

EXHIBIT D

From: MILO <milo@yiannopoulos.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 7:39 PM
To: Ivers, Mitchell
Cc: David Vigliano; Thomas Flannery, Jr.; Colin Madine; MILO Management Team; Alex Marlow
Subject: mss
Attachments: Dangerous MASTER EDIT MY 12-02-17.docx

Mitch,

Please find attached a new manuscript. Some notes:

1. I would like another 24-48 hours to add theory, history and pop culture material I consider critical to making the case for me as a cultural icon in my own right as well as America's most relevant cultural and political critic. There are also places in which the phrasing could be improved and language smoothed out a bit.

I'm getting you this now so you can begin to circulate it internally, but please note you will be receiving a new version in a day or two.

2. I think we should move the alt-right chapter back to the end, or at least further down the table of contents. **I HATE POLITICS AND I CONSIDER IT REALLY BORING.** I haven't done that in this mss, but I'm pretty set on it and will submit the book again later this week and with the new chapter order.

Also -- important -- I don't want the book to come across as whiny or self-justifying and that will be the case if we have Leslie Jones material followed by alt-right/white supremacist material.

My response to my critics isn't: "Oh no, let me explain!"
It is: FUCK YOU.

Nonetheless, all the clarifications you asked for are in here.

3. The ugly chapter has been nuked.

4. The feminism, gay, Gamergate and college tour chapters have been substantially rewritten.

5. 80-90% of your cuts have been made and 100% of your requests for clarifications, citations and further explanations have been provided.

Let me know what you think! We're at 80,000 words, so I'm happy to consider any cuts you would like to make, should you think we need them.

-- M



DANGEROUS

Milo Yiannopoulos

To John

CONTENTS

Preamble: On Freedom of Speech and Political Correctness

Prologue: The Art of the Troll

1. Why the Progressive Left Hates Me
2. Why the Alt-Right Hates Me
3. Why Twitter Hates Me
4. Why Feminists Hate Me
5. Why Black Lives Matter Hates Me
6. Why the Media Hates Me
7. Why Establishment Gays Hate Me
8. Why Establishment Republicans Hate Me
9. Why Muslims Hate Me
10. Why Gamers *Don't* Hate Me
11. Why My College Tour Is So Awesome

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

PREAMBLE

ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

I am an icon.

A messiah.

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

I turn straight men gay.¹ If you’re a woman, your boyfriend probably masturbates to me.

I wear police fetish gear, telling college audiences how much I love black dick while scolding Black Lives Matter for not actually caring about black lives.

I bathe naked in pig’s blood to protest the death of innocent Americans at the hands of Islamic terrorists and illegal aliens.

I am feminism’s worst nightmare.

I am the gay left’s worst nightmare.

I am the answer to politicians, journalists and professors who want to control what you can say and the language you can use.

I want you to be able to say, do, read, play and be *anything*.

As a result, I scare the progressive left more than anyone besides Donald Trump.

My college talks spark riots that cause hundreds of thousands of dollars’ worth of damage. People get shot at my shows.

¹ <http://bostonreview.net/politics-gender-sexuality/daniel-penny-milosexual-and-aesthetics-fascism>

I am a cultural icon and a symbol of hope to millions of dissident young Americans, conservative and libertarian alike, who see me as a valiant warrior against suffocating political correctness, language policing and speech codes.

I predicted that 2016 would be the year social justice warriors on college campuses and in the media lost their power – then I set about making that dream a reality.

I'm winning the war.

And I'm becoming very famous doing it.

If you've ever wondered what would happen if Mariah Carey picked up a copy of *On Liberty* and developed a taste for hurling grenades into ivory towers, you're in for a treat.

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

I'm a fire-starter and troublemaker who started out as an obscure British tech blogger and rose to infamy as one of America's most well-known polemicists and media personalities. I've created absolute mayhem in half a dozen industries: media, by being a notorious columnist; tech, by being banned from Twitter; education, by becoming the most in-demand speaker on American college campuses; gaming, by almost single-handedly coming to the defense of an entire generation of young gamers; and publishing, merely by dint of this book.

To the Establishment types who populate the media, academia and the entertainment industry, my existence is downright apocalyptic. The appearance of my expensive shoes and frosted tips and the sound of my laughter ringing down dorm corridors and across university quads are horrifying to close-minded people, because they force the professors, journalists, directors, activists and musicians to do something no one in America has done for a long time: *question their assumptions.*

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

They say I am responsible for the actions of others. When some anonymous reprobate goes after a celebrity on Twitter, I get the blame. It's like blaming Justin Bieber for the "cut for Bieber" trend, in which teenage Beliebers posted pictures of cuts on their arms as a protest against the Canadian singer's drug use.

My supporters see me for what I am: a critical voice in the pushback against political correctness, and a free-speech fundamentalist defending the public's right to express themselves however they please. Young conservatives and libertarians respond to me because I say the things they wish they could—things about their dreary professors and odious left-wing "comedians."

Mischief-making musicians, actors and writers love me -- but only in private, because they fear reprisals. Hundreds of them have written to me to say so. The names in my inbox, which include Hollywood A-listers, rappers, reality TV stars, authors, producers and investors, would make your head explode. There's a secret society for conservatives in Hollywood called the Friends of Abe. During its existence, only a few of its more than 1,500 members openly admitted their affiliation². These days what people in the Hills want to know is if you're friends with Milo.

2 <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/apr/21/secretive-hollywood-conservative-group-dissolves-trump>

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

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

They hate that.

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

I am the Ken doll from the underworld.

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

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

They hate that too.

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

I am a gay man. They call me a homophobe. I'm a sexual libertine and free-speech fundamentalist -- they call me a far-right troll. I date black men but they call me a racist. (They say that even saying that is racist.) I'm a Jew; they call me an anti-Semite. I want to keep men

who are confused about their identities out of women's bathrooms. For all of this, they call me a reactionary bigot.

And when I dare to express myself in public, they riot, they boycott publishers and they call anyone associated with me the most outrageous names.

Take the publication of this book, for instance. The response to this book is the whole reason I wrote it.

In case you've been shunning all media – and who could blame you? – since 2015, the announcement of *Dangerous* drew a tremendous outcry across social media, online media and traditional media. Despite being launched between Christmas and New Year's Day, when most of the world is on vacation, the firestorm was immediate.

I'm used to the heat. A lot of what came at me with the announcement were the typical lies I've dealt with for the last six months. Nonsensical and untrue charges, such as calling me the leader of the alt-right, a white nationalist, or a homophobe.

The reaction to this book is the whole reason I wrote it.

But even I was surprised by the scale of the onslaught. The *Chicago Review of Books* announced to great fanfare that they would not review another book published by my publisher's parent company, Simon & Schuster, in response to *Dangerous*. What are they so afraid of?

It isn't my signature blend of outrageous behavior, my mockery of ideologies considered sacrosanct in America today, or even my addiction to uncomfortably truths. The Establishment's real fear is that this book will deeply affect readers, especially young people. In particular, they fear that the young people at the epicenter of political correctness in America's universities will begin to question the ideologies foisted upon them thanks to the book you hold in your hands.

Weirdly, my views aren't even as radical, or “hateful” as my opponents seem to think they are. I believe in free speech, freedom of lifestyle – for hedonistic liberals and traditional conservatives both – and in putting facts before feelings. If you want white nationalism, go listen to Richard Spencer. I'm more of a conservative Lenny Bruce, packaging ideas and facts that were once pretty uncontroversial, and packaging them in bombastic, hard-hitting language. And what does it say about the liberal left that they're now the equivalent of the stuffy prudes who tried to censor Bruce?

Political correctness has morphed over the last decade. It used to be a particular way to think and speak in order to demonstrate to everyone around just how good of a person you are. Fellow liberals might not know anything about you, but they'd know you are a virtuous person based on your use of the term “undocumented American” instead of “illegal alien”.

The new brand of political correctness, popular on college campuses and the Internet, is the idea that no speech should exist that directly challenges politically-correct ideas. To campus radicals, and the professors who molded their behavior and outlook, it is incomprehensible that I should be permitted to speak on their campus, or, even worse, publish a book.

They believe that any speech that disagrees with them is “hate speech.” That term has been stretched so broadly that it has lost all meaning. Because they are not equipped for a world in which individuals can disagree with what is deemed appropriate thought, they react in a completely hysterical manner. Take for example Adam Morgan, the editor of the Chicago Review of Books, who wrote in The Guardian that my book could inspire people to commit acts of terrorism, specifically naming as examples Omar Mateen and Dylann Roof.

This is insane -- I gave a speech about the dangers of Islam mere steps from the site of Mateen's massacre, and the Internet Nazis who inspired Dylann Roof hate me too.

The practitioners of the new political correctness rely on silencing the opposition instead of winning with superior ideas. Whether purposefully or unwittingly, they've created a generation afraid of critical thinking, challenging one's beliefs and healthy debate. Freedom of speech is America's most cherished right, and implicit in freedom of speech is the freedom to disagree.

If there isn't a piece in a leading media source comparing this book to *Mein Kampf* by the time it is published, don't worry, it's coming soon. And that's precisely why this book is so necessary.

In America, you are free to disagree. My embrace of unapologetic and sometimes even offensive freedom of speech, and of putting facts, fun, and fabulousness ahead of feelings, has made me dangerous to the world of political correctness. But all of their outrage and attacks have made this book a bestseller, because freedom and laughter always win.

The message of this book is simple: Keep fighting, keep laughing and never stop doing either. Political correctness only wins when we are too afraid to say "feminism is cancer."

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

Keep reading and you'll find out how you can become as terrifying to the forces of political correctness and social justice as I am. And you won't even have to go gay! I'll even teach you how, despite my awesome personal qualities and tremendous professional success, I stay so remarkably modest.

PROLOGUE

THE ART OF THE TROLL

It was early 2017, and my campus tour was heating up.

Like, *literally* heating up. The University of California at Berkeley was on fire. As I prepared myself in the green room for another triumphant address to an adoring college audience, I was hearing frantic reports from outside the building that an armed, disciplined unit of black-masked leftist protesters had stormed the building and were setting it alight. Soon, assault was added to arson as I started hearing reports from outside that my fans were getting beaten up and pepper-sprayed by the armed thugs.

While the university police twiddled their thumbs, following the University of California's limp-wristed policy of avoiding confrontation with violent protesters³, the rioters (let's call them by their *real* name) seized their barricades and used them as battering rams to smash the windows of the student venue. Although I'm loathe to respond to the threat of violence, I couldn't overcome the objections of my security team, who quickly called the event off and evacuated me from the building. After causing approximately \$100,000 in damage to university property, the rioters then marched off to attack the town of Berkeley, where they proceeded to smash up a number of storefronts.

The outbreak of violence prompted a storm of media attention – as usual, attempts to shut me down only spread my message to an even wider audience – as well as a disturbing number of op-eds in student newspapers including *The Daily Californian* defending violence and calling for

³ <http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/matier-ross/article/Why-UC-police-let-anarchists-run-wild-in-Berkeley-10908034.php>

more. One UC Berkeley alumni claimed that my very appearance on a college campus was an act of violence, and that the riots were a form of self-defense⁴.

President Trump took a rather different view, sending jolts of terror into the hearts of university administrators everywhere by threatening to pull federal funding from UC Berkeley if they did not adequately defend freedom of speech.

How did this happen? How did a sassy gay Brit making fat jokes, mocking feminists, and defending free speech cause a First Amendment crisis on American college campuses, complete with violent riots and the threat of a White House intervention? How did I get *this good* at pissing people off?

THE ART OF THE TROLL

2016 was the year of the troll. And, as one of the world's most famous trolls, I have special insight into what that means.

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

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

The young memester faction of the alt-right accomplished this flawlessly by getting a popular cartoon internet frog called Pepe branded a "hate symbol." Now, left-wing activists, journalists, and "anti-hate" organizations will descend in a firestorm of fury on anyone who

⁴ <http://www.dailycal.org/2017/02/07/check-privilege-speaking-protests/>

shares the frog picture, no matter how innocent the context, invariably making themselves look ridiculous in the process.

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

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

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

Even calling myself a faggot is trolling you. Calling myself a "fabulous faggot" is trolling you fabulously. It's an old trick I picked up from drag queens: always tell the joke the other guy is going to tell about you first, and make it funny. Eminem perfected the same art in the late 1990s and early 2000s trying to break into rap as a white guy. It's an incredibly disarming tactic, and it's one of the reasons I make so many black dick jokes at my own expense in my college talks.

As Immortal Technique once so memorably put it, if you can take a dick, you can take a joke. I can't stand uptight people who won't let themselves laugh at things that are obviously funny for fear of being seen as "sexist," or whatever. And I hate people who can't laugh at themselves. If you can laugh heartily at your own shortcomings and eccentricities, people will give you permission to laugh at just about anyone. And it's through laughter we connect with others, and can reveal truths that most would find unpalatable or uncomfortable outside the context of a stand-up routine or a humorous newspaper column.

Unfortunately, because the American media establishment has given up on actually reporting anything of substance in favor of policing language for perceived bigotries, and inventing new offenses like "manspreading," "mansplaining" and "manslamming" when it runs

out of things to complain about, people are understandably afraid of cracking even the most innocent jokes in public these days if they involve any group that isn't straight white men.

Picking deserving targets, and making them hopping mad, is essential to good trolling. So is annoying both sides. To anyone who comes to my shows, or reads my columns, or sees me on TV, I'm a waspish, smart, interesting guy who just wants everyone to be free to read, do, say and be whatever they want. It's a shame that in today's America, that's considered controversial. But nothing I actually say is that outrageous.

Yet, to the media, I am the Antichrist.

Left-wing reporters describe me to disbelieving readers as a misogynist, racist, white-nationalist alt-right bigot. Actual Neo-Nazis, meanwhile, call me a "degenerate kike faggot" and have declared a "holy crusade" against me.^{5 6}

At least one of them must be wrong, but their collective confusion is so glorious that I don't want to correct either.

This is top-tier trolling: annoying your critics so much they print hysterical lies about you because they can't beat you on the facts and because you get under their skin so effectively, all the while torpedoing their own credibility and readership while your own fan base grows.

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

A master showman, Donald J. Trump can command the media's attention even though most of their leading lights utterly despise him.

⁵ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/09/29/antisemites-and-white-supremacists-declare-holy-crusade-against-milo/>

⁶ <http://www.dailystormer.com/stormer-book-club-crusade-the-final-solution-to-the-milo-problem/>

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

We should never mistake cruelty for trolling. It's true that to be a good troll, one must have a certain level of disregard for other peoples' feelings. But virtuous trolling must serve a purpose; the difference between trolling and cruelty is that cruelty has no purpose except to hurt someone. Trolls may hurt the feelings of delicate wallflowers, but they do so because reasoned argument and polite entreaty have failed. And, to be completely clear, in my experience most of those delicate wallflowers turn out to be sociopathic professional activists cynically playing the victim, trying to persuade you that jokes on Twitter can cause lasting psychological damage.

The most high-minded trolls should troll only in the name of debunking some untruth or exposing wrongdoing or hypocrisy. That's what I try to do.

Trolling is the perfect weapon of a political dissident intent on spreading forbidden or inconvenient truths. One of the purposes of trolling is to generate as much noise and public outcry as possible, which has the added effect of drawing attention to the very facts society is so eager to suppress. Furthermore, the mere act of unashamedly revealing such truths is frequently all that is needed to generate the outcry in the first place. Trolling and truth-telling are made for each other; two bold acts of modern rebellion existing in perfect, intricate symbiosis.

Want to know why the trolls are winning? It's because no matter how much you hate us, yell at us, ban us from your comment sections, stamp your feet, throw your toys out of the stroller or pretend that jokes on Twitter can cause you physical pain, *we're the only ones telling the truth any more.*

If you tell lies to and about men, if you spread conspiracy theories about the "wage gap" and "campus rape culture," if you tweet "Kill All White Men" and "I Bathe In Male Tears," if

you close comment sections because you hate being ridiculed by readers who are smarter than you are, if you prefer ideology and activism to facts, if you create an a hateful atmosphere in which it's okay to laugh at white people but no one else, if you are mean and vindictive and cruel and sociopathic yet try to cloak yourself in the language of tolerance and diversity, if you get people fired for bringing up studies or asking you to justify your claims, if you whip up outrage mobs over innocent jokes on social media, if you see racism and sexism and homophobia and transphobia and every other imaginable kind of bigotry everywhere just to get at people you don't like, and if you insist on warping reality to conform to your delusions, well. Don't be surprised if there's a backlash, and don't be surprised if that looks like Milo and President Trump.

We don't care how egregiously you lie about us or how many social media platforms you ban us from, So long as facts remain offensive, the age of the trolls will never end.

"In times of universal deceit," wrote George Orwell, "telling the truth is a revolutionary act." We live in a world where politicians lie to you, the media lies to you, your schoolteachers and your professors lie to you. It's little wonder that young people on campus retreat into safe spaces when they hear I'm coming -- the juddering foundation of lies that props up the progressive worldview has become so fragile that even the slightest bit of contrary speech is enough to shatter it. I bring a neutron bomb when a penknife would do just as well, and the results are always spectacular.

I feel no animosity or hatred towards the kids who hide behind safe spaces and social media blocking programs to protect their worldview. Their fragility is the result of an older generation's cowardice, and its inability to sort feel-good fiction from hard realities. They wanted so desperately to believe that everyone is equal and that we could all get along, and now

their kids have swallowed the lies they barely believed themselves. Trigger warnings and therapy sessions are the result.

Freethinkers and cultural libertarians should take heart. Throughout history, there have always been myths and irrationalities to defeat, and there have always been those who defend them to the bitter, tearful end. Truth, like freedom, must be fought for in every generation. If you're reading this book, you'll likely be one of the people fighting for it this time round. Good on you.

Do not presume that just because I take sympathy on the cry-bullies that I intend to go easy on them. I don't, and nor should you. The fastest way to break the spell of political correctness is to be relentlessly waspish, relentlessly offensive, and above all relentlessly funny. The cooler, more jovial, and more welcoming you are, the faster you'll be able to convince your millennial peers to come out of their comforting shells and confront reality. And the louder and more outrageously you shout your truths, the faster they'll hear.

It's cool to be the counterculture, and we're it. Twenty years ago, it was conservatives shutting down "obscene" bands and video games because they found them offensive. Now it's progressives. As a result, culture and counterculture have swapped places.

Today, the best way to rebel is to be conservative. Hold a placard saying there are only two genders, and that race isn't actually a social construct. Young conservative women: destroy your briefcase and say you want to be a homemaker and mother. Hang classical art in your bedroom and listen to Wagner -- that's far more dissident than listening to Marilyn Manson these days, much as I love him too. Conservatives are no longer the cultural elites, censoring dissident leftist media. Leftists are the cultural elites, censoring dissident conservatives. As a result, a

marvelously rebellious young force has arisen on the web. It's bold and it's subversive. And I'm its most dangerous faggot.

You'll get no end of excitement by following me, I promise. My ambitions are modest, just like me. I only want to win the culture war for western civilization. Being named the next Pope can wait.

I've only been doing this for two years, and I've had fists swung at me, bomb threats sent to my events, and faeces through my letterbox. It can be scary sometimes, but then again I've never been afraid of danger. I am, as my college tour bills me, the Dangerous Faggot. You can be too -- and you don't even need to be gay! Just read this book, stay fabulous, and always, always tell the truth.

But there's a serious point, too. Because there's a dark side to political correctness and the silencing of free speech, and that's what this book will teach you to fight. Political correctness is a mask. In today's culture we make an effort to appear "inoffensive" (well, I don't, but you know what I mean). We are cautious. We want to protect others from hurt feelings and inappropriate language and thought. At least, that's what the progressive left has taught us is the right way to behave.

But to exist this way is in defiance of our natural instincts toward hate and evil. Everyone feels these things from time to time. When they are suppressed, awful things can happen -- like mass murder.⁷ The more time you spend trying to tame the beast, the worse the eventual outpouring of dark power. Sooner or later we have no choice but to give in to our natures. This is especially true of men.

America's next school shooter won't be a Milo fan. They will be one of the poor misinformed goons outside, banging on an exit door, holding a sign that reads: "NO MORE

⁷ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/10/02/how-to-stop-mass-shootings/>

HATE!” As the young Canadian writer Alex Kazemi remarked on my hit podcast, lesbian shooters are going to be next big thing.⁸ Unless, of course, every young person in America reads this book.

⁸ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C6zo1CqDirM>

WHY THE PROGRESSIVE LEFT HATES ME

“97 per cent of workplace deaths are male.”

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

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

These statements are all facts⁹, yet in today’s America, introducing them to the conversation instantly causes outrage, like telling old people there’s nothing in their mouths and they can stop chewing. If you discuss them at all, you are expected to begin with certain caveats. “I’m a feminist, but...” “I’m not an Islamophobe, but...” “The majority of African-Americans are law-abiding citizens, but...”

I rarely, if ever, use caveats, because they’re irrelevant. I prefer to discuss the facts directly, and I use exaggeration and bombast, often outrageously. When Black Lives Matter activist Edward Ward stormed the stage during my otherwise-peaceful speech at DePaul, my response was to quip that, with all the security present, the black incarceration rate was likely to rise even higher if he didn’t sit down and listen respectfully like everyone else. I then asked the line of young black women roping off the stage if the reason they were so angry with me was that I’d slept with so many of their male relatives.

9 <http://www.inside-man.co.uk/2015/03/03/97-employees-die-work-men-2009-2014-figures/>
<http://www.api-qbv.org/violence/muslimwomen.php#stats>
<https://www.b’s.gov/content/pub/pdf/dofp12.pdf>
<https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/htus8008.pdf>

I refuse to preface any discussions of Islam, for instance, with the usual fake niceties about radical extremists.

Challenging the myths of the Left causes them to lose their minds. I puncture their fantasies with attention-grabbing wit and style. I'm also hot, which I'll cover in excruciating detail throughout this book.

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

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

Yes, I was in drug-saturated nightclubs in London, losing my virginity in interracial fivesomes with drag queens, seducing my English teacher and parish priest and experimenting with every depraved form of escapism I could find. And I listened to a lot of Mariah Carey, Marilyn Manson and Wagner and thought about cutting myself, just like those troubled "cut for Bieber" teens.

Obviously I never did it, because even growing up on a farm I still had a mirror and I always knew I was too beautiful to spoil.

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

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

To understand precisely why the left hates people like me so much, it's necessary to understand how and why the left has changed over the past few decades. Political parties on the left have shifted gears. They don't represent working people any more; their constituencies have changed and rather than defending the coal miner or factory worker from the worst excesses of capitalistic fervor, left-wing parties these days concern themselves with pandering to the whims and feelings of various minority groups and regulating language in the public square to make sure it's not "racist" or "sexist."

