. On the June 2nd edition of his show Cuomo to state that “Too many see the protests as the problem. No, the problem is what forced your fellow citizens to take to the streets. Persistent and poisonous inequities and injustice.” He later went on to state, “Please, show me where it says protesters are supposed to be polite and peaceful.” A typical New York Times report on rioting and violence in major American cities downplays the extent of the destruction that rioters wreak by referring to them as “protestors” and that the carnage seen cannot be directly attributed to said “protestors.” One of the more striking applications of this deliberate attempt at verbal vaguery was a passage which read, “Much of the recent activity focused on the Mark O. Hatfield Courthouse, a high-rise structure of limestone and glass to which the Trump administration dispatched federal agents for protection in early July, after a month of continuous demonstrations.” The Washington Post on August 24th lamented that the emphasis on rioting and violence was overblown and merely hyped up by a pro-Trump conservative media. The Post stated, “During the BLM protests, prominent Republicans like Sen. Tom Cotton (Ark.) and President Trump depicted the movement as threatening, using terms like ‘thugs,’ ‘mobs’ and even ‘acts of domestic terror.’ Conservative media outlets like Fox News disproportionately showed footage of property destruction and theft to support the narrative that the protests were out of control.” Democrat politicians have done much worse, however, essentially justifying the use of violence on behalf of rioters and looters, with some of the more radical identitarians within their lot going as far as to egg on the chaos. Democrat Representative of Massachusetts, Ayanna Pressley, stated, “You
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know, there needs to be unrest in the streets as long as there’s unrest in our lives.”

Democrat Representative of Queens, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, defended the BLM looting of businesses and spike in crime in her home state New York, asserting that, “Maybe this has to do with the fact that people aren’t paying their rent & are scared to pay their rent and so they go out and they need to feed their child and they don’t have money so... they feel like they either need to shoplift some bread or go hungry.”

In the state of California, Costa County District Attorney, Diane Becton, issued guidelines for law enforcement to follow. These guidelines required law enforcement officials to consider if the looters needed their loot before placing them under arrest. Factors that Becton instructed law enforcement to consider included: “i. Was the target business open or closed to the public during the state of emergency? ii. What was the manner and means by which the suspect gained entry to the business? iii. What was the nature/quantity/value of the goods targeted? iv. Was the theft committed for financial gain or personal need? v. Is there an articulable reason why another statute wouldn’t adequately address the particular incident?”

By justifying and pandering to the radical agenda of social justice rioters, the media believe that they can increase viewership and Democrats believe they can gain the upper hand in the upcoming election. What they fail to note – or perhaps deliberately ignore – is that perpetuating violence has very real consequences for ordinary citizens.

The unrest that Democrats and media talking heads have fueled in Kenosha, Wisconsin, will cost the city approximately $2 million in property damages alone. Many small businesses have forced to close their doors for good as direct consequence of the destruction and looting that they have been exposed to. One such business, Gravity Gaming Lounge suffered losses of around $20,000 in damage to its infrastructure and $10,000 in terms of inventory that had been looted. A morose statement released by the


owners stated, “As we look at the total costs, at this point we will be closing down completely.” Small business owner, Kimberly Warner, stated that Kenosha now “looks like a war zone,” and that “Our downtown and uptown is completely destroyed.” She went on to note that, “every single business was affected in my downtown area in some way, shape or form.” Reuters reported that “Arsonists set building ablaze and torched much of the black business district in Kenosha, Wisconsin, during a second night of unrest sparked by the wounding of a Black man shot in the back by police as his three young sons looked on.” BLM activists in Kenosha continued their assault on the city by storming upscale neighborhoods in an effort to cause as much disruption as possible. Ami Horowitz who was on the scene, reported, “So, now we’re in a wealthy white neighborhood and they want to make sure that nobody has peace, and nobody can sleep.” In a video that Horowitz recorded, BLM rioters can be heard chanting “Out of your house and into the streets!” In Manhattan, rioters and looters smashed and vandalized several businesses and banks in Lower Manhattan which will potentially cost residents and business owners tens of thousands of dollars. Police sources estimated that the rioting and destruction of property could cost the city up to $100,000 in damages. The managing editor of Human Events, Ian Miles Cheong, captured BLM rioters climbing onto people’s homes in Rochester, New York. Footage obtained from Cheong also depicted rioters trashing businesses and harassing passers-by. The rioting has also seen casualties in the form of retired police chief, David Dorn. Dorn, a Black man, was shot and killed by BLM rioters when he responded to the alarm of his friend’s pawn shop being set off in the middle of the night. His wife, Ann, recounted the harrowing ordeal:


“One example of that was his friendship with a young man named Lee. Dave met him when Lee was just a kid, after members of his family were attacked and murdered. Dave took a special interest in the boy. They bonded, and their friendship grew and remained strong through the years. Lee eventually opened a pawn shop. He trusted Dave implicitly and asked him to help with security. Dave readily agreed. Whenever the shop’s alarm would go off, the alarm company called Dave, and he would investigate. If he got a call after I went to bed, he would wake me up to tell me he was going to Lee’s shop to make sure everything was alright. Most of the time, they were false alarms – triggered by storms or animals – but I never rested easy until I heard Dave’s key turn to unlock the door. The alarm that went off the morning of June 2 was for real. It was a violent night in St. Louis. Four police officers were shot. Others were hit with rocks and fireworks. At least 55 businesses were damaged, looted, or set on fire. As the Officer Wellness and CIT Coordinator with the police department, I was keenly aware of the rioting and spent the evening getting ready to mobilize support efforts for officers who were impacted. After I had gone to bed, Dave received a call from Lee’s alarm company. The front door of the pawn shop had been breached. This time, he didn’t wake me up to tell me. He probably knew I would have tried to stop him or insisted on going with him. As I slept, looters were ransacking the shop. They shot and killed Dave in cold blood and livestreamed the execution and his last moments on this earth. Dave’s grandson was watching the video on Facebook in real time, not realizing he was watching his own grandfather dying on the sidewalk.”

Is it any wonder that stoking racial tensions in a country blotted by a racialized past would lead to such devastating outcomes? Of course not. The Democrats and the media were playing with fire from the outset, pandering to an overtly radical activist organization which had no qualms about employing violence to service their ends. After all, BLM organizers and chapter leaders have made clear intimations towards the use of violence in their activism. The leader of the New York chapter of the BLM stated that the movement was amply prepared to “burn down this system” if the federal government did not accede to their policy demands. Hawk Newsome, the chapter leader in question, stated to Fox News, “If this country doesn’t give us what we want, then we will burn down this system and replace it. I could be speaking figuratively, I could be speaking literally It’s matter of interpretation.” Taylor Norwood, a BLM activist in Chicago, declared that “You can listen to us or you can get ran over.” During a BLM event in

---


Washington, D.C., one particular chapter leader announced that, “I’m at a point where I’m ready to put these police in the f***ing grave. I’m at the point where, I want to burn the White House down. I want to take it to the senators. I want to take it to the Congress.” He continued, “I want to take the fight to them and at the end of the day, if they won’t hear us, we burn them the f**k down. I’m one that talk real s**t. I talk it in New York and I talk it in D.C. The same way I f**k police up in New York, I f**k cops up in here in D.C. The same way I bust police in the head in New York, I bust police in the head in D.C.”

As is the case with uprisings, the revolution eventually devours its originators. The illusion of control that identity politicians thought they had over the revolution has imploded. The Democrats essentially unlocked Pandora’s Box and unleashed a hydra upon themselves. Now the hydra is coming for them. The most obvious instance of this would be how, in spite of his constant support for the movement, Portland Mayor, Ted Wheeler, saw a riot take place outside his apartment complex. Journalist, Andy Ngo, who was on hand to record the scene, tweeted, “On the same day @tedwheeler rejected federal law enforcement resources, a mob of DSA, antifa & BLM radicals gathered at his condo,” Ngo continued. “They’ve locked themselves together in the lobby & demand his resignation & the defunding of police.”

In his monumental work on life in the Soviet labor camps, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, recounted a particularly striking vignette about life under totalitarianism: “At the conclusion of the conference, a tribute to Comrade Stalin was called for. Of course, everyone stood up... The small hall echoed with ‘stormy applause, rising to an ovation.’ For three minutes, four minutes, five minutes, the ‘stormy applause, rising to an ovation’ continued. But palms were getting sore and raised arms were already aching. ... It was becoming insufferably silly even to those who really adored Stalin. However, who would dare be the first to stop? ... Aware of all the falsity and all the impossibility of the situation, he still kept on applauding! Nine minutes! Ten! ... Insanity! To the last man! With make-believe enthusiasm on their faces, looking at each other with faint hope, the district leaders were just going to go on and on applauding until they fell where they stood, till they were carried out of the hall on stretchers! And even then those who were left would not falter.” This is exactly what has happened to modern society.

activist-warns-you-can-listen-to-us-or-you-can-get-ran-over-were-taking-that-st-back> [Accessed 6 September 2020].


Having courted the advances of social justice, identity politicians and the media are now held hostage by the revolution. The veneer of control, the mask of law and order has truly been shattered. Democrats have no control over the revolution of social justice and they have dragged innocent, unwilling citizens into the abyss with them.
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