Once concerned with great, era-defining questions, the left today is instead obsessed with identity politics. To highlight just how small their priorities have become, let me tell you a story from the recent past.

Ghostbusters

In the summer of 2016, I involved myself in a controversy that shouldn't have been a controversy: Paul Feig's feminist-friendly, all-female *Ghostbusters* reboot. I published a catty review of the abominable flick, tarring it with my trademark reserve as a crime against comedy. I

castigated the abysmal performances from the lead actresses, including the inexplicably popular Leslie Jones, as well as the movie's mean-spirited attitude to men.

A day later, I would be banned from one of the web's biggest social networks, leading to weeks of headlines in national newspapers.

Of course, the film had been attracting controversy for months before its release. It started when the film's trailer debuted on YouTube, where it was immediately assailed by peeved fans of the first, classic Bill Murray movie. They had read reports about director Paul Feig's plans to reinvent the franchise from the ground up, as well as the creators' seemingly sparse knowledge of the *Ghostbusters* universe. Like many die-hard pop culture fans, they were annoyed. This, coupled with the fact that the promo video was intensely boring, led to it becoming the most-disliked movie trailer in YouTube's history.

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

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

The media, amazingly, swallowed this obvious attempt to delegitimize criticism and ran with it. Not just the film media, you understand, but also the political, mainstream and even alternative media. The film started to generate more headlines than a Kardashian wedding. The frantic pro-*Ghostbusters* campaign reached peak absurdity when, after disappointing box office returns, politicians from the California Legislative Women's Caucus gathered at a private

screening to watch the movie. After the viewing, their leading members gave what felt to me like a series of pre-prepared statements to journalists, each one of them celebrating the movie as a work of high art and a progressive leap forward¹⁰.

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

The *Ghostbusters* reboot was also remarkably mean-spirited, which would have been okay if it had actually been funny. It is perhaps the only movie I've ever seen that appears to have been written entirely out of spite. Bill Murray gets chucked out of the window in the first 30 minutes, the villain is an incompetent white male secretary, and the movie seems to take a jab at men every second. The petty identity politics also came out in the movie's marketing, which featured male director Paul Feig getting on his hands and knees on the red carpet before being mock stepped on by the film's all-female cast. Can you imagine a similar stunt, with reversed genders? The press would seethe with confected outrage for weeks.

One of the reasons die-hard fans hated the new *Ghostbusters* is that its politics were cynically inverted. In the original movie, the bad guys weren't the ghosts. Everybody loves Slimer and the Stay-Puft Marshmallow Man. The bad guys were the clueless bureaucrats in the government, who set off a supernatural crisis through bumbling and red tape. The feminist version, the enemy is all mankind. Every man in the movie is malevolent, moronic or both. To add insult to injury, the Ghostbusters end up getting government funding at the end. (Like all feminists, they can only survive thanks to state largesse or corporate diversity budgets, never on their own merits.)

¹⁰ <http://www.breitbart.com/california/2016/08/03/ghostbusters-california-womens-caucus-praises-smart-bold-women/>

As you can tell, I wasn't keen. So I wrote a scathing review of the movie, and I mentioned on Twitter that I thought Leslie Jones looked like a dude. (She does.) Because even then I had a huge following, some people took to tweeting Leslie Jones. A small minority tweeted revolting things at her, such as comparisons between her and Harambe, the recently deceased gorilla.

Despite what you'll have read in the media, I neither tweeted anything racist at Leslie Jones nor in any way encouraged the few anonymous people who did. But Twitter, which had been trying to get rid of me for months, took the opportunity to permanently suspend my account.

In this case, "targeted harassment" seems to mean "being famous and having the wrong opinions." Twitter – and the media – decided I was responsible for the actions of strangers on the internet, all because I wrote a mean review, said Jones looked like a dude and laughed at her poorly-spelled tweets.

This is a shocking double standard. We don't blame Justin Bieber when he tweets or posts on Instagram about Selena Gomez, prompting death and rape threats. We don't blame Beyoncé for what the Beyhive does to Taylor Swift. Other celebrities play out their feuds and express their opinions all the time on social media with little or no thought to the consequences. They are never held accountable for the actions of their fans. Only me.

I was banned because I'm popular but I have the wrong politics, and that makes me dangerous.

The irony is, if you read my review, I made some pretty sympathetic remarks about Jones. I said it was a shame she'd been cast in such a stereotypical sassy black momma role. I

said it would be nice to see black women on screen who just happen to be black, rather than indulging these tired Minstrel Show routines. But no one remembers that now.

I don't mean to sound whiny about all this, because my Twitter ban made me a lot more famous. It was one of the best things that has ever happened to me. It broke my addiction to the constant little dopamine hits I got from all those retweets and likes. I get a lot more actual work done these days.

Plus, being banned was cool, like Madonna being banned from MTV in the 1990s and getting even more wildly popular as a result. I joined an elite club of dangerous people, with my homegirl Azealia Banks and right-wing investigative journalist Chuck Johnson. (All three of us are Trump supporters; go figure.) As a result of my Twitter ban, I became, for a huge slice of young America, a forbidden, guilty pleasure. And we all know those are the most irresistible kinds of treat.

Most of the edgiest and most interesting people have now either left Twitter or been struck off. The platform is dying, and so is the business behind it.¹¹ You know, I sort of feel bad for anyone banned after 2016. They're so behind the curve.

So, yes, I don't mean to whinge because I'm not in the least bit sad about it. But it's important to set the record straight when the lying mainstream media comes for you with its usual arsenal of name-calling, hysteria, selective disclosure and outright mendacity.

I guess you could say this is the story of how the left, one of western civilization's most historically significant ideological traditions, found itself at a point where defending a commercially unsuccessful, fourth-rate reboot of a 1980s movie about spooky ghosts became a matter of high political importance, and banning a catty gay columnist from commenting on a

¹¹ <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/twitter-tanks-and-becomes-fodder-for-ma-chatter-again-2017-02-09>

celebrity's looks became a priority for a social network that once advertised itself as "the free speech wing of the free speech party."

It's also a story of how I came to represent the left's greatest fear: their opponents becoming cooler, smarter, edgier and more popular than them.

Why All This Stuff Matters – And Pay Attention At The Back, Because This Is Important

I promise we'll get to the jokes and hair-care tips soon. But I want you to understand some history.

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

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

There was no reason why the left had to abandon its old blue-collar base, even if the base had started to sour on the Democrats in the 1960s over civil rights legislation. The industries that kept them in work may have largely disappeared, but the voters themselves didn't go anywhere. Indeed, as voters in old working-class heartlands entered a crisis, with insecure economic prospects, the left should have been more attentive to their concerns.

But that didn't happen.

Instead, the left chose to abandon their old voters and seek out new prospects. Slowly, they began to ignore the former working class, and turn to a very different electoral coalition: latte-sipping metropolitan voters, women, and minorities. The fact that minorities were only a small section of the electorate didn't bother the left -- they could just import new voters, regardless of how the rapid influx of cheap labor and new welfare recipients added pressure to their already-beleaguered former base and regardless of the horrifying consequences for social cohesion.^{12 13}

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

As their electoral coalition changed, so too did the left's politics. They became less concerned with pay, more contemptuous of efforts to protect old industries, and practically venomous towards the cultural values of their old voters. Barack Obama's infamous 2008 quip that former working-class communities "cling to guns or religion or antipathy toward people who aren't like them or anti-immigrant sentiment or anti-trade sentiment"¹⁴ epitomized the new attitude of the left.

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

What they did care about was their new voters -- the so-called "rainbow coalition" -- and ensuring minorities act and vote as a bloc.

Thus began the era of identity politics.

¹² <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/6418456/Labour-wanted-mass-immigration-to-make-UK-more-multicultural-says-former-adviser.html>

¹³ <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/07/22/muslims-and-islam-key-findings-in-the-u-s-and-around-the-world/>

¹⁴ http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mayhill-fowler/obama-no-surprise-that-ha_b_96188.html

(You know, I'm getting into this! I should consider a professorship somewhere. I'd be the hot lecturer that the football team would consider an easy A -- or maybe just easy. I'd make an excellent men's studies professor.¹⁵ And frankly a teaching position is about the only position I haven't tried.)

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

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

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

¹⁵ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/06/29/ive-just-been-appointed-oberlins-first-mens-studies-professor/>

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

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

That's why Andrew Breitbart, who gave his name to the website I write for, wrote about them extensively in his bestselling book, *Righteous Indignation*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

For better or worse (and it was definitely for worse), the New Left became the defining youth movement of the 60s and 70s, and although initially perceived as radical, its ideas would eventually come to dominate the culture.

The counter-culture of the 1960s became the prevailing culture of the 1980s. In the 1960s, parents stopped their kids from going to rock concerts. In the 1980s, a conservative British Prime Minister was endorsing Bob Geldof's rock band. In the 1990s, a former member of a rock band – Tony Blair – *became* the Prime Minister.

This rise of the New Left coincided with the decline of the unionized working class and the rise of non-unionized workers, who in the 1980s were increasingly attracted by Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher's promises of economic freedom and upward mobility. As the left looked to fill the gap, they increasingly turned to the New Left, and its coalition of women, social minorities, and immigrants.

The consequences of this pivot are plain to see today. While it's a stretch to say that modern leftist politicians want to overthrow capitalism (they're actually quite happy to get rich on the proceeds of globalization; Hillary Clinton is the perfect example), the intellectual legacy of Cultural Marxism can clearly be seen in their opinions: The metropolitan elites of today's leftist political class have Gramsci's condescension and contempt for working-class culture – which is still strikingly traditionalist, despite the best efforts of media critics and journalists.

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

You can spot these people a mile away if you know what to look for. They are the type who will be disappointed by a DNA test that shows they are of 99% European ancestry because they thought “I might be something interesting”. They are the type to point out at great pains that true communism has never been tried. They will write articles defending the acceptability of political violence from the safety of their gated community¹⁶.

For the New Left, white males are the cultural counterpart to the economic bourgeoisie class in classical Marxist theory -- a class of oppressors that must be overthrown by the oppressed. The influence of the New Left is seen most clearly in universities, where efforts to “deconstruct” the pillars of western civilization, from classical liberal humanism to the mythical “patriarchy” proceed just as Gramsci would have wanted.

By the early 2000s, in firm control of the baby boomers' cultural consciousness, the New Left was on course to become the new cultural hegemony. Conservatives, preoccupied with

16 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jesse-benn/sorry-liberals-a-violent-_b_10316186.html

defeating the Soviet Union and reviving the ideal of the free market, had failed to grasp the gravity of the left's cultural revolution. On the right, the culture wars were left to social conservatives, who obsessed over unwinnable fights like gay marriage, and alienated young people with hare-brained censorship campaigns against rock music, comic books and video games.

When social conservatives started going after *Harry Potter* for "promoting witchcraft," it became embarrassingly clear which side had won the culture wars. And it's the culture that matters: politics is downstream from culture, as Breitbart used to say. Politics is just a symptom, which is one of the many reasons I spend more time on college campuses than I do in Washington, DC.

If you're reading this and you're in college, or you recently graduated, you can lay the blame squarely at your parent's generation for handing culture to the regressive lunatics and social justice warriors. The previous generation of conservatives failed completely in their attempts to save academia, the media and the entertainment industry. In many cases, they didn't bother to fight at all, preferring to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on think tanks and magazines complaining about the problem while doing absolutely nothing to fix it, as brilliantly set out in a well-known 2016 essay in the *Claremont Review of Books*.¹⁷ The left, meanwhile, was setting up university departments, organizing activist groups and installing itself in Hollywood and New York City.

Ironically, the cultural left achieved dominance just at the point when they were no longer needed. By the end of the 1960s, when the New Left were still on the fringe, their milder allies in the social liberal movement were already well on their way to winning the really important cultural battles. Jim Crow was dismantled, gays were allowed out of the closet, and

¹⁷ <http://www.claremont.org/crb/basicpage/the-flight-93-election/>

anti-discrimination laws were put in the statute books. By the 1990s, it was difficult to argue that any social group in the west lacked equality under the law.

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

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

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

Conservative thinker Robert Nisbet says it goes back to the French Revolution: If you can live like the Marquis de Sade, who cares if Robespierre's in charge?

At the end of the 1990s, a decade in which despite the LA riots and the OJ trial we could all enjoy *The Fresh Prince Of Bel-Air* together without agonizing over white supremacist tropes in the Banks household, the cultural left assumed complete control of media, academia and entertainment. Once on the fringes, the New Left had become the establishment. They now

possessed that most dangerous of combinations: a great deal of power, and nothing obvious or important to use it on.

Seriously, you have to hand it to them. These guys put the work in. I do admire leftists' energy levels. If I had to spend all day screaming and crying, blaming made-up concepts like the "patriarchy" for my failure and defending Barack Obama, I'd be exhausted. Modern American liberals took Orwell's "two minutes hate" from *1984* and turned it into 24 hours. (The "two minute hate," for those unfamiliar, is a daily ritual in which every citizen in Orwell's dystopia must watch a video depicting the Party's enemies and direct hatred toward them for two minutes).

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

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

Why the Left Hates *You*

So what does this mean for you?

The priorities of the modern left are very different to those of the old. Because of their intellectual pedigree in the angry, victim-centric doctrine of Cultural Marxism, the left is committed to defending a worldview which arranges women, minorities, and gays in a sort of league table of oppression, with straight white males as the eternal oppressors at the top of the list, followed by gay white males, followed by straight white women, all the way down to paraplegic black immigrant Muslim transsexuals at the very bottom. It's a transformation so stark, not even Rachel Dolezal or Caitlyn Jenner would dare attempt it. As I mentioned earlier, if

you know anything about classical Marxism, it's pretty easy to understand -- straight white males are the "bourgeoisie," the group oppressing everyone else.

The academic phrase for this is "intersectionality." Intersectionalists are the ones responsible for dreaming up new, ever more bizarre categories of oppression. Intersectionality is the idea that there are "intersecting" categories of oppression: it's not enough to just talk about the oppression associated with being a woman; one must also talk about the oppression associated with being a black woman, a black disabled woman, a fat black disabled woman, a fat black disabled Muslim woman, and so on and so forth.

In plainer English, some people's lives suck for a bunch of reasons. The progressive left has constructed entire university departments just to parse that sentence.

The "Intersecting Axes of Privilege, Domination and Oppression" lists no fewer than *fourteen* categories of oppressed groups with a corresponding "privileged group" for each one¹⁸. There's whites (privileged) vs. people of color (oppressed), obviously, but there's also "male and masculine, female and feminine" (privileged) vs "gender deviants" (oppressed), attractive (privileged) vs unattractive (oppressed), credentialed (privileged) vs nonliterate (oppressed), and even fertile (privileged) vs infertile (oppressed).

Alongside each conflict between the privileged and oppressed is listed a form of oppression. Our bias in favor of people who can read and write, is, according to the Axes of Privilege, "Educationalism." Our bias in favor of the fertile is "Pro-natalism." Our bias in favor of men who look like men and women who look like women is "Genderism." Heaven help you if you're a literate, attractive, straight white man who looks and behaves like a man. According to the categories of oppression dreamed up by intersectional theorists, nothing and no-one could be more privileged.

¹⁸ <https://archive.is/VWMLg>

This is why, despite facing their own unique problems, men, and especially white working-class men, are routinely ignored by the new leftist political class – because, regardless of the data, straight white men can never be the victims of anything. Any attempts to address their issues are usually met with outrage and condescension. In 2016, when the British conservative MP Philip Davies gave a speech at a conference on men’s issues, the reaction of feminists in the left-wing Labour party was to demand he be suspended from his party. As for whites, any attempt to organize is usually received by the mainstream as the a revival of Nazism, despite the fact that much of such organizing activity today comes as a response to a culture that appears to hate them.

What I like to tell my college audiences is this: I’d prefer a world with no identity politics. I’d prefer we judged people according to reason, logic and evidence instead of barmy left-wing theories about “oppression.” But if you *are* going to divide everyone up into black versus white, male versus straight and girl versus boy, you have to accept that straight white men are going to want their own special party too. If we are to have identity politics, we must have identity politics for all.

Straight white boys in college aren’t neo-Nazis for resisting Black Lives Matter and feminism or for advocating for their own identity groups: they are simply responding – entirely logically – to what they’ve been told about how the world works. It just so happens they have been born into a group that invented most of the best but also some of the worst stuff in history, so they have to deal with that legacy and get called names.

Popular culture, dominated by the left, is instructive. Movies are filled with petty, mean-spirited jabs at straight white males. There’s a huge trend in movies that seek to channel white

guilt over slavery, with movies like *Django Unchained*, *10 Years A Slave* and *MLK*. The straight white male villains in these movies get progressively more sadistic and irredeemable.

Strangely, there are no movies about Ottoman or Middle Eastern slave-owners. I suppose we'll have to wait for Muslim guilt to become a thing. And that's before we even get to the pettiness of *Ghostbusters*.

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

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

The new, identity-driven left doesn't hate only white men. One of the consequences of replacing the old working-class/bourgeoisie dichotomy with the myriad identities of intersectional theory is that everything has become much more complicated. Yes, straight white males are the most oppressive, but how do you order everyone else? Are Muslims oppressing women, or are women oppressing Muslims? Is a disabled black man oppressed more than an able-bodied black woman? And what do we do about white males who are, let's say for the sake of argument, rich, pretty, popular, terrific in bed and the authors of terrific, best-selling books about free speech?

The result of dividing their political coalition into a hierarchy of victim groups is a tragicomic battle for the bottom. *Battle for the Bottom* is also the name of a movie I starred in while in college. Each group's advocates fight to be more oppressed than the others in this system. You see this on social media all the time -- "white feminists" are attacked by intersectionalists for not being ethnic enough, and thus not being oppressed enough. Or, using the illogical logic of the left, they are criticized for being too ethnic, which of course is "cultural appropriation." Probably.

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

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

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

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

Progressives will never understand this. Or, if they do, they don't care.

Identity politics is universally attractive because it enables failures and weaknesses to be spun as the products of oppression and historical injustice. The primary victims of it are the designated “oppressor class,” for whom it can be humiliating and deeply unfair. Take MTV’s *White People*, a documentary highlighting a handful of cherry-picked examples aimed to demonstrate “white privilege” in action. It’s an hour of television designed to produce discomfort in those with the wrong skin color. Or Netflix’s *Dear White People*, another pathetic dose of race-baiting.¹⁹

Safe to say, it’ll be a while before we see *Dear Black People* on our screens, much as, say, America’s police officers might have something to say to that community.

An even greater tragedy of identity politics is that it pits minority group against minority group. If the last ten years in the public square were defined by women ridiculing, criticizing and demeaning men, the next ten are going to be even more depressing, and even more socially divisive.

Welcome to the era of Minority Wars.²⁰

It sounds almost funny, but the modern leftist movement has argued itself into a position where people can be discriminated against on the basis of gender, skin color and orientation. “Straight white male” has thus become a socially acceptable form of insult.

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

This is why the left probably hates *you* too – even if you aren’t a straight white male:

If you’re gay, they’ll ask what your skin color is to work out if you’re really oppressed.

¹⁹ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/02/10/milo-dear-netflix-sod-off/>

²⁰ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/07/23/minority-wars-why-the-next-ten-years-will-set-everyone-against-everyone/>

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

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

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

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

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

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

Did you notice, by the way, that these whiny celebs uniformly threatened to move to overwhelmingly white countries? Imagine the chutzpah and obliviousness it takes to call working-class Americans racist while you plan to move to *Canada* if your candidate loses. Even Snoop Dogg, who promised to move to Africa, said he would only go to South Africa, which, okay, is not a white country. But it's not the Congo, either, and I'm guessing what Snoop had in mind was a nice gated complex with other rich westerners.

Aside from Snoop Dogg, if it wasn't Canada, it was New Zealand, Australia or another primarily white, English-speaking country. Why not Mexico or the Gambia? It turns out that the Hollywood Left is even more racist than the high-level Nazis, who lowered themselves to settling in South America. But Guatemala doesn't have a Whole Foods, so Lena Dunham had to cross it off her list.

Of course, I'm forgetting the new definition of racist we have to use now: Everything is racist, provided you're a straight white male. Donald Trump -- and before him, Margaret Thatcher -- were both right when they said that identity politics and name calling is what people do when they don't have any arguments left.

So Why DOES the Left Hate Us?

"Scab" was a derogatory word used by the unionized workers of the old left to describe strikebreakers: members of the working class who, during a strike, decided that feeding their families took priority over an abstract idea of left-wing solidarity.

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

So the word "scab" itself became an insult so damning that no amount of denial or explanation could expiate it. Once branded a scab, you and your family were scabs for life. It wasn't Twitter that gave name-calling its power: social media just added scale and mob mentality to an earlier leftist strategy for marking out untouchables.

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

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

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

Then there’s the old fallback of the “self-hater,” which can be applied to virtually any identity group.

White men can only survive in this new landscape through self-flagellation and groveling apology for what they are, by promoting how they’re “woke,” a “male feminist,” or a “straight ally.” (See: Macklemore.)

No prizes then, for guessing why the left hates me so much. As I mentioned at the start of this chapter, I’m gay, I’m metropolitan, and I’ve had more black men on me than you find in a college basketball team. Yet I’m not one of them. I get the “self-hating gay” variants daily. But I am who I am, to quote a musical. Or, to put it in more poetic terms, “I am large, I contain multitudes.”

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

I can’t be accused of being homophobic -- only that laughable charge of “self-hatred,” which most ordinary people accused of it instinctively react to with an eye-roll.

And it's a stretch to accuse someone of racism when they never shut up about their well-endowed black boyfriends. (I'll address this in more detail later.)

In short, I'm the left's worst nightmare: a living, breathing refutation of identity politics, and proof that free speech and the truth wrapped in a good joke will always be more persuasive and more powerful than identity politics.

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

They're afraid *you* might agree with me. Because if you're reading this, there's a good chance you might be a woman, or black, or disabled. And there's a chance you, too, might have realized that the left doesn't have your best interests at heart, because you're not "oppressed" enough.

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

And you know what: They're right.

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

One of the reasons the left reacted so hysterically to GamerGate, for example, was because so many female and minority gamers joined the fight against feminist finger-waggers and cultural scolds. This will be astonishing news to my critics, but *I'm really popular with women and minorities*, who hate being spoken for by feminists and progressives.

Rallying under the hashtag “#NotYourShield,” groups that the left took for granted like gays, African-Americans, the disabled, and women stood up and told left-wing journalists to stop speaking on their behalf. For those who rely on the mainstream media for their facts, the thought that women and minorities might side with GamerGate, or with me, will no doubt come as an extraordinary surprise. More on that later.

Rabid Social Justice Warriors considered #NotYourShield to be full of “ill-informed women” with no purpose other than “shut[ting] down talk about racism.”²¹ Other left-wing journalists made similarly disparaging comments, or, more commonly, ignored the tag entirely, pretending instead that GamerGate was an exclusively white male uprising. If that sounds familiar, consider the apoplectic response from feminists and mainstream media journalists to Trump’s success with female voters. Lena Dunham went on *The View* in full schoolmarm mode to remind the feminist sisterhood of its duty to re-educate those poor, ungrateful, ill-educated female hillbillies who voted Republican.²² (Those weren’t her exact words, of course, but we understood what she meant.)

The left’s deepest wish is that we rebel minorities didn’t exist.

Nothing terrifies them so much as the thought of their cherished identity classes going off the reservation. That’s why they reacted so hysterically - or in many cases, so silently - to #NotYourShield. It’s why a black rapper repeatedly called black *Breitbart* journalist Jerome Hudson a “coon” for disagreeing with Black Lives Matter.²³

21 https://twitter.com/arthur_affect/status/523554495276806144
<http://www.breitbart.com/london/2015/01/31/graham-linehan-saviour-of-women/>

22 <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2017/02/10/lena-dunham-calls-out-white-women-who-voted-trump-on-the-view.html>

23 <http://www.breitbart.com/big-hollywood/2016/07/20/rapper-talib-kweli-attacks-breitbart-jerome-hudson-calls-coon-twitter-not-banned-platform/>

And it's why I've been called "self-hating," and an internalized homophobe, as well as every other absurd stand-in for "class traitor" you can imagine.

Historically, the left championed the powerless, and fought the powerful. This has achieved good results, in the past. It meant that the left fought for workers' rights, winning basic protections for workers in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Many of the basic luxuries we take for granted today -- two-day weekends, 8-hour average workdays, and basic occupational health and safety -- were won by leftist workers' rights movements. Other important achievements, such as the end of lynching in the American South, and the outlawing of marital rape, were won by left-wing activists who instinctively defend perceived underclasses.

The dark side of this instinct, however, is the hatred of people deemed to be too successful or well-off: in other words, the "privileged." This is often coupled with a patronizing attitude towards allegedly oppressed classes. The early progressives, for example, were notable for their disdain for both the top *and* the bottom of society. The British progressives had a loathing for what they saw as the excesses of the Edwardian era, a time when the nobility and upper classes flaunted their wealth and glamor.

Progressives were not socialists. They were animated not by Marxist ideology but by moral fervor: they were often staunch Protestants. Susan B Anthony was even a Republican. Their reasons for championing women's suffrage are revealing: the historian Paige Meltzer describes how the cause of women's suffrage was taken up by progressives who believed that women were a force of moral purification, and before that by Republicans who championed their right to vote. They wanted to use women to clean up government and civilize a society they believed had become degenerate and corrupt.

“Puritanism,” wrote H.L. Mencken, whose lifetime spanned the first progressive era, is the “haunting fear that someone, somewhere, might be happy.” And who could possibly hate happiness? Why, those who are denied it themselves. Authoritarian movements draw in ugly, miserable, talentless people for precisely this reason – because it offers an outlet for their hatred of the successful, the good-looking, and anyone who looks like they might be enjoying themselves. In other words, people like me and my fans.

I’m not the first person to make this observation, of course. Rush Limbaugh famously described feminism as a way for ugly women to get attention and enter the mainstream. But on my travels around campuses, observing the rippling muscles of my frat boy fans and comparing them to the stinky protestors outside, I can’t help but observe the difference between happy, well-groomed, ambitious and intelligent Milo fans versus the raven-haired, facially-pierced, blue-haired social justice apparitions protesting outside.

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

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

Like the generals of World War One, the left convinces young people that they’re going to be heroes. In reality, they end up being indoctrinated into wacky, flimsy ideas that never stand up to scrutiny, challenge, or contact with the real world, leaving them disappointed,

disillusioned, and angry. The left puts its foot soldiers in the intellectual equivalent of the Somme -- running at machine guns armed with bayonets.

But the left's hold on the mind of young people is weakening -- and I am happy to be a leading cause. In addition to my efforts to support millennial gamers, my "Dangerous Faggot" tour rapidly mobilized a new breed of dissident student and my millions of fans across social media ask me one thing more often than anything else: "How can we fight?"

For too long, conservatives have relied on pundits whose audience is primarily over 60. In the case of Fox News, it's over 70. There is no other libertarian or conservative pop culture figure who comes close to the purchase I have with young people, who are sick of being lectured to by the increasingly nannying left. America's young conservatives and libertarians are looking for heroes. I'm happy to oblige.

Without an endless supply of eager young activists, the left is nothing. And I am hoovering up those young people and spitting them out as mischievous, dissident free speech warriors who don't give a damn about your feelings.

So you see, I'm more than just an outrageous faggot who spits uncomfortable facts at easily-triggered lefties. I'm a cultural movement. For hundreds of thousands of students, attending my talks, reading my columns, watching my videos, and wearing my SWAG By Milo gear²⁴ has become the ultimate statement of rebellion. Soon there will be millions of us.

Progressives succeeded in their long march through the left's cultural institutions. They became the establishment. But young people have always been instinctively anti-establishment, and that's where I come in.

Authoritarian liberals have become so comfortable that their arguments have degenerated entirely into rhetoric and slogans -- whereas during the Obama years, libertarians and

²⁴ Available at www.swagbymilo.com while stocks last

conservatives were forced to develop a stronger basis in fact. It was only a matter of time before Trump and I appeared to add the individual touches of rhetorical flourish and star power to the freedom-loving conservative vision of the world.

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

WHY THE ALT-RIGHT HATES ME

To the people who are proud to call themselves white supremacists, I am a “n****r-loving ... kike faggot” and a “disease-ridden Jew.”²⁵ But to NBC News and *USA Today* I am – at least until they are forced to issue grovelling corrections^{26 27} – a “white nationalist leader.” This reflects more poorly on the media than it does on the uglier fringe of the alt-right. Aside from the “disease-ridden” part, the *Daily Stormer* is closer to the facts.

Anyone who calls me a white supremacist has no understanding whatsoever of what white supremacy is. But that’s sadly common in America today, where wearing a Trump hat is enough to get you called a Nazi and attacked in the street by the black-masked “anti-fascists” of the left. The media, in its hysterical, fact-free hunt for racists under the bed, has lost its authority in these matters.

So, for those of you still confused, I’m going to explain what white supremacy is, what the alt-right is, and why I have no great love for either.

In late November 2016, *Bloomberg Businessweek* published their annual Jealousy List, a collection of “stories we wish we’d done this year -- and don’t want you to miss.” The list

²⁵ <http://www.dailystormer.com/disease-ridden-jew-acronym-milo-threatens-to-buy-4chan/>

²⁶ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/07/fake-news-nbc-news-issues-correction-falsely-branding-milo-white-nationalist/>

²⁷ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/04/fake-news-usa-today-issues-correction-after-falsely-branding-milo-as-white-nationalist-alt-right/>

included predictable names: *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, as well as BuzzFeed and Deadspin. And then, not-so-predictably, was Breitbart.

And it wasn't just any Breitbart article. *Bloomberg* specifically chose "An Establishment Conservative's Guide to the Alt-Right," the whopping 5,000-word explainer on the controversial movement written by me and my colleague Allum Bokhari. In addition to singling out the piece as one of the best of the year, *Bloomberg* economics editor Peter Coy said he had "learned something" from the piece.

I will dispense with the humility for which I am widely known: *Bloomberg* was right to pick our story. It was the most influential piece of political journalism published that year, with the exception of Ann Coulter's *Adios America*, which heavily influenced Donald Trump's immigration policy.

The definition of alt-right has moved on since we penned our guide to the movement. In March 2016, when Bokhari and I published our explanation of the movement, there was little commentary, and no trace of an authoritative definition of the emerging alt-right in the media beyond the usual hysterics and moral panic that, like clockwork, accompanies the rise of any popular new right-wing movement.

The Daily Beast described it as a "White Power movement," for which there was no evidence. *National Review* portrayed alt-righters as embittered members of the white-working class, which was also not correct. "Thuggish alt-right Trumpers" were the words used by Red State, another conservative outlet that wrote in hand-wringing terms about for online trolling. BuzzFeed described the alt-right as a "white nationalist movement" where "rare Pepes ... are common." (Don't worry, I'll explain what a "Pepe" is later in this chapter.)

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

Well, we thought that the distinction was very meaningful.

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

Both the white nationalists and the neo-Nazis took over this ill-defined term “alt-right,” and soon the people who enjoyed the label initially were being accused of sins they did not commit. Eventually, the hardline white nationalists would solidify their hold on the movement, with figures like Spencer gaining increasing prominence in the media. This of course suits the media, who have always wanted to lump the memesters in with the true crazies. But that doesn't make it right to do so.

In effect, the extremist fringe of the alt-right and the leftist media worked together to define “alt-right” as something narrow and ugly, and entirely different from the broad, culturally libertarian and classically liberal movement Bokhari and I had sketched out.

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

Even today, it's not clear-cut. There are even Jews who still identify with the alt-right²⁸.

To deny the movement's complexity in a frantic effort to advertise their own moral virtue, as so many columnists on the left and right did, was an act of supreme intellectual dishonesty. Virtue-signalling, for those who don't know the term, is the tendency of some individuals to signal their superior virtue by moral grandstanding, often in lieu of some other endeavour, like accurately explaining a new political movement.

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

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

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

If you were in London and on the campus of the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in May 2002, you might have bumped into Leila Khaled, who was being hosted for a talk there²⁹. What did Khaled do in her youth? Draw a picture of a cartoon frog in a Hitler

²⁸ <http://forward.com/scribe/348466/im-a-jew-and-im-a-member-of-the-alt-right/>

²⁹ <http://www.city-journal.org/html/terrorist-returns-9942.html>

uniform, perhaps? No, nothing so grievous as that -- she just hijacked a plane on behalf of the Palestinian Liberation Organization in 1969.

And of course, if you were a student at the University of Illinois in the early 2000s, you may well have found yourself taught by Obama associate³⁰ William Charles "Bill" Ayers, an unreformed communist and co-founder of the Weather Underground, the same organization that inspired the murder of two policemen described above, as well as dozens of terrorist attacks on targets ranging from police precincts to the Pentagon.

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

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

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

God knows I've dabbled with dangerous iconography myself. I've worn just about every political symbol you can imagine in my late-teen and early-20s experimentation phase, not because I have any particular love for the regimes they come from. I just like pissing people off!

³⁰ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2012/06/04/obama-ayers/>

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

Young people flirting with dangerous imagery are the people Bokhari and I described as the "memesters" in our taxonomy of the alt-right, and those are the people I will always speak up for. Because as a walk through the past of some of America's most notorious left-wing professors shows us, there are lot worse things you could do in your youth than shock *National Review* writers on Twitter. As many realized during the election, *National Review* needed a little shocking.

That argument holds, by the way, if your desire to explode polite taboos includes taking aim at the Holocaust.

What a lot of conservatives don't realize is that no one aged 22 knows anyone who was alive during the Second World War. And because they're not educated properly, they don't regard anti-semitism any differently from racism or sexism. They simply weren't taught about the horrors of the Holocaust. And so, for many of them, right-wing journalists complaining about oven jokes strike them as no different from left-wing journalists getting upset about sexism or racism. They think it's all a load of crap cooked up to save people's feelings.

I happen to disagree, strongly, that anti-semitism is just like sexism or racism. I think it's a unique case, and in my college talks I often underscore what I think is a particularly virulent history of bigotry against Jews. Since there have been Jews, it has always been dangerous to be one, somewhere in the world. But to a lot of the teenagers I talk to, they regard complaints about anti-semitism with the same contempt they do complaints about racism and sexism. And when you look at what has sometimes passed for "anti-semitism," you have to admit they have a point.

It's simply a fact that Jews are disproportionately well represented in the media, in the entertainment industry and in banking. We perform well in those industries! And merely pointing out that statistical success should not be considered anti-semitic. When you attack people for telling the truth, you lose credibility – and young observers who don't know any better might just lump you in with the race-baiters of Black Lives Matter and the dishonest professional victims who make up the majority of third-wave feminism.

As I say, I think anti-semitism is unique. But I can at least understand why so many young people find jokes about the Second World War attractive: they drive establishment types, especially conservatives, *absolutely crackers*. And I will defend to the death their right to tweet jokes about gas ovens, no matter how distasteful I might personally find those jokes and no matter who gets offended.

The Alt-Right Declares a Holy Crusade—Against Me

From day one, the media had an agenda: Let's turn the alt-right into a synonym for "Neo-Nazi," and then accuse everyone we don't like of being a member of the movement. It was an old game, one we've seen many times before, and it was growing exceedingly tedious.

Their first target was me.

Because I was guilty of writing the only even-handed analysis of the alt-right – in other words, I gave them a fair hearing, as I thought journalists were supposed to do – the mainstream media decided to crown me queen of the movement, even though I never claimed to be a member, and even though I have frequently been informed by its more ardently racist elements that they don't want a "racemixing kike faggot" like me at their meetings!

Later I took to making public statements that I was not a member of the alt-right to see if it would make a difference. It didn't. Nothing would make the media tell the truth: journalists simply lie and lie and lie until their enemies are beaten into submission.

I chose not to be beaten into submission.

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

On the one hand, these guys are declaring the alt-right to be a racist, anti-semitic, homophobic hate group. On the other, they're saying that a gay Jew with a black boyfriend is the head of it. Something doesn't quite add up! But consistency has never been a strong point of the liberal media.

I'm willing to accept that there a few idiots who simply don't know any better working at NPR and the Daily Beast. The rest are just outright liars. No matter how visually appealing my face is, the alt-right joins campus crybabies, the morbidly obese, and the Muslim Brotherhood as one of the few groups in America that does not want me associated with them. Perhaps some of the younger, less serious memesters wouldn't mind, but the hardline, white supremacists are unequivocal about it.

"I am hereby declaring a Holy Crusade against Milo Yiannopoulos, who is the single greatest threat our movement has at this time," wrote *Daily Stormer* editor and 5-foot-2 skinhead Andrew Anglin last year³¹. "He is our arch-nemesis. We need to stop this kike." (Anglin, ironically enough, is rumored to be Jewish.)

³¹ <http://www.dailystormer.com/stormer-book-club-crusade-the-final-solution-to-the-milo-problem/>

To repeat, for the idiots at NBC News, *USA Today* and CNN: the editor of the most hardcore alt-right site on the web declared me the movement's "arch-nemesis."

Yet according to the media, I'm still the leader of the movement. Frankly, I am overjoyed that both infantile communists and internet Nazis all hate my guts. All the worst people in the world – feminists, cyclists, Black Lives Matter activists, vapers and, yes, the couple of thousand Bitcoin brownshirts living in their parent's basements really, really hate me.

Breitbart was another target of the mainstream media, which repeatedly sought to pigeonhole us as an "alt-right" platform after our former Executive Editor, Steve Bannon, joined the Trump campaign. Yes, Breitbart, where virtually our entire management team is Jewish and most of our senior editors are Jewish, the same Breitbart that publishes the "Breitbart Jerusalem" vertical, is supposedly a platform for a movement that, according to the mainstream media, hates Jews and Israel.

The media's ultimate target was the incoming Trump administration, which is why they stepped up their attacks after Steve Bannon was appointed to the campaign team. During the transition, as the establishment fought the populists for a seat at Trump's cabinet table, the media unleashed its full arsenal against Bannon and Breitbart. The Huffington Post and The Intercept published mind-bending "explainers" on how Bannon was somehow both anti-semitic and pro-Israel at the same time. According to *The Independent*, Bannon was an "alt-right media baron" with "the ear of the president." According to the L.A Times, the alt-right was actually "Steve Bannon's fringe brand of conservatism."

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

But this was 2016, a year that unlike any other proved just how absurd, powerless, and morally bankrupt the media had become. Donald Trump ignored the media pressure and named Bannon his Chief Strategist.

The Fringe Takes Over

The media didn't succeed in its main intention, which was delegitimizing the most effective right-wing individuals of modern times. But they may have succeeded in killing off the alt-right, or at least rendering the word meaningless and unhelpful.

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

You see, if you call something neo-Nazi for long enough, it will invariably attract actual neo-Nazis and – this may surprise you! – scare off normal people.

The alt-right has always had a fringe element of Reich-loving basement-dwellers who describe the Holocaust as a "Holohoax" and want to ban "race-mixing." When we wrote our guide to the alt-right, these were just one of many factions in the alt-right, alongside dissident intellectuals, taboo-breaking kids, and instinctive social conservatives.

An Israel-supporting former Tea Party member was, in those days, just as likely to be drawn to the alt-right as a Richard Spencer devotee, because it was the most exciting, dynamic, and effective right-wing movement to emerge since the Tea Party. Even leftist outlets like BuzzFeed acknowledged its power to dominate the internet and influence the news cycle.

One week in September, shortly after Hillary Clinton read out several of my headlines in a speech on the alt-right, the national broadcast media spoke of little besides Pepe the Frog. Pepe, for the uninitiated, is a cartoon frog from a web comic that went viral in the mid-noughties. Originally used as a reaction image to signify a poster's emotional response to something (there are "Sad Pepes, Happy Pepes, Angry Pepes and Smug Pepes – a lot like emojis), the frog inexplicably evolved into something of a mascot for the alt-right and for Trump supporters.

Following the classic media playbook of "if you don't understand it, call it racist," the media branded this innocent cartoon frog a "symbol of white supremacy."

We should give thanks to NPR, CNN and the Southern Poverty Law Center for identifying the real causes of racial tension in America. It isn't terrible schools, or black fatherlessness, or constant race-baiting from hucksters like Al Sharpton. No! It's a cartoon frog. And people wonder why no one trusts the media any more.

If you're wondering why largely apolitical trolls are attracted to the alt-right, this is it -- nothing tickles them more than getting the entire world to discuss one of their memes and desperately try to make sense of it. Double points if it makes people angry and they start calling it names on cable news!

Pepe, I am happy to report, has escaped the redefinition of "alt-right" mostly unscathed, and is still a mascot on college campuses, where he is used as a symbol of dissidence and resistance to progressive left orthodoxy.

Largely thanks to the willingness of old-school conservatives to march in lockstep with the mainstream media, the alt-right gradually came to be dominated not by pranksters and trolls but by actual white nationalists. A turning point came shortly after Donald Trump's election

victory, when Richard Spencer foolishly encouraged a room full of his supporters to “hail Trump,” which three people promptly did -- with so-called “Roman salutes.”³²

Even nominal white identitarians like Paul “RamZPaul” Ramsey decided they’d had enough with the movement after that, and promptly disavowed it³³.

It increasingly looks like the only people left in the alt-right movement will soon be Holocaust-deniers, Richard Spencer fans and *Daily Stormer* readers. If that’s the case, I want nothing to do with the movement -- and, presumably, the movement wants nothing to do with me.

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

³² <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/11/19/white-nationalists-and-nazi-saluting-tila-tequila-toast-emperor-trump-in-washington-dc.html>

³³ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n8HBLX_khwQ

WHY TWITTER HATES ME

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

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

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

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

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

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

In May 2016, it was revealed that the inevitable had indeed happened -- Facebook was discriminating against topics of interest to conservatives on its "Trending News" feature. A former employee of the team told *Gizmodo* that in addition to neglecting conservative trends, the company also suppressed stories about itself while artificially promoting stories about the Black Lives Matter movement.³⁴

According to *Gizmodo*, Facebook's team of "News Curators" were "told to select articles from a list of preferred media outlets that included sites like the *New York Times*, *Time*, *Variety*, and other liberal mainstream outlets. They would regularly avoid sites like World Star Hip Hop, The Blaze, and Breitbart, but were never explicitly told to suppress those outlets." A leaked document published in *The Guardian* later confirmed that Facebook would check against a list of preferred mainstream outlets (including the BBC, the liberal-leaning *New York Times* and CNN, and FOX) before assigning a story "national-level importance."³⁵ In other words, it was up to places like CNN to sign off on stories from right-leaning outlets before Facebook would touch them. Can anyone spot the problem?

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

³⁴ <http://gizmodo.com/former-facebook-workers-we-routinely-suppressed-conser-1775461006>

³⁵ <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/may/12/facebook-trending-news-leaked-documents-editor-guidelines>

policies of bias against conservatives -- all they have to do is give minimal oversight to their overwhelmingly left-leaning employees, and turn a blind eye to the inevitable consequences.

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

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

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

Meanwhile, according to the source, stories about progressive causes like Black Lives Matter were promoted, due to pressure from Facebook's left-leaning staff (they would also pressure Mark Zuckerberg to use Facebook to help swing the election for Hillary Clinton, and blame him for not doing enough after she lost)³⁶.

³⁶ http://qizmodo.com/facebook-employees-asked-mark-zuckerberg-if-they-should-1771012990?utm_campaign=socialflow_qizmodo_twitter&utm_source=qizmodo_twitter&utm_medium=socialflow

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/facebook-employees-pushed-to-remove-trump-posts-as-hate-speech-1477075392>

Facebook got a lot of pressure about not having a trending topic for Black Lives Matter,” the individual said. “They realized it was a problem, and they boosted it in the ordering. They gave it preference over other topics. When we injected it, everyone started saying, ‘Yeah, now I’m seeing it as number one’.” This particular injection is especially noteworthy because the #BlackLivesMatter movement originated on Facebook, and the ensuing media coverage of the movement often noted its powerful social media presence.

Facebook’s political bias scandal took place after Twitter’s. But because, unlike Twitter, Facebook actually matters to normal people, it caused an instant response from politicians.

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

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

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

Breitbart received an invitation to attend the meeting, but unlike S.E Cupp, Glenn Beck and other assorted establishment types, we declined to attend because we considered the invitation a photo op, and not a serious effort to engage with conservatives. Instead, I asked

Mark Zuckerberg to answer, in a live debate with me, to the only group who mattered -- the millions of ordinary conservatives who used his platform. He refused.

I'm a humble man -- take a walk if you're still laughing more 30 seconds after reading that -- who can of course handle not receiving attention, so my response to Facebook's snub was characteristically gracious and mild. Along with Allum Bokhari, I wrote a series of stories exposing the wacky progressive views of Facebook's Trending News team^{37,38}, leading to them all getting fired and replaced with a computer algorithm³⁹. You're welcome, America.

Anti-Muslim activist Pamela Geller, who was banned from Facebook (and then reinstated, following *Breitbart* coverage⁴⁰) following the Muslim terrorist attack in Orlando, Florida, is also not letting the matter of Facebook's bias stand. Geller is currently suing the company⁴¹, and in an article for *Breitbart*, she explained why.

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

³⁷ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/07/14/facebook-trending-editor-ben-wagner/>

³⁸ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/07/15/facebook-trending-editor-jennifer-jenkins-race-isnt-real/>

³⁹ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/08/27/entire-facebook-trending-news-team-fired-following-breitbart-coverage/>

⁴⁰ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/06/14/pamela-geller-stop-islamization-america-reinstated-facebook-following-breitbart-story/>

⁴¹ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/07/13/pamela-geller-suing-facebook/>

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

Geller isn't alone. Gun shop owners⁴², immigration hawks⁴³ and admins of right-wing meme pages⁴⁴ have also faced censorship from Facebook.

Yet, amazingly, out of the leading web companies, Facebook is perhaps the best of the bunch. The impression I get from speaking to Facebook's management behind closed doors is of a company trying desperately to rein in its own hyper-progressive employees. A report from *The Wall Street Journal* revealed that in the middle of the campaign, Mark Zuckerberg faced pressure from his community standards team to censor content from Donald Trump, whom they argued was engaging in "hate speech." The team even threatened to quit if Trump wasn't censored, but Zuckerberg reportedly held his ground.⁴⁵

Zuckerberg also stood fast when faced with pressure to remove Trump supporter Peter Thiel from Facebook's board, releasing a statement in support of political diversity.⁴⁶

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

⁴² <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/06/17/gun-trainers-store-owners-banned-quickly-reinstated-facebook-orlando/>

⁴³ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/05/18/facebook-censoring-content-critical-immigration/>

⁴⁴ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/05/21/facebook-bans-canadian-commentator-for-saying-it-targets-conservatives/>

⁴⁵ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/10/21/report-facebook-employees-wanted-to-censor-hate-speech-from-trump-threatened-to-quit/>

⁴⁶ <http://www.breitbart.com/california/2016/10/20/facebook-zuckerberg-defends-trump-supporter-peter-thiel/>

This doesn't make Zuckerberg special, I should add. Assuming this isn't a deception (remember, he once called his own users "dumb fucks" for trusting him with their personal data), he's doing the bare minimum of what we expect from our social media companies -- providing people with a platform to air their opinions, without letting his personal politics get in the way.

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

Back to Twitter

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

My love of Shakespeare has provided me with no end of colorful ways to describe Twitter and its sandal-wearing, hobo-chic CEO Jack Dorsey.

Not for Twitter, where its stock has declined some 80 per cent since 2014, and where user growth has stalled since 2013, but for the rest of us, who receive the news of the company's

misfortunes with the grim satisfaction that karma, cosmic justice and divine retribution are alive and well.

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

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

But, because Twitter was about freedom, fun, and the humbling of authority, it was only a matter of time before the progressive left decided to crash the party.

They became particularly motivated after they figured out how much its users loved me (really, it shouldn't have taken them as long as it did to figure that out). In October 2015, Fusion was already referring to me as "the internet's biggest troll" with "terrifying allure" (both true) and when, a few months later, Twitter removed my "verified" badge, the Huffington Post congratulated the platform for "standing up for women online."⁴⁷ Ugh, please.

It started with my blue verified check mark. Verified checks, for those of you who don't know, are given out to prominent figures who are likely to be impersonated. I'm probably the

⁴⁷ http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/jessie-thompson/milo-yiannopoulos-unverified-twitter-blue-tick_b_8944126.html

most impersonated individual who isn't Beyoncé, yet Twitter still took away my check mark, and for ideological reasons -- a move that was then without precedent. Groucho Marx once said he'd never be part of a club that wanted him as a member. I take the opposite view -- after I was unverified, it's pretty clear that the club's become a lot less exclusive, and a lot less cool.

I knew from that moment that Twitter was looking for an excuse to ban me, and that they would eventually find one. I also knew that when they succeeded, all hell would break loose. I wasn't disappointed, although Twitter's shareholders probably are now.

The pretext they needed turned out to be the all-female reboot of *Ghostbusters*, a remarkably bad film that flopped at the box office and contributed to Sony's decision to take a near-\$1 billion write-down on its movie business.⁴⁸ I covered the film in more detail in a previous chapter. All you really need to know is that it was a vindictive and boring feminist reboot and that before it had even been released, director Paul Feig was denouncing its critics as “misogynist” and “right-wing.”⁴⁹

As always, the smell of butthurt attracts trolls, who prey on the easily-offended like frogs on grasshoppers. As my Breitbart colleague Ezra Dulis eloquently put it, “To a Twitter troll, there is no greater rush than a response from an angry celebrity – the knowledge that you, in the middle of Podunkville, USA, have the power to get under the skin of someone rich, famous, and surrounded by ass kissers.”⁵⁰

So, when Leslie Jones, one of the four leading actresses in that cinematic trainwreck, began angrily responding to her detractors on Twitter, the result was inevitable. She was feeding the trolls, so they started to swarm.

48 <http://uk.businessinsider.com/sonys-movie-division-1-billion-loss-2017-1?r=US&IR=T>

49 <http://deadline.com/2016/06/yara-shahidi-paul-feig-ghostbusters-pga-produced-by-conference-diversity-panel-1201767470/>

50 <http://www.breitbart.com/big-hollywood/2016/07/20/leslie-jones-twitter-trolls-milo-yiannopoulos/>

Media reports say I was the one who led these swarms. This couldn't be further from the truth. She was engaging in running battles with her detractors on Twitter for hours before I got involved, actively trading insults with them and provoking them.

(I suspect part of the reason why lefties in the media saw me as the ringleader of the trolls is that it's hard for them to imagine the idea that people can move collectively without a leader. It's their authoritarianism showing: for them, a herd *must* have a shepherd. It cannot move on its own. The idea of people thinking independently and acting independently frightens them.)

My main offense was writing a review of her movie she didn't like – if you don't count my real crime, which was daring to get into a feud with a black woman, itself seemingly proof of racism in progressive America today.

I criticized Leslie Jones, tossing a few jabs her way. I can't stand celebrities with thin skins. Getting hate mail is part and parcel of being famous no matter what you look like. I don't just get hate mail – I get dead animals and syringes full of mystery liquid through my letterbox. But rather than bleat about homophobic stalkers, I resolve to get even by writing something that will annoy the left-wing haters even more.

I tweeted that she was playing the victim,⁵¹ that her character in *Ghostbusters* was an unfunny racial stereotype, and that her tweets were barely literate⁵². All are true. (Despite calling people “bitches” all evening, she had the audacity to report me for that last one.)

Jones accused me of supporting the racists tweeting her gorilla pictures (wrong), and retweeting sycophants accusing me of being a “Gay Uncle Tom.” (Later, she would laughably claim that the retweet was a result of her “being hacked”⁵³). Finally, she blocked me. I sent out a

51 <http://media.breitbart.com/media/2016/07/CntB-7vUEAA-Nn1.jpg>

52 <http://media.breitbart.com/media/2016/07/CntCAM3VIAAR7T-.jpg>

53 <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/07/20/ghostbusters-leslie-jones-blames-hack-for-uncle-tom-retweet/>

final tweet (“Rejected by yet another black dude!”) and left it at that. Another easy victory over a hypocritical, thin-skinned Hollywood celebrity.

The next day, a day that will live in social media infamy, Twitter took my account away forever. A few minutes before I was scheduled to take the stage at a “Gays for Trump” party I was headlining at the Republican National Convention, I was banned from the network forever. I suspect – but of course can't prove – that they waited until just before my event deliberately, to cause maximum damage. Remember, this is a company whose employees wrote “#SCREWNERO” on a whiteboard in its San Francisco headquarters.

They didn't plan on my preternatural skill for turning every minor setback into a gigantic, glittering triumph.

The immediate result of my ban was the greatest barrage of press attention I'd ever received. (I've since surpassed it, naturally.) CNN, CNBC, and ABC all wanted me on to talk about it. Like all progressive imbeciles, Twitter HQ willfully ignored the Streisand Effect – whenever censorship is attempted, it simply draws ever more attention to its target. Sometimes I wonder if my biggest enemies are in fact my biggest friends, and are all secretly helping me out while pretending to be leftists in public.

I was the number-one trending topic for a full day, with tens of thousands of users tweeting the “#FreeMilo” hashtag in solidarity. It wasn't long before my fans started scrawling the slogan in chalk outside Twitter's international network of offices. I'm now seen as Patient Zero in Twitter's crusade against conservatives, particularly the Trump-supporting kind.

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

Do I feel bad about being a catalyst for Twitter's censorship? No more than Jean-Luc Picard should feel bad about being a catalyst for the Borg's invasion of Federation space.

By the way, one thing you won't read in the media is that Leslie Jones directly incited harassment against her critics, the very rule violation I was falsely accused of when Twitter suspended my account. When one user suggested to Jones that some introspection might be in order if she wanted to stop the wave of trolling, Jones responded with an unequivocal call to dog-pile the user: "Bitch I want to tell everyone about you but I'm going to let everybody else do it I'm gonna retweet your hate!! Get her!!"⁵⁴ In another tweet, she also urged her followers to "go after them like they going after me."⁵⁵ Twitter of course did nothing in the face of these flagrant rule-violations; she didn't even have to delete her tweets to unlock her account, which is the site's mildest form of punishment for a terms-of-service breach.

The left first proceeded in its crusade to censor Twitter with methods much the same as their later campaign against "fake news" on Facebook: with a barrage of pressure from their allies in politics and the media. A host of feminist whingebags, including ghoulish Democratic congresswoman Katherine Clark and hand-wringing British Labour MP Stella Creasy, ginned up a panic about "death threats" and "trolls" who were supposedly striking fear into innocent, powerless women on Twitter. (Coincidentally, these women almost always turned out to be professional feminist activists and left-wing politicians.) The narrative was repeated breathlessly across the national media in both Britain and America -- and slowly, the platform that once proudly proclaimed its status as "the free speech wing of the free speech party," began to contort into a feminist-friendly safe space in which you could tweet "#KillAllWhiteMen," "#MasculinitySoFragile" or "I BATHE IN MALE TEARS" without a care in the world, but if

54 <https://archive.is/hHzf6>

55 <https://archive.is/9Qsz8>

you made a joke about a feminist, you risked losing your account forever. The double standards quickly became obvious to everyone.

The censors received a boost in late 2015 when co-founder Jack Dorsey replaced relatively pro-free speech Dick Costolo as permanent CEO. Dorsey, a close friend of DeRay Mckesson who had marched with Black Lives Matter in Ferguson, Missouri,⁵⁶ had a reputation for wacky progressive values. He quickly set about turning Twitter into a sharia-compliant conservative-free zone.

A crackdown began almost immediately. Just two months after Dorsey became CEO, conservative actor Adam Baldwin received a temporary suspension for a tweet implying that conservatives and libertarians were more sexually attractive than left-wingers. (An observation that has been repeatedly confirmed by surveys and studies.⁵⁷) The tweet broke none of Twitter's rules, yet Baldwin was forced to delete it before his account was restored. This was at the same time angry death threats to Donald Trump, then a contender for the Republican nomination, were a daily occurrence.

I knew it was only a matter of time before Dorsey came for me too, because I am so effective and popular, so I was determined to cause him as much trouble as possible before it happened. And after it happened. And after Twitter is bankrupt. And after Jack Dorsey is disgraced and handing out GoFundMe donation links on the streets of San Francisco. Really, the man just sucks at picking enemies.

Like any CEO, Dorsey can't admit his political bias openly. On the rare occasions when he does address the issue, he insists that the platform is politically neutral. In an interview with the *Today* show's Matt Lauer shortly after my deverification, Dorsey flatly denied that the

⁵⁶ <http://www.usatoday.com/story/tech/news/2016/06/01/twitters-dorsey-describes-time-ferguson-mo-wake-up-call/85270192/>

⁵⁷ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UTBafIj-ay0>

platform censors anything other than threats of violence, insisting that Twitter merely existed to “empower conversation.”⁵⁸

This is the same platform that banned me for being unkind about a celebrity, put a “safety” filter on all outgoing links to the blog of Vox Day, sci-fi’s leading libertarian right-winger, and has kicked countless right-wingers off its platform, sometimes temporarily, sometimes permanently. These included conservative journalist Chuck C. Johnson, his platform WeSearchr, actor Adam Baldwin, the cultural libertarian YouTuber Sargon of Akkad, and the Canadian writer and anti-feminist Janet Bloomfield.

It also included a conscious crackdown on the alt-right, directly after the election. Dozens of the movement’s prominent voices got the boot. At the same time, when Jerome Hudson, an African-American writer for Breitbart was bombarded with racial slurs including “coon” and “uncle Tom,” Twitter took no action.⁵⁹ In the two months following the election, social media analytics also discovered more than 12,000 tweets calling for the death of Donald Trump – tweets that were allowed to remain on the platform.⁶⁰ Yet Twitter continues to profess its political neutrality. In my time as technology editor for Breitbart News, I have never seen an example of an account suspended for sending death or rape threats to Donald Trump or any other prominent conservative.

Twitter was also secretly discriminating against conservative news sources well before the words “Facebook” and “fake news” emerged from a progressive news outlet. In February 2016, a source who worked closely with Twitter revealed to Breitbart that the company had been

⁵⁸ <http://www.newsbusters.org/blogs/nb/tom-blumer/2016/03/20/twitter-ceo-dorsey-denies-censorship-today-show-interview-lauer-fails>

⁵⁹ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-hollywood/2016/07/20/rapper-talib-kweli-attacks-breitbart-jerome-hudson-calls-coon-twitter-not-banned-platform/>

⁶⁰ <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4189124/More-12-000-tweets-call-Trump-s-assassination.html>

“shadowbanning” inconvenient Twitter users and maintained a “whitelist” of trusted news sources.⁶¹

(“Shadowbanning” is the sneaky practice of removing or minimizing a user’s posts from public view without alerting the user, who often continues posting, believing nothing has changed.)

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

Earnest made it clear that even Obama believed that the success of social media platforms is “predicated on the important protection of First Amendment rights to self-expression.” He also recommended that Twitter users who feel aggrieved by the platform’s policies should turn to lawsuits as a response. Several such lawsuits are already in the works.

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

The death of Twitter is inevitable at this point, but Dorsey certainly isn’t doing anything to slow down the process. Doesn’t he understand that if you suspend your platform’s funniest, smartest, and most attractive people (hello!), you’ll bore other users to death as well? Not only that, but the censorship also creates a chilling effect, frightening other users from speaking their minds. On Twitter, a site designed for rapid-fire streams of consciousness, that means nothing less than the death of the platform.

⁶¹ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/02/16/exclusive-twitter-shadowbanning-is-real-say-inside-sources/>

There's an impression, put about by the media, abetted by Twitter itself and now, stupidly, accepted by just about everyone, that Twitter's problems and the reason the company hasn't been acquired boil down to "abuse" and "harassment."

Actually, the opposite is true. The history of social networks knows no exception to this simple rule: when you start clamping down on free expression, you die. Twitter is no different. Twitter can't maintain user growth because it's boring (all the cool people left, or have been banned) and because the product is terrible, not because of "trolls." If trolls were the problem, newspaper comment sections, reddit, 4chan and YouTube would have closed down years ago.

People *love* getting into spats on the internet. Some people spend their whole lives doing it! The only people who object to ridicule and criticism are touchy, fragile celebrities and journalists with brittle egos who can't cope with readers pointing out how biased and stupid they are. Twitter's problem is that there's too little edgy speech, not too much, and the fact that people who don't want to hear from each other too often do, because the product is so badly engineered.

I can't believe I'm the only person who understands this.

The media's "war on trolls" is actually just another kind of class warfare: politically-correct university-educated elites don't like how the working classes speak. They're horrified by the ribald humor, sharp language and raucous tone of working-class interactions. So they brand it all as "abuse" and "harassment" and close their comment sections because they are too delicate to engage with how ordinary people actually talk. And then they wonder why people think they are snobbish and distant.

(The same thing is happening with the media's failure to report accurately on the flyover states, and its palpable contempt for working-class Trump voters.)

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

And as for suspending me because of a spat with Leslie Jones... come off it. I mean, if you're going to sell out your core values to a celebrity, at least pick someone funny or talented.

Google

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

The occasion that led him to address it was the release of an explosive video showing bias in Google's search results. In the video, tech channel SourceFed demonstrated that searches for Hillary Clinton did not autocomplete to words that were popular searches if they reflected negatively on the Democratic candidate (for example "Hillary Clinton cri" did not autocomplete to the popular search term "Hillary Clinton criminal"). This contrasted with the competing, though far less influential Bing and Yahoo search engines, where all search terms autocompleted correctly.

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

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

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

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

WikiLeaks confirmed the Schmidt's involvement with the Clinton campaign in an email leak, which included a Democratic staffer acknowledging that Schmidt's group was working "directly and indirectly" with the Clinton team⁶². Chillingly, a leaked email sent from Schmidt himself suggested the creation of a voter database that regularly aggregates "all that is known"

⁶² <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/10/19/wikileaks-googles-eric-schmidt-working-with-clinton-campaign/>

about individual voters. Creating such a database is Orwellian in the extreme and sounds daunting, but Google, with its vast quantities of user data, could pull it off with frightening efficiency⁶³.

It's not just Schmidt, either. A report from *The Intercept* in April 2016 revealed just how close Google's relationship with the Obama administration was.⁶⁴ The report showed that Google representatives attended meetings at the White House "more than once a week, on average, from the beginning of Obama's presidency through October 2015."

The Intercept's report also showed how Google operated a "revolving door" with the White House, with employees frequently moving between both.

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

The data includes individuals from Google appointed to government boards while maintaining their positions at the tech firm. Google board member John Doerr was appointed to the President's Council on Jobs and Competitiveness in February 2011. Eric Schmidt has been part of the President's Council of Advisers on Science and Technology

⁶³ <http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2016-11-01/wikileaks-reveals-googles-strategic-plan-help-democrats-win-election>

⁶⁴ <https://theintercept.com/2016/04/22/googles-remarkably-close-relationship-with-the-obama-white-house-in-two-charts/>

since 2009. He was also more recently appointed to lead the Defense Innovation Advisory Board at the Pentagon, which occurred outside the time frame of the data.

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

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

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

The numbers should horrify anyone who holds out hope that future elections might be fair ones. One of Robert Epstein's earlier experiments found that manipulation of search results can convince undecided voters to back a candidate with frightening efficiency⁶⁵. In some demographics, Epstein found that the conversion rate was up to 80 per cent.

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

Why Conservatives Must Take on Silicon Valley

⁶⁵ <http://www.pnas.org/content/112/33/E4512.full.pdf?with-ds=yes>

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

They need to be aware that, aside from rare exceptions like Peter Thiel, almost everyone in the world of tech *absolutely hates them*. Jack Dorsey is an ardent Black Lives Matter supporter who has joined the group on marches in Ferguson, Missouri. He has appeared on stage with the group's leading member, DeRay Mckesson and has brought censorious feminists into Twitter to advise the company on who it should ban from the platform.

Mark Zuckerberg, meanwhile, is an ardent globalist who believes that the United States should "follow Germany's lead on immigration.". Despite his flowery words in favor of political diversity, he also banned employees from writing "All Lives Matter" on company whiteboards.

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

Soon, the only advantage conservatives have on the web will be the Drudge Report, an incredibly well-trafficked news aggregator run by conservative media pioneer Matt Drudge. The site can still instantly make a story go viral, and has been a constant thorn in the side of progressives seeking dominance of the web. But it's not good enough. Social media continues to advance, and we cannot allow progressives to monopolize it without a fightback.

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

Social media bias is far more dangerous to conservatives than mainstream media bias. Users believe they're choosing information sources themselves, and are more trusting as a result. If conservatives -- and that includes President Trump -- want to avoid disaster, they need to get serious about pressuring Silicon Valley to stay honest. They should raise the specter of antitrust, media regulation, and all the other regulatory demons feared by America's social media companies -- who have many legal and financial reasons for wanting to remain classified by the courts as politically neutral platforms, even though everyone knows they're not.

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

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

As for ordinary users, we should arm themselves with all the tools they need to fight back against the companies that now oversee so much of our day-to-day communications. Learn the data laws of your home country -- what information social media companies are allowed to keep on your activities, and what they're required to hand over if asked. Find other people who have been treated injudiciously by social media companies, and form pressure groups. Organize letter-writing campaigns to your congressmen. Tell conservative and libertarian journalists about what's going on.

Fighting back against politically-biased social media companies is the most important battle for conservatives and libertarians in the coming decade. Leftists at a college campus might influence a few hundred other students if they're lucky. A social media company can influence tens of millions. There is no greater danger to free expression and free speech today than the far-

left biases of Silicon Valley. These are the arbiters of our conversations. They are looking over your shoulder as you type. They are tracking what you share, and deciding who sees it. They are dreaming up new rules to control what you say, and new algorithms to control what you see. Do not let them get away with it.

WHY FEMINISTS HATE ME

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

-- Marilyn Monroe

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

-- Lana Del Rey

"Math is hard; let's lie about rape."

-- Feminist Barbie

Feminism is dying. Although it has never had more influence on politically-correct elites in the media and Hollywood, support for it is collapsing utterly among ordinary people of all political persuasions, thanks at least in part to hysterical, free speech-hating feminist activists who pedal lies and conspiracy theories on a daily basis.

To understand what's going on, all you have to do is look at what western feminists spend their time on.

Eggplant emojis. Spreading your legs apart on public transport. Explaining things. Creating lists of tweets. Air conditioning. What do these five things all have in common? They've all been denounced by spoilt brat feminist journalists as sexist.

“Manspreading” is the term used to describe the practice of spreading your legs apart on public transport. This alleged sexist outrage, which grew out of a feminist Tumblr blog⁶⁶ that attracted viral attention in 2014, was actually made illegal in the city of New York⁶⁷.

“Mansplaining,” we are told by feminists, is the grievous sin of explaining something to a woman whilst being male⁶⁸.

“Manthreading” is doing the same, to more people at once, on social media⁶⁹. I’m happy to report that neither are illegal ... yet.

Eggplant emojis? Yep, they’re sexist too. According to one feminist blogger, they’re the “next frontier in online harassment”⁷⁰. Because it looks like a penis, apparently. In a sign of just how eager mainstream society is to please feminists, one of the largest photo-sharing networks on the web, Instagram, promptly banned the eggplant emoji after concerns arose⁷¹. Reader, I hope the feminists never discover the Eiffel Tower.

⁶⁶ <https://www.buzzfeed.com/juliegerstein/this-tumblr-has-a-great-idea-for-men-who-take-up-t>

⁶⁷ <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/men/thinking-man/11643052/Manspreading-arrests-the-long-arm-of-the-law-just-invaded-our-personal-space.html>

⁶⁸ <http://time.com/3590980/clickbait-normcore-mansplain-oxford-word-runners-up/>

<https://newrepublic.com/article/114234/lawrence-odonnell-yells-julia-ioffe-about-putin-and-snowden>

<http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2015/11/nader-mansplains-monetary-policy-to-yellen.html>

http://inthesetimes.com/article/16552/rebecca_solnit_explains_mansplaining

⁶⁹ <http://gizmodo.com/men-please-stop-manthreading-1790036387>

⁷⁰ <http://www.vocativ.com/culture/society/the-eggplant-emoji-is-the-next-frontline-of-online-harassment/>

⁷¹ <http://www.cbc.ca/news/trending/instagram-bans-the-eggplant-emoji-from-new-search-function-1.3052329>

Air conditioning is also sexist, according to mainstream feminist columnists. Men can deal with the cold better, they say, and obstinately keep it cranked up⁷². You know, I also get cold quite easily, but I've never considered turning it into a sociopolitical issue.

How did everything from your sitting posture to your emojis come to be politicized by a generation of wacky purple-haired gender studies alumni, at a time when fewer than one in five American women describes herself as a feminist? How and why did corporations start taking mad complaints from the overactive imaginations of New York bloggers seriously when their actual customers so clearly don't give a shit and run screaming in terror from grotesque spectacles like Lena Dunham?

It wasn't always like this. As recently as the middle of the twentieth century, feminists had their sights set on laudable goals -- ending sexual harassment in the workplace, ending discrimination, repealing archaic laws enabling marital rape, and -- above all -- establishing full equality of opportunity for women. This movement, broadly defined as "second-wave feminism," had goals that few reasonable people could disagree with. And still today, fair-minded women like Christina Hoff Sommers continue to beat the drum for what she calls "freedom feminism" -- a feminism that promises equal legal rights and equality of opportunity.

Despite valiant efforts, the feminism of Sommers and her allies is not the one that men or women recognize today. They see the petty feminism of Tumblr and BuzzFeed, the feminism that belittles and demonizes men (*manspreading*, *mansplaining*, *manthreading*), the feminism that obsesses over emojis and air conditioners. And they're quickly being turned off the concept

⁷² <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/womens-life/11760417/Air-conditioning-in-your-office-is-sexist.-True-story.html>

altogether. As the politically moderate columnist Heather Wilhelm puts it, “I didn’t leave feminism, it left me.”⁷³

Honestly, don’t get me started on how they treat women who decline to describe themselves as feminist.

Feminism describes itself merely as a movement for female equality. But it behaves like something quite different: a vindictive, spiteful, mean-spirited festival of man-hating. And women agree with me.

Heather Wilhelm’s sentiment is shared by increasing swathes of the western public, both male and female, liberal and conservative. In Britain, only 7 percent of people choose to label themselves as feminist⁷⁴. In America, the number is higher, but still dire -- only 18 percent of Americans consider themselves feminist, according to a Vox poll⁷⁵.

Broken down by gender, the numbers are still dire for feminism. In the British poll, just nine percent of women identified with the label compared to four percent of men. The Vox poll did not release its gender split, but another poll from YouGov and the Huffington Post found that just 23 percent of women and 16 percent of men identified with the term⁷⁶.

Part of this unpopularity is without a doubt driven by the activists themselves. Researchers at the University of Toronto discovered that people who were already inclined to favor feminist causes were less likely to do so if they came into contact with a “stereotypical”

⁷³
http://www.realclearpolitics.com/2014/12/10/i_didn039t_leave_feminism_it_left_me_347327.html

⁷⁴
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/life/only-7-per-cent-of-britons-consider-themselves-feminists/>

⁷⁵
<http://www.vox.com/2015/4/8/8372417/feminist-gender-equality-poll>

⁷⁶
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/04/16/feminism-poll_n_3094917.html

feminist activist⁷⁷. The more people see feminists, the less likely they are to identify with feminism ... Even if they're already feminists! The researchers concluded that feminists and other activists ought to behave in a less abrasive manner if they wanted to win support for their causes.

Unfortunately for them (and fortunately for the rest of us), feminists continue to do the exact opposite.

Lurking beneath the surface for the last decade has been a repellant brand of misandrist bigotry, designed to justify the hatred of men.

Feminism as practiced by celebrities in the 2000s was just *Mean Girls* writ large: women competing to be the hottest. Madonna used to say that women hate each other – if she read books she'd know it's called intrasexual competition – while men protect each other.

But in the 2010s, things got ugly. Feminists started to police the slightest perceived infraction from men and call it “manspreading” or “mansplaining” while treating women who dared to go off the reservation ideologically as subhuman. Witness the Rob Lowe roast with Ann Coulter. If anyone dared call Lena Dunham a cunt as many times as they said it to Ann on that show -- and believe me, I've been trying -- there would be uproar.

Because I'm a compassionate soul, I'm going to explain in this chapter why feminists hate me, but I'm first going to explain how feminists can turn things around for themselves. I'm not just doing this because I'm kind and gracious and generous, of course. I'm actually fond of giving my enemies a guide to beat me. I do it all the time.⁷⁸

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

⁷⁷

<http://bps-research-digest.blogspot.co.uk/2014/01/activists-have-image-problem-say-social.html>

⁷⁸ <http://www.breitbart.com/social-justice/2016/03/21/how-to-beat-me-spoiler-you-wont/>

They call it Milosplaining.

MANHATERS

When you tell a feminist you don't believe in feminism, they'll often respond with the inane line: "So you don't believe in equality for women!" Yet in both the American and British polls referenced earlier in the chapter, overwhelming majorities supported equality of the sexes -- 86 percent of men and 74 percent of women in the U.K, and 85 percent overall in the U.S.

Clearly, both genders overwhelmingly believe that feminism and equality no longer mean the same thing. Why could that be?

Can you think of any other topic that you can get 85 percent of Americans to agree on? This is a country where 5 percent of the people believe Paul McCartney died in 1966 and was replaced by a double, and 14 percent are unsure⁷⁹.

Maybe it's down to the way feminists behave towards advocates of men's issues -- even when those advocates are feminists themselves.

In 2013, feminist filmmaker Cassie Jaye began making a documentary about the Men's Rights Movement (MRM), a movement that was fast become feminism's favorite boogeyman, mostly because it was right about just about everything and because its adherents ruthlessly exposed the conspiracy theories and lies of third-wave feminism. Jaye went into the project on the assumption that she was going to be examining a hate group -- that's what feminist bloggers and activists were then branding the MRM. As always, the facts didn't match the narrative.

Jaye quickly discovered that the MRM was full of people with legitimate concerns that long gone unaddressed by the mainstream. One of the clearest examples is men's health. A Breitbart analysis of stories on NPR's website showed there are 2.8 times as many stories on

⁷⁹ http://www.publicpolicypolling.com/pdf/2011/PPP_Release_National_ConspiracyTheories_040213.pdf

women's cancers as men's, but bringing that up in public is still a guaranteed route to sneers and ridicule from journalists, regardless of mortality rates.

On top of the lack of publicity, there is a huge gap in research funding. There's a ten percent gap in the survival rates for sufferers of breast cancer and prostate cancer, with prostate cancer sufferers being approximately 10 percent more likely to survive the disease⁸⁰. But the funding gap is much higher than 10 percent. Figures from the National Cancer Institute show annual funding for breast cancer outstripping that of Prostate Cancer by sometimes double or more⁸¹.

It's not just cancer, either. In all of the top ten causes of death -- heart disease, cancer, stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, accidents, pneumonia and influenza, diabetes, suicide, kidney disease, and chronic liver disease and cirrhosis -- men are more likely to die than women. According to 2014 figures, American women have an average life expectancy of 81.2 years. For men, it's 76.42⁸².

Another leading killer of men is suicide, frequently described as a "silent epidemic" thanks to the rapid increase in the number of male victims over the past decade. CDC research tracking suicides from 1999 to 2014 found that the rate of male suicide increased 62 percent faster than the rate of female suicide⁸³. Men are now more than four times as likely as women to die by their own hand.

80

<http://www.cancer.net/cancer-types/breast-cancer/statistics>
<http://www.cancer.net/cancer-types/prostate-cancer/statistics>

81

<https://www.cancer.gov/about-nci/budget/fact-book/data/research-funding>

82

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

83

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

These are all very real and measurable gender gaps, unlike the gender wage gap which is completely explained by life choices. The other difference is that the gender wage gap gives feminists something to complain about and pick up cushy diversity consulting gigs to “fix”, while the gender health gap leaves men in coffins.

The health issues alone are enough to justify a men’s movement. But even the phrase “men’s rights” provokes allegations of “misogyny” from the mainstream press.

The MRM has other complaints. There’s a lack of resources for male victims of domestic violence. In Britain, for example, there are just 78 spaces in the *entire country* that can be used as shelters for male victims of domestic violence, compared to approximately 4,000 for women, despite the fact that women and men suffer domestic violence at roughly similar rates. Even left-wing sources acknowledge this⁸⁴.

There’s disparity in prison sentencing. A study from the University of Michigan found that men, on average, receive sentences that are 63 percent higher than women, for the same crimes committed in the United States⁸⁵. One case in Britain neatly summed up the problem: a woman was spared jail despite stealing £38,000 from her company’s debit card, because the judge, in his own words, “hates sending women to prison.”⁸⁶

These issues alone -- putting aside all the other complaints of the MRM, from military conscription to workplace fatalities to false rape accusations -- are more than enough to justify

84 <http://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/health-and-families/health-news/domestic-violence-as-a-man-its-very-difficult-to-say-ive-been-beaten-up-8572143.html>
<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2010/sep/05/men-victims-domestic-violence>

85 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/09/11/men-women-prison-sentence-length-gender-gap_n_1874742.html

86 <https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/2579876/female-office-manager-who-went-on-38k-luxury-shopping-spree-with-company-card-is-spared-jail-by-judge-because-he-hates-sending-women-to-prison/>

male advocacy. And even if feminists were concerned by the rhetoric of the Men's Rights Movement, they would have to be monstrously sociopathic to try to stop a respectable, feminist filmmaker like Cassie Jaye from carrying out an impartial investigation of these issues. Wouldn't they?

Of course, that's exactly what they did.

Earlier in this book I mentioned how mercilessly the left treats perceive "traitors" to its identity-driven crusades. Jaye was no exception. Despite having a track record of acclaimed work, with two award-winning documentaries under her belt, Jaye found herself cut off from traditional routes of support. When I interviewed her for Breitbart, she told me that initial grants were withdrawn once it became apparent that she wanted to take a balanced look at the movement. "We weren't finding executive producers who wanted to take a balanced approach, we found people who wanted to make a feminist film," Jaye told me⁸⁷.

In her search for funding, Jaye learned more about the institutional bias against men's issues. "There are no categories for men's films though there are several for women and minorities. I submitted the film to human rights categories, and was rejected by all of them." Jaye eventually had no choice but to turn to an internet crowdfunding campaign, which Breitbart and a gang of other deplorables lent our support to. After I wrote a story about Jaye's movie, it was funded in a day⁸⁸.

But what does it say about society's hostility to men's issues that it took a right-wing provocateur like me to get the documentary off the ground? Where was the establishment, with

87 <http://www.breitbart.com/big-hollywood/2015/10/26/the-red-pill-filmmaker-started-to-doubt-her-feminist-beliefs-now-her-movie-is-at-risk/>

88 <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2015/10/29/dear-cassie-jaye-sorry-for-manspreading-your-red-pill-kickstarter/>

its supposed commitment to equality and fairness and human rights? And why can't people talk about this stuff without getting shouted down or ejected from polite society?

"Hostility" is the right word. Feminists and the establishment weren't content to simply not fund Jaye's documentary -- they accused Jaye of having a "weird affinity for bigots"⁸⁹ and actively encouraged boycotts of the film. In Australia, the cinema slated to host the premiere of the movie pulled out following a feminist pressure campaign⁹⁰.

Jaye had betrayed the sisterhood, and the knives were out. And all it took was the mere hint of an honest, impartial look at men's issues. Is it any wonder that people no longer associate feminism with equality of the sexes?

On the rare occasions society does take notice of men's issues, feminists are usually there to spoil the party. When men try to talk about their problems -- not something many men are comfortable doing in the first place -- they are usually treated with indifference, anger, or scorn by feminists. When the University of York's equality and diversity committee announced they would mark International Men's Day with an event addressing men's issues, particularly suicide, they faced a campaign from more than 200 activist students and professors demanding the event be cancelled. "We believe that men's issues cannot be approached in the same way as unfairness and discrimination towards women, because women are structurally unequal to men," said an open letter. The University of York quickly complied and cancelled the celebration.

This happened less than 24 hours after a male student at York had killed himself.⁹¹

⁸⁹ <http://www.wehuntedthemammoth.com/2016/10/24/red-pill-director-cassie-jaye-hits-a-new-low-with-her-appearance-on-a-white-supremacist-podcast/>

⁹⁰ <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2016/oct/26/the-red-pill-melbourne-cinema-drops-mens-rights-film-after-feminist-backlash>

⁹¹ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2015/11/18/male-university-of-york-student-commits-suicide-on-day-his-university-ditches-international-mens-day-after-pressure-from-feminists/>

Examples of this sort of thing aren't hard to come by. "Movember" is an annual event in which men grow their mustaches to raise awareness for prostate cancer -- a whimsical grassroots effort, it is one of the few instances in which awareness of a male cancer briefly rises to the fore.

Feminists, instead of helping, regularly complain about it getting attention in the press. The left-wing *New Statesman* went further, complaining that Movember is "divisive, gender normative, racist and ineffective." (Why racist? Because "large numbers of minority ethnic men" use mustaches as a "cultural or religious signifier."). Or maybe because some races can't grow facial hair to save their life. An article in Rabble, a Canadian news site, complained about sexist "Mo Bros" and their "exclusionary" behaviour⁹², despite the fact that the vast majority of Movember participants are hipsters in metropolitan areas. *Slate* published an article from two feminists whining that Movember "celebrated masculinity" in order to fight cancer. (They meant it as a criticism.)

They wrote: "Are we grumpy contrarians and feminist killjoys who hate things precisely because other people love them? Probably, but..."

Well, at least they have some self-awareness. But self-awareness alone won't change the fact that the number of people who identify as feminists in the west is approaching the number of people who believe that blacks are innately inferior to whites.⁹³ (That's fewer than 10 percent, for any progressives who think the number is high.)

Testicular cancer is also one of the few men's diseases that has a grassroots awareness campaign, called #CockInASock. It's fairly self-explanatory and receives wide praise in Huffington Post and BuzzFeed. Articles show chiseled men exposing most of their body to raise awareness. *Vice* published an article condemning #CockInASock as an "inane counterpart" to the

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

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

breast cancer awareness hashtag #nomakeupselfie, and claimed that “without exception, everyone who’s doing it is a douchebag.”⁹⁴ Fashionista celebrated the “objectification of the male form” but complained that the common sight of pubic hair exposed a sexist double standard (men have to shave and women don’t)⁹⁵. Once again, feminists were taking a male advocacy campaign and trying to make it all about them.

As the examples above demonstrate, we are living in an era when much of the feminism on display to the public is petty, mean-spirited, obsessed with trivialities, man-hating and implacably opposed to free expression.

A feminist makes a documentary about men’s issues and faces a boycott campaign. Innocent fundraisers wear mustaches to raise money to fight prostate cancer and get lambasted as sexist. Students try to raise awareness of men’s issues and get shut down by feminists working with a university administration.

Is it any wonder that feminism has acquired a reputation for gratuitous, self-serving hatred?

Ordinary people don’t like meanness – except when it’s done with a nod and a wink, in service of a greater good, say by a roguish and charming gay British columnist – and they don’t like sexism. I don’t mean “hatred” as the left frequently defines it, which is offensive jokes and challenges to left-wing taboos, but actual, tribal, loathing. And I don’t mean “sexism” as in “men disagreeing with me on Twitter” – I mean actual discrimination of the sort you find in child custody cases.

Hatred is a theme that runs through the politics of the left. Socialists hate the financially successful. LGBT activists hate fundamentalist Christians. Black Lives Matter hate police

94 https://www.vice.com/en_au/article/the-cockinasock-thing-cancer-charity-vanity

95 <http://fashionista.com/2014/03/cockinasock>

officers, especially white police officers. But none of these groups hate with the PMS-fueled, *Mean Girls* pettiness of feminism. Here are a few more examples.

In 2015, a British student activist Bahar Mustafa was pictured beneath a sign on a door reading “no white cis men please,” while she made a faux tearful gesture beneath it. She had already attracted controversy for banning “cis-gendered”⁹⁶ white males from the screening of a film at her university’s student union, of which she then was a representative.

The incident occurred just as the mainstream press were becoming aware of the return of segregation on campuses, under the guise of “safe spaces” for women and minorities. As the press dug through Mustafa’s history, they found tweets in which she used the hashtags “#KillAllWhiteMen” and #WhiteTrash. Moderate liberals and establishment conservatives alike huffed and puffed.

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

Valenti is a columnist at the *Guardian* and therefore considered a protected class by other journalists. No one should ever be investigated for hate speech, as Mustafa was, but it’s clear from the example of Valenti, who once wrote the headline “Feminists Don’t Hate Men, But It Woudn’t Matter If We Did” that discrimination against women has largely disappeared, feminists have had to invent new, fake problems to stay relevant and to have something to be angry about.

⁹⁶ “cisgendered” is left-speak for normal

Many will say that I've written far worse than Valenti. I have! But I'm not trying to lead a self-proclaimed equality movement. The only cause I can partially claim to represent is that of free speech, where I consider myself part of a long line of boundary-pushers who shocked the mainstream, from Andres Serrano of *Piss Christ* fame to Marilyn Manson. If I *were* the leader of an egalitarian movement it would deserve to be unpopular.

The problem with feminists isn't that they're hateful and outrageous -- it's that they're hateful and outrageous while claiming to be just, and moral, and caring, and egalitarian. And, of course, that almost everything that comes out of their mouths is a blatant lie, which will be covered up by more lies and screeching insults if you dare to call them out on it.

LIARS

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

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

Horrifying, isn't it? It almost sounds too gruesome and sadistic to be true.

Well, that's because it wasn't.

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

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

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

Rolling Stone's humiliation came at the height of the "rape culture" panic on college campuses, in which feminist activists convinced the media, as well as the White House, that college-aged women were being raped at levels comparable to war-torn, lawless countries like the Democratic Republic of Congo.

The statistic they endlessly trot out is that "1 in 4" women will be sexually assaulted during their time at college, a number they arrive at based on surveys where even the researchers who conduct them admit that their numbers are likely to be inflated by response bias⁹⁷. Actually

reliable statistics, from the Bureau of Justice, put the figure at 6.1 per 1,000 for students and 7.6 per 1,000 for non-students⁹⁸. Still too many, but not even close to the number President Obama has repeated.

(Despite suffering a lower rate of victimization, it's the privileged college students who get all the attention from politicians. Weird!)

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

But I still find it hard to understand how everyone allowed themselves to be hoodwinked for so long. Rape has existed since the first caveman saw a cavewoman with less facial hair than usual and picked up a bone club. How did we get the idea that it's a brand new crisis, worse than it's ever been? The crime statistics are inarguable: rape has declined nearly 75 percent since the early 1990s⁹⁹ and continues to plummet.

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

ANTI-SCIENCE

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/09/21/how-misleading-is-the-new-one-in-four-campus-rape-statistic.html>

98

<https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5176>

99

http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/foreigners/2014/12/the_world_is_not_falling_apart_the_trend_lines_reveal_an_increasingly_peaceful.html

Feminists' denial of facts isn't contained to recent panics like rape culture. Some feminist myths have been circulating for decades. The pay gap is perhaps the most well-known and widespread feminist myth. Taken as an article of faith by business leaders and politicians alike, this feminist lie claims that women (on average) are only paid \$0.79 for every dollar earned by a man.

Study after study¹⁰⁰¹⁰¹ has shown that the wage gap shrinks to nonexistence when relevant, non-sexist factors like chosen career paths, chosen work hours and chosen career discontinuity are taken into account.

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

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

In its economic illiteracy, the former argument betrays the Marxist pedigree of third-wave feminism.

100

http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/goldin/files/dynamics_of_the_gender_gap_for_young_professionals_in_the_financial_and_corporate_sectors.pdf

101

http://www.hawaii.edu/religion/courses/Gender_Wage_Gap_Report.pdf

The latter is one of the more interesting chicken-and-egg problems in feminism. They say they want more women in STEM, yet also encourage women to sign up for worthless gender-studies degrees. As Christina Hoff Sommers says: “Want to close the wage gap? Step one: Change your major from feminist dance therapy to electrical engineering.¹⁰²” No feminists ever do.

The feminist war on science doesn't end there. (Oh, you thought Republicans were the ones waging war on science? Think again.¹⁰³) Possibly a greater intellectual travesty is what feminists have done to the study of gender differences, which ought to be one of the most rapidly expanding frontiers in our understanding of ourselves, but, under the direction of feminists and left-wing universities, has withered into mindless repetition of 1960s social-science shibboleths.

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

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

The sum total of their research is overwhelming -- gender roles are largely governed by nature, not nurture as feminists would have you believe. The most compelling research comes

102

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

103

<http://www.city-journal.org/html/real-war-science-14782.html>

from Baron-Cohen, perhaps the world's leading autism researcher. Baron-Cohen grew interested in gender roles after he noticed that boys were approximately four times more likely to be diagnosed with autism¹⁰⁴ than girls. He knew that autism was correlated with over-systemizing, or an over-technical brain. So he decided to test if boys really were, as the old sexists believed, born with more technically-oriented brains than women.

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

Other studies also drive home the inescapable reality that men and women are simply wired differently. Surveys of women across countries have found that women in developing countries, where jobs and resources are scarce, are more likely to enter STEM fields¹⁰⁵. Yet in the vastly more feminist west, where women have greater financial security and career choices, women choose different professions. In other words, when women have a choice, they don't choose STEM.

That's not to say women don't find *any* scientific fields appealing. Psychology (people oriented) and biology (plants, animals, and again people) are both dominated by women, as is veterinary medicine. Whenever I meet a feminist who claims that the patriarchy prevents women from going into astrophysics and computer science, I always ask them why it hasn't also

104

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

105

http://psych.fullerton.edu/rlippa/abstracts_2009.htm

prevented them from going into biology, where 58 percent of bachelor's, master's degrees, and doctorates are given to women¹⁰⁶. I've yet to receive a persuasive answer.

There is more. Men and women respond differently to stress -- women prefer to be with people, while men prefer to be alone¹⁰⁷. Men and women also experience romantic jealousy differently -- men are more upset by sexual infidelity, while women are more upset by emotional infidelity (the thought that a man might be forming an emotional connection with another lover)¹⁰⁸. Gender differences can also be observed in entertainment -- men prefer realistic shooters and competitive video games, while women prefer social games like *The Sims*.

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

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

Yet say this on Twitter or in a national newspaper column and watch all hell break loose.

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

"I have no idea why because we've worked so hard to avoid that," wailed Proudfoot.

106

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

107

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

108

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

Joel Wood, an assistant professor at Thompson Rivers University quickly replied with some emotional support. “Pink and Disney princesses,” Woods complained. “We tried to discourage them, but our daughters gravitated towards both.”¹⁰⁹,”

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

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

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

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

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

Second, and most importantly, they will have to rediscover a commitment to free speech and start showing up to debates again, armed with facts instead of feelings.

109

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

MANIPULATORS

I often face accusations that I'm too harsh toward feminists, and I can see why people say so. After all, I don't just critique feminists' arguments, do I? I never miss a chance to draw attention to their appearance. And let's face facts: some of them look *frightful*. My old favorite Lena Dunham is a particular travesty, being both shockingly unattractive and determined to pose nude or semi-nude at every chance she gets. No-one wants to see obese hairy men with their tops off, so why does she assume people want to see her naked form on the front of their magazines? I just don't understand it.

I will readily admit that my fixation on appearance is part of my faggy obsession with aesthetics. Like a true gay stereotype, I used to do a lot of interior design. Bad aesthetics offends me on a visceral level, and I can't help but point it out, whether it's male or female. I often draw attention to the pallid complexions and thinning hairlines of my male opponents – but enough about Ben Shapiro!

But if there wasn't a point to my appearance-focused one-liners, if they served no greater purpose, and if all they accomplished was mere cruelty, I would happily contain my impulses. However, there is an important underlying point to this that most people overlook.

It's so much fun!

Okay, okay, I'm kidding. It's this.

Anyone who's paid close attention to the evolution of the left over the past few decades will have noticed that it's taken a decidedly *therapeutic* turn. This is the subject of books like *Therapy Culture* by Frank Furedi and *One Nation Under Therapy* by Christina Hoff Sommers, which charts the rising trend to treat feelings and emotions as things that ought to be protected rather than challenged. On campuses, this instinct finds its expression in "trigger warnings,"

demanded by social justice warriors to warn students in advance of content – be it lectures, books, films, or works of art – that might hurt (or “trigger”) students.

At the University of Oxford in the U.K, for example, law students demanded trigger warnings before lectures on sexual assault law, on the grounds that such subject matter is potentially distressing. The thought that students should seek to toughen up rather than wrap themselves in cotton wool never occurred to them.

This left’s embrace of therapy culture has led damaged people to gravitate to the movement. And why wouldn’t they? Instead of encouraging people to change themselves, the left tells vulnerable people that they should instead change the environment around them to protect themselves from having their feelings hurt. It’s not their problem, the left soothingly says, it’s society’s.

Obesity, another disorder that is as much mental as physical, gets the same treatment. More than a third of adults are obese in the United States alone, with nearly 70 per cent classified as overweight in some way¹¹⁰. Furthermore, health problems caused by obesity are also one of the biggest causes of healthcare expenditure, with estimates of the annual cost ranging from \$147 billion to \$210 billion per year. Obese employees are also estimated to cost employers an extra \$506 per obese worker per year¹¹¹. It is damaging to society as well as to the individual.

And what does the left do in the face of this crisis? Michelle Obama, at least, has campaigned for better diets and active lifestyles for children¹¹², even if the meals her campaign has produced are disgusting, and regularly thrown away by children.

¹¹⁰ <http://europe.newsweek.com/7-10-american-adults-are-overweight-or-obese-329130?rm=eu>

¹¹¹ <http://stateofobesity.org/healthcare-costs-obesity/>

¹¹² <https://letsmove.obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/>

But the radical left, the intersectional feminist left, the left that dreams up new categories of oppression and loves to wrap its subjects in cotton wool has responded by declaring that the *feelings* of fat people are more important than their health.

I encountered the result of this during my college tour, when I stopped off at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. There I was confronted with a morbidly obese girl who interrupted a joint event featuring myself, radio host Steven Crowder and Christina Hoff Sommers. Her interruption consisted of loudly screaming “KEEP YOUR HATE SPEECH OFF THIS CAMPUS!” while flailing her arms over her head. The video of her outburst instantly went viral online, and she became known as “Trigglypuff.”

Later, the internet would discover that she gave presentations on “fat acceptance” and “body positivity,” two new concepts dreamed up by the intersectional feminist left to argue that even the obese were healthily-sized and should not be shamed or called out or encouraged to fix their weight problems. Their attitude is summed up in one dreadful slogan: “Healthy At Every Size.”¹¹³

The internet was quick to mock, but I wasn’t. Trigglypuff was a grim reminder of what the intersectional left does to people. Trigglypuff had been sucked in by an ideology that promised her acceptance and shelter from the hurtful realities of the world, where weight loss is a prerequisite of health, not to mention happiness and social acceptance. The left received an eager footsoldier who proselytized its ideology and shouted down those who challenged it. In return, Trigglypuff received nothing but the misleading assurance that she could be seen as normal and healthy, a paper-thin shield that inevitably collapsed as soon as she came into contact with the world outside her bubble. I couldn’t mock Trigglypuff. Fat celebrities, who set an

¹¹³ <http://haescommunity.com/>

atrocious example for millions despite having the finest personal trainers in the world on their Hollywood doorsteps? Yes. But not Trigglypuff. Her entire predicament was too horrible.

To avoid more Trigglypuffs, we have to tear down the trigger warnings, the safe spaces, the “fat positivity workshops,” and the other constructions the left has created to entice vulnerable, hurting people to their cause. All these serve to do is encourage these people to blame others and attack society for making them feel miserable, when in reality they will never be happy unless they *fix* whatever it is about them that triggers our gag reflexes. Exceptions should of course be made for those whose problems are caused by incurable diseases or genetics, but left-wingers seek to cast a much wider net than that.

When I call a celebrity fat, I’m not doing so merely to be cruel. I’m calling attention to an obvious fact that the left seeks to suppress: that being fat is *not a good thing*. The same is true of being ugly, which is another thing that the intersectional left are trying to convert into a category of oppression, contrasting it with the privilege of being attractive¹¹⁴. If you can fix it, you should, and if you can’t fix it, you at least need to deal with the fact that you can’t blame society for beauty standards, which change over time, but only slightly.

Attempting to overturn them completely, something the intersectional left promises is achievable, will only bring misery on the least fortunate in society.

Am I just rationalizing my gay urge to raise up the aesthetically pleasing and tear down its opposite? Perhaps partly. But I am not joking when I say fat-shaming should be a social obligation. Daniel Callahan, president emeritus of America’s oldest bioethics research institute, agrees with me. “Safe and slow incrementalism that strives never to stigmatize obesity has not and cannot do the necessary work,” wrote Callahan, a former smoker, in 2014. “The force of

¹¹⁴ https://sites.google.com/site/natalyadell/_/rsrc/1392074157467/home/intersectionality/nocite-Axes%20of%20dominance%20privilege%20and%20oppression.png

being shamed and beat upon socially was as persuasive for me to stop smoking as the threats to my health.”¹¹⁵

With a little effort, we can help fat people help themselves. But first we have to make sure that “fat acceptance,” perhaps the most alarming and irresponsible idea to come out of leftist victimhood and grievance politics, is given the heart attack it deserves. We should never let go of fat-shaming, as a society or as individuals.

Let’s be clear. Fat acceptance, or “body positivity” as some call it, is not empowering. It’s utterly cruel. Fat acceptance activists are actively encouraging young, impressionable girls to lead a life of loneliness, isolation, and misery. The people pushing this stuff on young women are evil. And they have to be stopped.

Strange though it may sound, perhaps even those who fat-shame solely out of cruelty and spite are inadvertently doing good. Because the sooner fat people (and, indeed, ugly people) come face to face with the reality of human nature, the sooner they’ll decide that they have to make a change before it’s too late.

Or, if they can’t change, they will at least be able to develop a method of coping. One day perhaps, the fat acceptance movement will realize that forcing others to accept you only ends in repressed feelings and misery on both sides. And perhaps that’s the day they’ll realize that Michelle Obama – dare I say it – was on to something.

And before you say, “What can I do about being ugly?” you know perfectly well. If you’re a man, work out – a lot. Learn some jokes and get a good job. You’ll do fine. If you’re a woman, save up for surgery and *stop fucking eating*.

¹¹⁵ <http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2013/01/a-case-for-shaming-obese-people-tastefully/267446/>

DO WE NEED FEMINISM?

In 2014, it would have been easy for me to answer this question with a resounding “no.” Feminism in the west serves little purpose other than hating men, making absurd demands, lying about inequality and obsessing over trivial issues. It has poisoned relations between the sexes, nearly destroyed due process on campus, and constantly saddles businesses with pointless gender diversity requirements based on bogus economics.

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

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

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

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

That's a feminism we could all get behind.

For now, feminists should resign themselves to pats on the back from Daily Beast columnists and total oblivion with regular people. And to being absolutely hated by lovers of free speech, facts, reason and logic.

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

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

I promote facts over feelings.

I stick up for men.

I resist the new trend for "affirmative consent." Amazingly, yet predictably, feminists aren't satisfied that the scales are already tilted in women's favor when an allegation of rape is made. They want complete control over romantic relationships. It's not enough that they can destroy a man's self-esteem with a word of rejection or his reputation with a single bogus rape claim. They also want to throw men in jail if their advance is too awkward, or if they themselves say yes and then later regret it.

That's the reason we now have affirmative consent, perhaps the most Kafkaesque set of laws in America, now signed into statute for all colleges in California, Louisiana, and Indiana, and statewide in New York and Illinois¹¹⁶. It's the idea that if you don't consent at every stage of a sexual encounter, it's rape. That means asking for every kiss and asking for every boob squeeze. It's almost as if feminists want everyone to remain celibate.

116

<http://affirmativeconsent.com/affirmative-consent-laws-state-by-state/>

Most of all though, I think they hate me because whenever I meet a feminist in person, they usually end up adoring my personality and fashion sense as much as they hate my words. They're torn between hating me and wanting to be my best friend. I tell them all the same thing: if only they slimmed down and got a cute haircut, they could have a boyfriend as charming and handsome as me, and give up on all this angry man-hating.

While I don't love feminism, I do love women. It makes me sad to see what feminism has done to a generation of American women who could have been and done anything if it hadn't been for BuzzFeed and Gawker.

Everywhere feminism exists it is a threat to happiness and freedom. Just think how funny Sarah Silverman used to be, cracking outrageous jokes about Jews, Mexicans and gays, before she contracted feminism and became just another disapproving housewife on Twitter.

I think feminists have passed the point where they'll ever be popular, but if they focus on the real threats to women today – in particular, from Islam – they might at least win back some measure of respect. I'm not holding my breath.

WHY BLACK LIVES MATTER HATES ME

I love black people.

Indeed, I love black people so much that my Grindr profile once said “No Whites.”¹¹⁷ I'd considered “Coloreds Only Served in Rear,” but that was a little too edgy, especially considering that Grindr once deleted my profile for writing: “Don't contact me if you're under seven inches or you know who your dad is.”

Alas, some black people -- the ones conned by Black Lives Matter -- don't love me as much as I love them.

And after everything I've done for the black community! I've lost count of the number of black youths I've personally lifted out of poverty. (Admittedly, I send them back the next day in an Uber.)

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

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

¹¹⁷ This is an actual thing that worries progressives, by the way. It's called “sexual racism.” <https://www.queerty.com/many-white-guys-grindr-many-racist-blogger-laments-20161001>

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

It also identified Shaun King as ethnically white.¹¹⁸ That's right: a self-appointed leader of Black Lives Matter, who attended a historically black college, on an Oprah Winfrey scholarship targeted at disadvantaged black kids, had – according to his birth certificate – a white mother and a white father. The document couldn't be clearer – he was white!

For more than two days after I reported on the questions about Shaun King's background, King tried to ignore the issue¹¹⁹, blocking people on social media who brought it up and refusing to answer media questions, despite massive international interest in the story.¹²⁰ Finally, in an article for the left-wing blogging platform *Daily Kos*, he delivered the only argument that had a chance of getting him out of the scandal: that his mother had an affair with a light-skinned black man, a man King did not name.¹²¹ The implication was clear: King had no idea who his father was, and had thus been making representations about his ancestry he could not justify.¹²²

My response to his claim that his mother had slept around was simple: take a DNA test. If King's claims were true, taking a DNA test and putting its results on the public record would have put the matter to rest once and for all. He still hasn't done so.

¹¹⁸ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/19/did-black-lives-matter-organiser-shaun-king-mislead-oprah-winfrey-by-pretending-to-be-biracial/>

¹¹⁹ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/19/shaun-king-doesnt-rebut-story-about-his-racial-history-in-twitter-meltdown/>

¹²⁰ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2015/08/19/international-media-go-nuts-over-shaun-kings-race-scandal/>

¹²¹ <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2015/8/20/1413881/-Race-love-hate-and-me-A-distinctly-American-story>

¹²² <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/20/shaun-king-confession-i-have-no-idea-who-my-father-is/>

As it turned out, these explosive new racial allegations are just the latest in a string of controversies surrounding Shaun King: on July 21, a conservative blog reported that his account of a “brutal, racially-motivated beating” in 1995, which at least two reports have described as “Kentucky’s first hate crime,” did not match up with a police report from the case.¹²³

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

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

King’s story is increasingly common -- left wingers, especially on campus, are fond of faking hate crimes to boost their own public profiles and bolster support for their political causes. But King was doing far more than that -- he was using his position as one of the unelected figureheads of Black Lives Matter to drum up sympathy, and ultimately line his own pockets.¹²⁴

125

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

King’s story is mirrored by that of Rachel Dolezal, who built a career in the NAACP by pretending to be black. After she was exposed, Dolezal claimed that she “identified as black.” In

¹²³ <http://dailycaller.com/2015/07/21/leading-ferguson-activists-hate-crime-claim-disputed-by-police-report-detective/>

¹²⁴ <http://dailycaller.com/2015/11/16/charities-touted-by-black-lives-matter-activist-shaun-king-appear-to-have-never-existed/>

¹²⁵ <http://dailycaller.com/2015/12/16/shaun-kings-charity-fundraising-comes-under-more-scrutiny/>

other words, that she was trans-racial. Months before the Dolezal story broke, I joked that after transgender people, the next frontier of left-wing identity politics would be transracial. I didn't expect to be proven right so soon.

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

Sad, but not surprising. The left has made victimhood prestigious, profitable, and in some respects almost revered. Even with all the legitimate problems faced by black people in America, it makes sense that some people would pretend to be members of the race to reap all the attendant rewards.^{126 127}

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

The point of these donations is strictly to advance the cause of identity politics and racial division. They do nothing to serve the black community or black lives.

Worse -- they do extraordinary damage to both.

The Police Protect Black Lives

¹²⁶ <https://web.archive.org/web/20150822014309/http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/19/why-white-people-seek-black-privilege>

¹²⁷ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/19/why-do-people-imitate-oppressed-minorities/>

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

As liberals would rather you didn't know, this force isn't the police. It is inner city gangs, who are primarily black themselves. The numbers are indisputable. Between 1980 and 2008, blacks made up 52.5 percent of homicide offenders, despite making up just 12.2 percent of the population according to 2010 data. The victim of black violence is their own community. In the same 1980-2008 survey, it was found that 93 percent of black homicide victims were killed by other black people.¹²⁸ Black Lives Matter focuses exclusively on deaths caused by the police, yet this is far eclipsed by the black deaths caused by other black people. In 2014, there were 238 black deaths at the hands of police, a number sensationally reported by Raw Story as "more black deaths than on 9/11." But in the same year, there were 6,095 black victims of homicide -- more homicide victims than any other race. And virtually all of the victims died at the hands of other black people¹²⁹.

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

Unlike the wage gap, the black murder gap is very real, and simply isn't discussed by black activists. As is so often the cause in politics, I suspect it's a matter of tribalism, or ingroup-outgroup psychology. It's always easier to blame other people for your problems, instead of undergoing the difficult process of looking inward. Like feminists who blame their everyday

¹²⁸ <http://www.b's.gov/content/pub/pdf/htus8008.pdf>

¹²⁹ <https://www.themarshallproject.org/2016/02/08/black-and-unarmed-behind-the-numbers#.t7yfHNI5z>
[https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2014/crime-in-the-u.s.-2014/tables/expanded-homicide-data/expanded homicide data table 1 murder victims by race ethnicity and sex 2014.xls](https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2014/crime-in-the-u.s.-2014/tables/expanded-homicide-data/expanded%20homicide%20data%20table%201%20murder%20victims%20by%20race%20ethnicity%20and%20sex%202014.xls)

grievances on an invisible “patriarchy,” or wifi-enabled Waffen SS wannabes who think the Jews are responsible for everything bad that happens to them, or Democrats who blame the Russians for Hillary losing the 2016 election, it’s very easy to dodge responsibility if you have a boogeyman to lump the blame on.

Leftism, which combines tribal identity politics with a disdain for personal responsibility, is the ultimate political expression of this instinct. The violence is more easily solved. Yet BLM aren’t just ignoring the problem – they end up *making it worse*. Whenever Black Lives Matter torches another city district (usually their own neighborhoods), police are left with no option other than withdrawing from proactive policing until tensions cool. That means fewer patrols in black neighborhoods and fewer stop-and-searches of black people, which would save black lives.

It can be almost impossible to reason against Black Lives Matter-inspired action, peaceful or otherwise, regardless of whether it makes sense or not.

In a 2015 column, I openly pondered just how real Black Lives Matter was.¹³⁰

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

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

¹³⁰ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/10/movements-less-ridiculous-than-black-lives-matter/>

At first, the left vociferously denied the idea that there was a “Ferguson Effect” -- a spike in violent crime across America caused by the rolling back of proactive policing in response to Black Lives Matter. But eventually, the evidence grew so compelling (10 heavily black cities saw a homicide surge of over 60 percent¹³¹) that even Vox admitted the problem was now “too clear to ignore” and grudgingly conceded that the Ferguson Effect was “narrowly correct, at least in some cities.¹³²”

The great lie of Black Lives Matter is that police hurt black people rather than the truth, which is that police help them. A cursory glance at arrest statistics reveals the group’s claims to be shockingly fraudulent. It’s true that police shootings disproportionately affect black people -- they make up 26 percent of police shooting victims, despite making up 13 percent of the population¹³³. But as has been tirelessly¹³¹ pointed out by every conservative journalist who covers this topic, they are also vastly overrepresented in crime statistics.

Some may find evidence of police bias in the fact that blacks make up 26% of the police-shooting victims, compared with their 13% representation in the national population. But as residents of poor black neighborhoods know too well, violent crimes are disproportionately committed by blacks. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, blacks were charged with 62% of all robberies, 57% of murders and 45% of assaults in the 75 largest U.S. counties in 2009, though they made up roughly 15% of the population there. When paired with the crime statistics, 26 percent is not a surprising number. Moreover, it is not always white police officers who are doing the shooting, a fact that casts doubt on claims from BLM activists and progressive journalists that there is an epidemic of white racism in America’s police force. From the same article:

¹³¹ <http://www.wsj.com/articles/the-nationwide-crime-wave-is-building-1464045462>

¹³² <http://www.vox.com/2016/5/18/11683594/ferguson-effect-crime-police>

¹³³ <http://www.wsj.com/articles/the-myths-of-black-lives-matter-1468087453>

The Black Lives Matter movement claims that white officers are especially prone to shooting innocent blacks due to racial bias, but this too is a myth. A March 2015 Justice Department report on the Philadelphia Police Department found that black and Hispanic officers were much more likely than white officers to shoot blacks based on “threat misperception”—that is, the mistaken belief that a civilian is armed.

A 2015 study by University of Pennsylvania criminologist Greg Ridgeway, formerly acting director of the National Institute of Justice, found that, at a crime scene where gunfire is involved, black officers in the New York City Police Department were 3.3 times more likely to discharge their weapons than other officers at the scene.

There are white people that Black Lives Matter should look up to, and they’re not Shaun King. They’re Heather MacDonald, the tireless Manhattan Institute researcher who has outlined the damage done to black lives by the Black Lives Matter movement in meticulous detail (many of the citations in this chapter are from her work). They’re Rudy Giuliani, the former mayor of New York, whose proactive policing caused gang violence in the city to plummet. And they’re the hundreds of thousands of police officers, white and black, who patrol America’s streets at night, preventing young black men from murdering each other.

When violence is committed against the police, it doesn’t discriminate by ethnicity. The two NYPD officers who were shot “execution-style” at the height of Black Lives Matter unrest were Asian and Hispanic¹³⁴.

On the rare occasions when police officers do shoot a black suspect, they’re just as likely to do so if the officer themselves were black. Or even if the officer was a Black Lives Matter

¹³⁴ <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/12/20/new-york-city-police-officers-shot/20698679/>

activist! Whenever black critics of the police have dared submit themselves to “use of force” simulations, which put participants in police scenarios where the use of force against a suspect is an available option, they end up pulling the trigger just as often as white policemen¹³⁵.

Black lives don't matter to Black Lives Matter. If they did, they wouldn't focus on police-related deaths, which make up a tiny part of preventable black deaths, they would focus on the problems of their own community rather than decrying dwindling “white racism,” and above all they wouldn't force police off America's streets.

The great truth obscured by the media and left-wing politicians is the fact that the police are not enemies to black lives, but in fact their greatest defenders.

The Facts

Despite my obvious degeneracy, I consider myself, on balance, right-wing. Still, not even a proud dissident conservative like me would deny that there are real, structural issues in America that make it more difficult to be a black person. If I were a partisan hack, I'd shy away from making that admission. But – and this will shock some of you – I'm even open to an argument for slavery reparations, provided it's spent on top-quality schools in black neighborhoods so the brightest black kids have a chance of getting to Harvard.

Unlike the largely bogus complaints of feminists and gays, who are at this point largely privileged classes, some African-Americans, especially women, are still second-class citizens in America.

Education is a prime example. Schools in America are still largely segregated -- black pupils overwhelmingly go to schools in lower-income neighborhoods, where class sizes are

¹³⁵ <http://www.fox10phoenix.com/news/1382363-story>

large, the standard of teaching is poor, and where gangs prey upon adolescent boys. In 83 out of the 97 large American cities where data is available, the majority of black students attended school where most of their classmates were low-income. In 54 out of the 97 cities, at least 80 percent of black students did so¹³⁶.

For far too many young black adults in America the only dream they have of escaping a life of poverty is playing professional sports or becoming a music artist.

Fixing America's schools would go a long way to solving the deep-seated issues that cause black people to remain stuck in a cycle of crime and poverty. But unlike the angry, tribal politics of Black Lives Matter, the political dividends of such reforms could only be reaped in the very long term. Efforts to fix America's schools, as George W. Bush discovered when he attempted to do so, typically cause more political damage than they garner support.

The problem of black schools is part of a wider maelstrom of disadvantage faced by black people in America. Black children are more likely to live in inadequate housing, are more likely to grow up in conditions of relative poverty and are more likely to have uneducated or poorly educated parents -- one of the strongest indicators of future academic and professional success.

You'll notice "parents" is plural in the previous sentence, but 70 per cent of black children are born to single women¹³⁷. Black fatherlessness is widespread and socially and educationally devastating for black children. Furthermore, black children are likely to grow up surrounded by crime, which makes them more likely to fall into the lifestyle themselves, and more likely to be affected by crime -- which obviously has a host of ramifications that affect

¹³⁶ <http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/02/concentration-poverty-american-schools/471414/>

¹³⁷ https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr64/nvsr64_12.pdf

educational attainment, including absenteeism and stress. (Real stress, not the “triggering” that feminists experience when they encounter something they disagree with.)

Then there’s the war on drugs, which needlessly puts hundreds of thousands of black people in jail. Entire generations of young black men have been lost to the prison system. It must end.

I don’t claim to have the answer to these problems. But I wouldn’t attack progressives if they truly wanted to discuss them, and I would never pretend that these problems don’t exist. In fact, I’d like to see more Republicans take these issues seriously. I’m no libertarian, but it’s no surprise that Senator Rand Paul was polling so well with black voters before he dropped out of the Republican presidential race in 2016¹³⁸. Paul’s proposals for drug reform, prison reform, and education reform were specifically designed to address issues in the black community.

The fact of continued racial disadvantage in America will be uncomfortable for conservatives who are sick of constant, bogus complaints about racism. Those bogus complaints do exist, it’s true. But that’s no excuse for ignoring the facts. Structural disadvantage does still exist, and something has to be done about it. I’ve never known conservatives to react to uncomfortable facts with the hand-wringing and denialism of the left, so I have every confidence that they’ll receive these with an open mind.

In an era allergic to facts, it’s possible to ignore incontrovertible data. My experience as a journalist has been that the left does more fact-avoidance than the right, at least in the last decade. I’m sure that wasn’t always so.

Having made the problem of racial disadvantage worse with ill-advised welfare programs that try to fix black poverty by throwing money at the problem, progressives are now moving on to Black Lives Matter, a movement that is not even trying to save black lives.

¹³⁸ <http://rare.us/story/rand-paul-is-getting-more-black-support-than-almost-any-other-republican/>

As we shall see in the next section, they are also focusing on issues that are entirely trivial.

The Narrative

Black Lives Matter is instructive, because it illustrates how the political and cultural establishment can spread misinformation even when the truth is in plain sight. After all, it's not as if data on homicides, deaths in police custody and arrests is hidden away. Anyone can access the information they need to debunk the selective truths promulgated by Black Lives Matter.

But that takes time and effort. Activists, cultural elites and the mainstream media know that most people have too much going on in their lives to fact-check the narrative. Especially if the narrative is blasted out of every TV network, broadsheet newspaper and online social network.

In the mainstream media, there is perhaps one major mainstream newspaper -- the *Wall Street Journal* -- that regularly publishes articles critical of Black Lives Matter. Virtually every other publication is completely on board with the poisonous message that America's police officers, one of the most important groups *defending* black lives, somehow have it in for black people.

Here are a selection of op-eds from mainstream outlets published in the past two years.

The Washington Post: "Black Lives Matter And America's Long History of Resisting Civil Rights Protesters."

The New York Times: "Dear White America." (the article condemned a "system that continues to value black lives on the cheap.")

The Chicago Tribune: “I Never Have To Worry I’ll Be Shot in Chicago. I’m White.” (the article amazingly manages to talk about the problem of gang violence while simultaneously condemning allegedly overzealous policing.)

You know, if I was fed a constant stream of articles telling me that the world hated me because of the color of my skin, I might burn down a city or three. Despite my urge to correct the poor decisions of black rioters, I'm not going to burn down a city, because I don't read the *Daily Stormer*. I don't believe that my race is under siege. Plus white people only usually riot when a college basketball team wins the championship. Unfortunately, African-Americans rarely hear anything else.

It’s not just the mainstream media. Social media companies, which have far greater potential to subtly influence ordinary members of the public, are also in bed with Black Lives Matter. Jack Dorsey’s closeness to Black Lives Matter leader Deray Mckesson is well-documented: they have appeared on stage together, and Dorsey himself marched during the Ferguson protests.

Facebook is no better. Mark Zuckerberg is a progressive who praises Germany’s disastrous immigration policies and pushes for their adoption in the United States. In February 2016, he wrote a letter to Facebook employees reprimanding them for replacing “Black Lives Matter” slogans with “All Lives Matter” on company whiteboards. “This has been a deeply hurtful and tiresome experience for the black community and really the entire Facebook community, and we are now investigating the current incidents” wrote Zuckerberg¹³⁹.

Twitter’s embrace of fashionable progressive narratives needs no introduction. This is the company whose CEO has marched alongside Black Lives Matter protesters in Ferguson. This is

¹³⁹ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/02/26/zuckerberg-reprimands-facebook-staff-for-rejecting-black-lives-matter/>

the platform that permanently banned conservative blogger Charles C. Johnson because he threatened to “take out” Mckesson -- all neutral observers, including the feminist tech journalist Amanda Hess, agreed that this was clearly a metaphor for a journalistic exposé.

Yet Twitter banned him anyway, because DeRay is one of Twitter’s political VIPs. This is the company that has a “Black Lives Matter” poster hanging in its office. If they really cared about black lives, they’d have a framed photo of Sheriff David Clarke, the fiery Sheriff of Milwaukee County, known for his stinging rebukes of the movement and its debilitating effect on law enforcement.

Progressives have considerable power to shape the narrative. They control the mainstream media, Hollywood, and the commanding heights of the new social media economy. If they wanted to, they could use this power to create inexorable pressure to solve the real issues of America’s black population.

Instead, they’re using it to push Black Lives Matter, one of the most destructive movements in the country’s history.

And you know, it’s actually worse than that.

Racism

Whenever you reveal truths about the problems in the black community, or attack the cherished Black Lives Matter movement, as I have done above, charges of racism are usually not far behind. This is of course compounded by my level-headed analyses of the alt-right, which has led media organization after media organization to brand me a “white nationalist” – almost always followed by a groveling apology and retraction after my lawyers get in touch.

The Left in America is so stupid that they seem to genuinely believe that “disagrees with Black Lives Matter” is the same thing as “hates black people and wants a white ethnostate.”

But part of the reason why I’m so frustrating to the left is that their usual charges of racism just don’t work against me. Racism is probably the most ridiculous of all the charges the left foolishly uses in their futile attempts to sink the Battleship Milo, with the exception of the few leftists who are desperate enough to insult my hair.

In addition to the fact that I’m part Jewish, and thus have no love for anyone who hates or discriminates against minority groups, have you seen the people I sleep with? They come in a lot of colors, and very few of them are white.

The left’s usual response is to resort to a cliché. “Having black friends doesn’t mean you aren’t racist!” The reason they use this argument so often is because it eliminates the best possible defense against charges of racism. What better way to show tolerance and acceptance than in who you choose to spend time with, make friends with, and, indeed, love? There isn’t one.

My question to people who make this argument is simple: if it doesn’t satisfy you that I choose to spend time with, and make love to, and, for Heaven’s sake, fall in love with, men of color *when nothing is forcing me to*, what would persuade you that I’m not a racist?

Many of the most cherished people in my life are black men. Because I love and respect them, I believe they deserve the truth and to face the harsh reality of black America today. It’s a reality that includes problems created and sustained by the left, and by the black community itself – as well as real problems of structural racism.

The left, by contrast, seeks to patronize minorities by wrapping them in cotton wool, and preventing them from coming into contact with anything that might offend them. “Trigger

warnings” and “safe spaces” are designed to protect “marginalized communities” from offensive speech, which they are apparently too fragile to hear.

And they call *me* the racist.

Leftists are convinced that my criticism of Black Lives Matter is motivated by racism. But real racists don’t tend to hide their motivations: they can be seen plainly in their language. Ask a white supremacist if she’s a white supremacist and you will get the answer: “Yes.”

The same can’t be said of her counterpart in the Black Lives Matter movement. Take Yusra Khogali, a leader and co-founder of BLM in Toronto, who made a post on her Facebook page describing white skin as “sub-human” (she actually used the word “sub-humxn” – the alteration of the word “man” in human being a popular trend among intersectionalists). She claimed that white people are a “genetic defect of blackness” and that melanin, the pigment that gives human skin its color, “directly communicates with cosmic energy.” Because of this, Khogali proclaimed that black people were “superhumxn.¹⁴⁰” At least in Toronto, it seems that Black Lives Matter are happy to have open racial supremacists as their leaders.

Creative biology is nothing new to black supremacists and separatists, like the belief that a black scientist named Jakub created the white race as a “race of devils.¹⁴¹” The difference of course is that in the past these could be laughed at and considered as loopy as flat-earth theory. Now believers in this stuff are leading movements like Black Lives Matter, which are regularly lauded by mainstream politicians and commentators.

That wasn’t the first time Khogali had made a racist comment on social media, by the way. In February 2016, she tweeted “Plz Allah give me strength to not cuss/kill these men and

¹⁴⁰ <http://www.torontosun.com/2017/02/11/black-lives-matter-co-founder-appears-to-label-white-people-defects>

¹⁴¹ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yakub_\(Nation_of_Islam\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yakub_(Nation_of_Islam))

white folks out here today. Plz plz plz.¹⁴²” We don’t need to guess at Khogali’s motivations. Her hatred is plain for everyone to see. Yet the mainstream media seems more interested in trying to explain how a sassy gay British columnist with Jewish heritage and a black boyfriend is the real racist.

I suppose we should applaud Khogali for not physically attacking any white men. As we’ll shortly see, not everyone has her restraint.

There are some who argue that racism against white people doesn’t exist. For a time the top result on Google for “is it possible to be racist to a white person” was an article from the Huffington Post arguing that such a thing was impossible, because racism is “prejudice plus power” and whites “control the system and economic structure in society.”¹⁴³

I’m not sure this argument would be very convincing to the mentally disabled, 18-year old white kid who was kidnapped and tortured by four black people in Chicago while they livestreamed the ordeal on Facebook. The video captured the man’s captors hurling racial abuse at him (“Fuck Donald Trump, nigga! Fuck white people, boy!”) slapping him, and slicing at his scalp with a knife¹⁴⁴.

Blood in the Streets

When Lyndon B. Johnson was discussing the need to tackle racism in America, he was under no illusions about the gravity of the problem facing the nation. “The Negro fought in the

¹⁴² <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/black-lives-matter-controversial-tweet-1.3523055>

¹⁴³ <https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/1901544/google-promotes-controversial-claim-its-not-possible-for-ethnic-minorities-to-be-racist-against-white-people/>

¹⁴⁴ <http://www.npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2017/01/09/508607762/a-dscomfitting-question-was-the-chicago-torture-case-racism>

war [World War Two]" Johnson told an aide. "He's not gonna keep taking the shit we're dishing out. We're in a race with time. If we don't act, we're gonna have blood in the streets."

It's been more than fifty years since the Johnson administration signed the 1964 Civil Rights Act into law, and America has blood on its streets. But it can no longer be blamed on racism -- at least, not on white racism.

On July 7, 2016, the black supremacist Micah Xavier Johnson opened fire on police officers in Dallas, Texas, killing five officers and injuring nine others, as well as two civilians. It was the deadliest incident for U.S. law enforcement since the September 11 attacks.

Just ten days later, another black supremacist, Gavin Eugene Long, opened fire on police officers in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. He killed two officers and hospitalized three others, one critically.

Both Micah Xavier Johnson and Gavin Eugene Long grew up in a society in which university professors, celebrities, and mainstream news outlets all told them that the police were racist and wanted to kill them. Both men turned to virulently racist forms of black nationalism, which -- unlike, say, Pepe the Frog -- receives scant scrutiny or attention by media and political elites. In many university departments, the racist, anti-white views held by Long and Johnson are virtually encouraged.

Both men are individuals responsible for their actions, but it would be simplistic to argue that they weren't also products of their environment, and the messages they were bombarded with since birth. While the progressive left harangues white twerkers and dreadlock-wearers as racist, and while the establishment media wrings its hands over alt-right memes, black people in America are being fed a diet of anti-white, anti-police hatred that, inevitably, spills over into violence.

The greatest tragedy is that the primary target of this violence is the police, one of the greatest, largely unacknowledged *allies* of black communities. It is the police who stand between black people and the greatest threat to black lives, gang violence. It is the police who disperse black rioters when they're burning down their own neighborhoods. And, amazingly, they will continue to do both, despite the fact that they seem to receive only bullets and bloodshed from black people in return.

I'm proud to enjoy the support of police officers and other men and women serving America. I am never more humbled and grateful when I receive praise from these people, who risk so much and give so much for their country, often in return for nothing but scorn from the public and politicians. There are few things make me angry -- or "rustle my jimmies," as I believe the kids like to say -- but this persistent injustice is surely one of them.

Black Lives Matter hates me, and I hate them. But I don't hate them because they pose a threat to white people. I hate them because they do precisely the opposite of what they claim to do. They cause *more* black lives to be lost, not less. And they do so by attacking the one group of people, the police, who are trying to help their communities.

The people who *really* ought to hate Black Lives Matter are -- you guessed it -- black people.

6

WHY THE MEDIA HATES ME

It was two weeks after the election of Donald J. Trump as President of the United States, and the Deputy Prime Minister of Japan, Tarō Asō, was visibly annoyed. But he wasn't annoyed at Donald Trump.

Speaking in Japan's National Diet (their parliament), the famously blunt Deputy Prime Minister shot down a suggestion that the country should begin to make plans for Trump's policies, as predicted by the American media.

"There's no point in Japan making policy based on the guesses of American newspapers when they're always wrong" said Asō. "We shall just have to wait until things are decided."¹⁴⁵

Asō was right to be annoyed. What is a Japanese politician to do when previously-trusted names in western news, like the *New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, BBC and CNN fail so comprehensively to describe what's going on in American politics? It's best not to pay attention at all.

It's an option that a growing number of Americans have taken as well.

A Gallup poll conducted less than a month before the election found that Americans' trust in the mainstream media had fallen to an all-time low. Just 32 percent said they had a "great deal" or a "fair amount" of trust in the media, the lowest figure that Gallup has recorded since they began conducting the poll in 1972. Just ten years ago, the same figure stood at 50 percent.

Even Democrats, who the media caters to, are lukewarm on the subject. Gallup found that just 51 percent of them said they had a great deal or a fair amount of trust in the media,

¹⁴⁵ https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=2&v=fjyz-NtENhl

compared to 30 percent of independents and 14 percent of Republicans -- roughly the same number who supported John Kasich in the primary.

Even more worryingly for the media, trust is in particular decline among younger people. From 2011 to 2016, trust in the 18-49 age bracket fell by nearly twenty points, from 43 percent in 2011 to 26 percent in 2016. For the older generation (50 and over), trust only declined by six points in the same period, from 44 percent in 2011 to 38 percent in 2016.

In other words, the few people who still trust the media in America will soon be either retired or dead.

Isn't it deliciously ironic that the children of the 1960s, that era when the young rose up against the heroic, selfless World War Two generation, are now stuck in the same old jam as their grandparents? After working so hard to destroy conservative values, they settled into a lazy complacency, foolishly believing they had won the culture war forever. Now they have to watch as their own children rise up against them in glorious rebellion, embracing the very values that they sought to destroy.

So, the children of the 70s and 80s listened to punk rock instead of Walter Cronkite? Well the children of the 2010s read 4chan and watch my live roasts of feminism instead of Anderson Cooper. Cosmic justice.

The media has no way to dig itself out of this mess. They are stuck in the greatest circle-jerk of virtue-signaling ever seen in history. Their primary concern is no longer conveying the latest information about current events to the American public, but with demonstrating their own commitment to the politically correct worldview of their colleagues and peers in the ever-shrinking world of the metropolitan bubble.

Most of their leading lights have lost any interest of objective news reporting, of Woodward & Bernstein-style investigative journalism, of speaking truth to power. Those who do are terrified of being ostracized and go along with the virtue signaling -- as a result, any good journalism they eventually come out with is left ignored by an increasingly disgusted, disillusioned public.

That's why they missed the rise of Trump: not because the signs weren't obvious -- they were hiding in plain sight, in the tens of thousands who attended his rallies, even in previously-solid Democrat strongholds like Michigan and Pennsylvania.

And of course, they were also hiding in the millions of people who watch my YouTube videos and share my Facebook posts. Trump and I have many of the same supporters. If the media wanted to judge where the wind was blowing, they should have paid attention to my soaring Google rankings and those of other mischievous young libertarian and conservative artists, commentators and thinkers.¹⁴⁶

Precisely the same thing happened in Brexit, unexpectedly won by the populist right, and in the 2015 British Parliamentary elections, unexpectedly won by the center-right Conservative party. In both cases, left-wing hysteria led voters to keep their heads down until election day, when they quietly voted for the right.

Why didn't the media spot the signs? Because they didn't want to. In their worldview, Mitt Romney's failed bid for President in 2012 proved the dominance of the new Democratic coalition of urban voters and minorities. They grew drunk on the delusion of their own unassailable power. Surely Trump, who said far more offensive things than Romney, would go down to a historic defeat. Not at the hands of the Democrats, but at the hands of the media.

¹⁴⁶ <https://www.google.com/trends/explore?q=milo%20yiannopoulos,tomi%20lahren>

Not every journalist working in the mainstream media failed to see the tsunami that was about to engulf the Democrats and their allies in the media elite, but those who suspected it was coming probably decided that keeping their heads down was the best career choice. A couple of examples prove that they likely made the right choice.

When Huffington Post blogger David Seaman published two articles for the site breaking with the left-wing and mainstream media's self-imposed vow of silence on Hillary Clinton's health, retribution was swift and merciless. Not only were his two articles on the subject ("Hillary's Health Is Superb, Aside From Seizures, Lesions, Adrenaline Pens," and "Donald Trump Challenges Hillary Clinton To Health Records Duel") deleted, but he was fired, locked out of his editing account, and then his *entire history of articles* at the online news site was scrubbed from the site.

Understandably miffed, Seaman took to YouTube to express his astonishment.

"Whenever a video concerning a presidential candidate's health is viewed more than 3.5 million times, somebody under contract to the Huffington Post should be able to link out to that, especially as a journalist living in the US without having their account revoked" said Seaman. "I've filed hundreds of stories over my years as a journalist and pundit and I've never had anything like this happen."

Seaman was not the only example. There was also Michael Tracey, a reporter for *Vice* whose relentless Hillary-bashing was tolerated only during the primaries, when Tracey was a vocal supporter of Sen. Bernie Sanders. But once Clinton had won her victory over Sanders, Tracey's views were suddenly unwelcome.

Nonetheless, he persisted, repeatedly highlighting the failings of Hillary Clinton on social media in the months leading up to the election. On September 6, 2016, he published one of the

election cycle's more prescient columns: "The Mainstream Media Has a Donald J. Trump-Sized Blind Spot." Tellingly, it wasn't published at his home turf of *Vice*, but at the Daily Beast.

In his column, Tracey described how the media's tactics were backfiring.

I can't tell you how many ordinary folks I've spoken with who don't trust that the rolling Trump outrage machine otherwise known as current mainstream media is giving them the real story. This includes people who generally dislike Trump. One representative example was a restaurant worker in Philadelphia during the Democratic Convention in July who told me that she assumes anything Trump says or does will instantly be blown out of proportion, so has decided to just ignore the coverage. For her, it's a rational reaction to such disproportionate, all-consuming furor: She says she cannot process it all and also retain her sanity. So even if a controversy arises that is legitimately worth getting up-in-arms about, she will no longer know it¹⁴⁷.

Tracey was right, and the mainstream media (as well as all the *National Review* writers who assumed Trump would surely lose) were wrong. Not only did they fail to anticipate that Trump's unstoppable momentum would carry him to the White House, but they also likely aided the process, by crying wolf, confecting controversy and pretending to be offended and outraged so many times that the voting public simply switched off.

Presumably, Tracey's superiors at *Vice* aren't big fans of "I-told-you-so" moments, and quickly found an excuse to get rid of him after the election. They didn't even care that his readership appeared to be growing: he had to go. Unwilling to be as blatant in their pro-Clinton

¹⁴⁷ <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/09/06/the-mainstream-media-has-a-donald-j-trump-sized-blind-spot.html>

bias as the Huffington Post, *Vice* instead opted to fire Tracey after he questioned another progressive icon. After he pointed out that Lena Dunham could not have participated in the closed Democratic primary in New York because she was not registered with the party, *Vice* fired him for reprinting a screenshot of publicly accessible, easily searchable voter registration data.¹⁴⁸

I don't think Tracey or Seaman will end up with their careers particularly damaged in the long-term. They were right, and the furious progressive editors who fired them were wrong. They won't want for employment in the new media ecosystem. But in addition to creating a chilling effect in the mainstream media, where journalists decline to defy the narrative out of fear for their jobs, it also shows how committed the mainstream media is to remaining in its cycle of error. The few reporters who do see past the biases of the bubble are purged. And so, the cycle continues.

Nevertheless, I have good news for Japan's politicians, and for anyone else wondering where to look for truth in this new age of progressive propaganda masquerading as impartial journalism. You see, as virtue-signaling intensifies and the Overton window – the range of acceptable ideas and topics of political discussion in society -- grows ever narrower, it's no longer just the cranks and the UFO-hunters who are left outside the mainstream -- journalists and fact-hunters who actually *do* know what's going on in the world are left outside too. Some of them are handsome, funny, charismatic and fabulous. And if you want to know when the next Donald J. Trump is coming around the corner, all you have to do is find them.

I am of course referring to myself, to Breitbart, and to my fellow travelers in the anti-establishment press. The very people and publications that are frantically decried by the

¹⁴⁸ <http://heatst.com/world/vice-reporter-fired-after-story-questioning-whether-lena-dunham-voted-in-primary/>

opposition as “fake news.” They don’t understand why our star is rising, and theirs is falling – it’s because we’re upfront about our opinions and priorities, and are committed to reporting the stories that the discredited mainstream media routinely ignores.

We also have respect for our readers. Unlike most of the rest of the press, we don’t look down our nose at ordinary Americans.

I made many mistakes in my youth – dropping out of college, spending too much time blowing drug dealers, not resisting Father Michael’s advances – but picking journalism as a career was probably the biggest one ever.

It’s certainly not a path I’d advise anyone else to take, unless you fancy answering to miserable, soft-spoken nerds in plaid shirts who want you to convince the public that Islam is nothing to be worried about and that “mansplaining” is a serious threat to women.

Nevertheless, if you are going to be a journalist, tell the truth. Your career options will be limited initially, but honesty pays off where it matters – with the public. And you don’t even have to be left wing! I trust anti-establishment leftists like Michael Tracey far more than *National Review* or Red State columnists, who revealed themselves during the campaign to be little more than watered-down versions of the virtue-signaling mainstream.

We are not hard to find. The alternative media is increasingly difficult to ignore -- Breitbart, for example, maintained the top spot in political news on Facebook and Twitter for most of the election year. Despite the best efforts of biased Silicon Valley CEOs like Twitter’s Jack Dorsey to silence our leading voices, we are the ones that people want to share, and we are the ones that people want to pay attention to.

During my career as a tech journalist in Europe, I quickly learned that tech journalism is a corrupt mess populated by hacks. Then during GamerGate we learned the gaming press is a

corrupt mess populated by hacks not interested in the hobby, merely in politicizing it. Now during this election we've learned that the entire mainstream media is a corrupt mess populated by hacks pushing the political views of those in power with zealotry and mendacity.

Just a few years ago, you'd have been laughed out of the room for saying stuff like that. Now everyone knows it's true.

Fake News

Having been embarrassed so often and so spectacularly by the alternative media, you would expect the mainstream to show a little humility after Trump's victory. Instead, they opted to double down, in an ill-conceived attempt to take vengeance on those who humiliated them. As always, their efforts have backfired completely.

Instead of asking themselves why they (and the Democrats) lost people's trust, the media instead asked why the people had lost trust in them. A subtle but important difference.

The media decided that the people had been duped.

Instead of listening to virtuous propaganda like CNN, the people were listening to, reading, and watching – shock, horror! – alternative media. Something had to be done. But what? Well, the mainstream media could always engage with the alternative media and its arguments directly -- but that would require facts, evidence, debate, open-mindedness, and other long-forgotten qualities in the mainstream media.

So they didn't do that.

The media could always start listening to its readers again, by reopening comment sections and actually listening to what they had to say, rather than writing all criticism off as

“abuse,” “harassment” and “trolling.” But that would require humility and the ability to admit that perhaps those backward losers in the flyover states knew something they didn’t.

So they didn’t do that.

Instead, in the days following the presidential election, the media seized on a new meme emerging from left-wing academics and analysts desperate for a reason to absolve them of responsibility for losing America.

That meme was “fake news” -- the idea that Donald Trump had won because of the power of social media to spread misinformation. Voters’ anger at elites wasn’t legitimate, you see -- it was all because of the alternative media -- sorry, I mean *fake news sites* -- and mean lies about poor Hillary.

A few examples of genuine fake news (sites that create fake stories for clicks and ad revenue like the sites with the extra suffix “.co”: abcnews.com.co, DrudgeReport.com.co, MSNBC.com.co, usatoday.com.co, Washingtonpost.com.co) were seized upon by the media to prove the existence of a wider problem. Two false stories about high-profile endorsements of Trump (from Pope Francis and Denzel Washington respectively) and one activist’s mistaken photo about bussed-in anti-Trump protesters in Austin, Texas were used to paint a picture of a deluded electorate¹⁴⁹ ¹⁵⁰. Other similar stories were cited, including the much-discussed “Pizzagate.”

Of course, we didn’t report on any of those stories. But Breitbart, along with InfoWars, Prison Planet, The Blaze, Project Veritas, Private Eye, The Independent Journal Review, World Net Daily, and ZeroHedge were placed on a list compiled by a left-wing academic of so-called

¹⁴⁹ <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/20/business/media/how-fake-news-spreads.html>

¹⁵⁰ <http://www.nbcnews.com/tech/tech-news/facebook-google-crack-down-fake-news-advertising-n684101>

“fake news sites.”¹⁵¹ It wasn’t just the alternative media either - even more liberal sites like Red State and the Daily Wire made the list!

This was no accident. Part of the reason why the left was drawn so rapidly to the “fake news” meme was because it offered the hope of striking back at a freewheeling new anti-establishment media that was rapidly supplanting them.

In the age of the internet, there are any number of independent commentators for the public to choose from, and their soaring popularity is a testament to the media’s failure to hang on to their audience. There’s Steven Crowder, once a Fox News contributor, who now enjoys far more freedom in his widely-watched YouTube show “Louder with Crowder.” There’s Stefan Molyneux, whose piercing insight into the issues of the day is far more exciting and intellectually stimulating than anything Keith Olbermann or Sally Kohn has to offer. There’s Gavin McInnes, one of the only Canadians I like, who is smarter and wittier than either. And there’s Joe Rogan of the wildly successful podcast *The Joe Rogan Experience*, whose monthly download numbers – 11 million in a single month in 2014 – should terrify to the mainstream media¹⁵².

The real crisis of mainstream credibility can be seen in the rise of the “alt-media,” people who were previously considered crackpots and fringe loons. The InfoWars commentators, Alex Jones and Paul Joseph Watson, now rack up hundreds of thousands, even millions of views with every YouTube broadcast they release. What does it say about the mainstream media’s

¹⁵¹ <http://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2016/11/breaking-media-list-fake-news-websites-includes-breitbart-infowars-zerohedge-twitchy-blaze/>

¹⁵² <http://www.reviewjournal.com/columns-blogs/doug-elfman/joe-rogan-s-three-hour-podcast-show-tops-11-million-monthly-downloads>

credibility that a man known to accuse the federal government of “turning the freaking frogs gay¹⁵³” is on the rise, while they’re on the decline?

Julian Assange and WikiLeaks are also symbols of the mainstream media’s declining power. Once upon a time, a leaker or a whistleblower would have to go to a newspaper or a broadcaster in order to get their story out. When the media is biased, this can be a problem: *Newsweek* passed on the story of President Clinton and Monica Lewinsky, remember: it was Matt Drudge who ended up leaking the story online¹⁵⁴. Now, the map has changed: WikiLeaks will dump virtually any leaks from governments and political parties on the web, virtually uncensored. Sure, the media could just ignore them, but this is the age of the internet: if they don’t spread the news, social media users will.

Now aware of the existential threat posed to his world order, even outgoing president Barack Obama got involved. According to *The New Yorker*, just a few days after the election Obama was talking “obsessively” about a BuzzFeed article attacking pro-Trump fake news sites¹⁵⁵. In his public statements, Obama also blamed “fake news” for the public’s lack of belief in man-made climate change.

“An explanation of climate change from a Nobel Prize-winning physicist looks exactly the same on your Facebook page as the denial of climate change by somebody on the Koch brothers payroll.” complained Obama.

What horror! People can publish and share information that casts doubt on what ivory-tower scientific authorities are saying! Information can flow freely! Something must be done!

¹⁵³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fgKvl5VQVky>

¹⁵⁴ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2012/12/26/newsweek-claims-credit-for-drudge-scoop-lewinsky/>

¹⁵⁵ http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/11/28/obama-reckons-with-a-trump-presidency?mbid=social_twitter

Obama continued, without any hint of irony. “The capacity to disseminate misinformation, wild conspiracy theories, to paint the opposition in wildly negative light without any rebuttal — that has accelerated in ways that much more sharply polarize the electorate.”¹⁵⁶ You could be forgiven for thinking he was talking about CNN.

Wow, that sounds like a serious problem! Just how polarizing and negative are these fake news sites going? Are they writing inflammatory stories about their political opponents with headlines like “This Is How Fascism Comes To America”? Oh wait no, that was the *Washington Post*, in an article about Donald Trump¹⁵⁷. Are they suggesting that Democrats will commit genocide if elected? Oh wait no, that was an op-ed in the *New York Times*, writing about Donald Trump¹⁵⁸.

The subheading “just say it: Trump sounds more and more like Hitler” was, again, not published on any of the sites on the left-wing “fake news” list, but on Slate, a once-respected magazine that once featured columns from Christopher Hitchens¹⁵⁹.

And what about the unverified dossier claiming that the Russian government is blackmailing Donald Trump with evidence of him engaging in “perverted sexual acts” that were monitored by Russian intelligence?¹⁶⁰ It was published in BuzzFeed and the reported on by CNN. In fairness, both have now established themselves as purveyors of fake news, so the meme isn’t entirely inaccurate.

¹⁵⁶ http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/11/28/obama-reckons-with-a-trump-presidency?mbid=social_twitter

¹⁵⁷ https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/this-is-how-fascism-comes-to-america/2016/05/17/c4e32c58-1c47-11e6-8c7b-6931e66333e7_story.html?utm_term=.34a69326dd42

¹⁵⁸ <http://www.ibtimes.com/will-donald-trump-commit-muslim-genocide-president-new-york-times-op-ed-warns-about-2382483>

¹⁵⁹ http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2016/10/nobody_s_like_hitler_but_trump_is_getting_closer.html

¹⁶⁰ <http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2017/01/trump-russia-report-explained>
https://www.buzzfeed.com/kenbensinger/these-reports-allege-trump-has-deep-ties-to-russia?utm_term=.omAvEqX5PA#.vi85P41Nnb

Obama is right, there is a problem with hysterics and misinformation in the press -- but it's a problem of the mainstream press, not the alternative media. It is, to put it mildly, *a bit fucking rich* for journalists who got absolutely everything they could conceivably have got wrong about this election totally wrong, and who published gerrymandered polls assuring the public of Hillary's victory, to start complaining after the fact about "fake news" because they lost the election.

One of the fake news media's most common targets is me. I partly forgive them for this -- my daily skincare regime is more complex and at least as interesting as national events. But I don't forgive the lies. Just Google "Milo Yiannopoulos" and the terms "alt-right" and "white supremacist" or "white nationalist" and count the number of times I've falsely been called these things.

These aren't just sub-par lefty rags like ThinkProgress either (although of course they're included¹⁶¹). It's supposedly respectable publications like NPR, which called me a "self-proclaimed leader of the alt-right,"¹⁶² Britain's *Daily Telegraph*¹⁶³ (I used to write a column for them -- they've clearly gone downhill since I left), and Bloomberg Businessweek¹⁶⁴ both called me "the face" of the alt-right, although the latter did it in so inadvertently gracious a manner that I couldn't help but be flattered. ("The pretty, monstrous face of the alt-right," they said). Less flatteringly but no less falsely, CNN wrote an article including me in a list of "white nationalists" and accused me of "speaking disparagingly about Jews."¹⁶⁵

¹⁶¹ <https://thinkprogress.org/trump-embraces-the-alt-right-cd91cc889154#.wo07v4zto>

¹⁶² <http://www.npr.org/2016/08/26/491452721/the-history-of-the-alt-right>

¹⁶³ <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/11/21/school-cancels-talk-far-right-trump-cheerleader-milo-yiannopoulos/>

¹⁶⁴ <https://www.bloomberg.com/features/2016-america-divided/milo-yiannopoulos/>

¹⁶⁵ <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/16/politics/white-nationalists-trump-losing-faith/>

The media has also held me responsible for “leading” the campaign of racist harassment against Leslie Jones.^{166 167} (I simply said she was ugly and that the character she played was a stereotype. Both are true!). I’ve also been held responsible for the release of Jones’s nude photographs, which were obtained in a hack and released on the web a month after my suspension from Twitter¹⁶⁸.

After Trump’s election, the volume of fake news from the mainstream media increased dramatically. I’m not sure I have enough fingers and toes to count the number of media outlets that tried to associate me with white supremacy, white nationalism, the alt-right, sending racist tweets to Leslie Jones, or all four. They included some of the biggest names in news: CNN, CBS, NBC News, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The Chicago Tribune*, and *USA Today*. Almost all of them issued groveling retractions, and in some cases apologies, after my press team got in touch, and it became clear that I was not the sort of person to let their smears stand without a fight¹⁶⁹. But by that point, the damage is done: most people have already read the story and formed their opinions.

These are all mainstream, respectable publications staffed by professional journalists. The very same people that we are supposed to believe will provide the public with real, not fake

¹⁶⁶ <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/jul/20/milo-yiannopoulos-twitter-ban-leslie-jones-bad-idea>

¹⁶⁷ <http://www.express.co.uk/entertainment/films/691418/Twitter-leslie-jones-racist-ban-ghostbusters-tweets-breitbart-milo-yiannopoulos>

¹⁶⁸ <http://ca.complex.com/life/2016/12/worst-people-2016/james-comey>

¹⁶⁹ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/07/fake-news-nbc-news-issues-correction-falsely-branding-milo-white-nationalist/>

<http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/04/fake-news-usa-today-issues-correction-after-falsely-branding-milo-as-white-nationalist-alt-right/>

<http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/18/cnn-refuses-correct-article-branding-milo-white-nationalist-racist/>

<http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/22/cbs-offers-pathetically-slimy-correction-milo-white-nationalist-lie/>

<http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/22/fake-news-la-times-changes-article-falsely-branding-milo-white-nationalist/>

<http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/29/chicago-tribune-issues-correction-smearing-milo-white-nationalist/>

news. Yet this is how they behave towards even the mildest of disagreement; a constant game of virtue-signaling and vice-signaling -- telling others whom to shun by slapping the latest negative buzzword on them, and simultaneously signaling to their friends that they're with the "good guys."

If the media only went after provocateurs like me that would be fine. I wind people up for a living, so I expect a little heat. But they also go after people whose contribution to society consists of more than just barbed words and fabulous hairdos. People like Martin Shkreli, who they accused of fleecing HIV and AIDS-sufferers out of their money by raising the price of Daraprim, a drug which treated a number of relatively rare conditions associated with the disease. Shkreli had a reason for raising the price: he wanted to fund research for a cheaper, better alternative¹⁷⁰. Moreover, his company, Turing Pharmaceuticals, made it clear that it was health insurers and corporations, not financially disadvantaged patients who would be out of pocket. But that didn't stop the media from branding Shkreli "the most hated man in America."¹⁷¹ He might be no angel, but the Daraprim price-hike is only grounds for "hatred" if you're a misinformed lefty or a mainstream journalist... But I repeat myself.

They act like the *Mean Girls* character Regina George, who victimizes any other girl who could possibly be a threat to her popularity, only to discover at the end of the movie that no one actually likes her. Is it any wonder that no-one trusts these reprobates?

Having realized that the "fake news" meme was now being used to shine a light on their own failings, the mainstream media desperately tried to put the genie back in the bottle. *The Washington Post* released an article stating that it was "Time to retire the tainted term 'fake

¹⁷⁰ <http://www.fiercebiotech.com/biotech/why-would-martin-shkreli-hike-an-old-drug-price-by-5000-only-a-moron-would-ask>

¹⁷¹ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-34331761>

news,” complaining that conservatives were now using the label against the media¹⁷². But it was too late – the media had given the world a term to describe their own failings, and we were going to use it.

Unable to face up to their own failings, the metropolitan media-political bubble has opted for projection instead. So, there’s nothing for it. We have to strap them to a chair, tape their eyes open, and make them look in the mirror.

That’s why, even though it’s probably for nothing in the end, I make a point of ritually humiliating journalists who lie about me. Because if I can make them think twice about doing it to me, perhaps they’ll think twice about doing it to you.

Narrative Over Truth

When the mainstream media want to attack the alternative media, they have no option but to conflate us with obviously fake sites. The truth is, we rarely get it wrong -- because if we did, our error would be trumpeted ceaselessly around the mainstream media for days. On Wikipedia, where left-wing editors have long since taken over, the entry for Breitbart erroneously lists us as a platform for the alt-right and provides a helpful list of the handful of stories other journalists have attempted to pick apart. If we’d made any more mistakes than that, trust me they’d be on there.

One of the things that infuriates Breitbart critics more than anything is how careful we are in our reporting. They just *hate* not being able to plausibly brand us reckless or conspiratorial. Breitbart is subjected to more scrutiny than any other news site in the world, but

¹⁷² https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/its-time-to-retire-the-tainted-term-fake-news/2017/01/06/a5a7516c-d375-11e6-945a-76f69a399dd5_story.html?utm_term=.308ff1d9821b

editor-in-chief Alex Marlow, in my view the most gifted editor of his generation, runs a tight ship. A *Guardian* journalist who read us obsessively for 48 hours could find no factual errors or misrepresentations in our coverage.¹⁷³ He instead ended up praising the “genius” of our “clever packaging.”¹⁷⁴ “The actual articles are quite benign,” admitted the reporter, Adam Gabbatt. “They could have been published on a liberal news site.”

When people actually listen to my talks, or read my columns on Breitbart, they come away impressed – and some of them are persuaded. That’s what all the name-calling and slander from the mainstream is designed to do: stop you from reading.

But in the internet era, when a click to check on a claim costs nothing and people are so used to being lied to by establishment journalists, this strategy doesn’t work any more.

If I were to publish a list of all the mainstream media’s errors, half-truths and misinformation in the nine years for which Wikipedia has cooked up a handful of objections to Breitbart coverage, it would fill a book this size on its own – and that’s if I only listed the headlines. But a few especially egregious examples do suggest themselves.

Let’s start with one that we all remember: that Donald Trump is a puppet of President Vladimir Putin of Russia. “Vladimir Putin has a plan for destroying the west” wrote *Slate* in an article that was shared over 80,000 times across Twitter and Facebook. “And that plan looks a lot like Donald Trump.” Their evidence? The fact that Trump and Putin have complimented each other publicly, the fact that former Trump campaign staffer Paul Manafort once did business in the Ukraine, and the fact that Trump advisor Lt. Gen. Michael Flynn attended a gala hosted by the news channel *Russia Today*.

¹⁷³ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2016/08/22/guardian-reporter-reads-nothing-breitbart-days-declares-genius/>

¹⁷⁴ <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2016/aug/19/reading-breitbart-news-steve-bannon-donald-trump>

The fact that Trump's secretary of state nominee Rex Tillerson was awarded the Russian Order of Friendship in 2013 was pointed to later as a sure sign of impending doom. But any student of history knows that even during the Cold War, the U.S relationship with Russia alternated between periods of friendship and periods of enmity. It is entirely unremarkable that senior U.S. officials have had dealing with Russia in the past.

This, per *Slate*, made Trump “The moral equivalent of Henry Wallace’s communist-infiltrated campaign for president in 1948, albeit less sincere and idealistic than that.”

The narrative was echoed throughout the mainstream and left-wing media until election day. Politico ran an article calling Trump “The Kremlin’s Candidate,” using even less evidence than the *Slate* piece. It focused exclusively on Lt. Gen. Flynn’s relationship with *Russia Today*, a network which I have also appeared on, and his view that Russia and the U.S. should co-operate to defeat ISIS -- an underwhelmingly common view among analysts.¹⁷⁵

The Guardian, meanwhile, published the account of a no-name think tank employee who claimed that Trump could “endanger western security interests” and said she expected “a lot of appeasement when it comes to Ukraine and Syria.”

Stories repeating the same circumstantial irrelevancies appeared in the *Washington Post*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *L.A. Times*, NBC, the BBC, CNN, and Fox News among others. It’s a pattern we see time and time again with the mainstream media: Once one outlet picks up on a story, however weak or inconsistent, that might damage conservatives, every other mainstream outlet runs with it as well, with no further fact-checking required.

Establishment conservatives who believed Trump was unelectable and would alienate women and minorities should have remembered 2012, when the media did to Mitt Romney

¹⁷⁵ <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/04/donald-trump-2016-russia-today-rt-kremlin-media-vladimir-putin-213833>

precisely what they tried to do to Trump. When Mitt Romney remarked during his second debate with Barack Obama that he asked for, and received, “binders full” of resumes of qualified women when he was facing a deficit of female applicants for jobs in his administration as Governor of Massachusetts, progressives instantly turned it into a media meme about Republicans being sexist and out-of-touch.

The fact that Romney, a man so boringly moderate his speeches could easily be sold as sleeping aids, was painted as a virulent sexist by the media should have clued Republicans in to the fact that the media would behave the same no matter how their candidate behaved. The best strategy their candidates could adopt, in fact, was one of defiant indifference or outright hostility to media narratives. And in 2016, Donald Trump proved it.

I’ve taken something of the same approach to my own rising profile, taunting and humiliating journalists who lie and rewarding others for good behavior by allowing them to interview me again if I’m happy with their prior performance.

If you want a clear example of the difference between the “fake news” that leftists complain about, which at worst duped a few thousand voters into believing that a presidential candidate got a celebrity endorsement, consider what the rape culture narrative did to American college campuses. Miscarriages of justice up and down the country. Colleges facing crippling lawsuits from former students. Male and female undergraduates terrified of one another -- the former of being dragged through the new kangaroo courts springing up on college campuses, and the latter of a fake rape panic that painted college-aged men as insatiable, psychopathic monsters.

All of this was down to the media, which leapt on the rape culture panic for clicks and political advantage. The bogus statistic -- the “fake news” -- at the center of the narrative was the lie that 1 in 4 or 1 in 5 female American college students will be sexually assaulted during their

time at university. (The figure seems to change depending on how ambitious the speaker is feeling that day.) The real number, according to Justice Department statistics, is closer to 1 in 170, or 7.6 per 1,000¹⁷⁶ -- a number that gets smaller every year.

Yet virtually every media outlet insisted that some variation of sexism in the media, “lad banter” and “frat culture” was responsible for a new epidemic of rape. Video game developers found themselves being accused of “rape culture” if they made their characters too sexy. Newsstands faced pressure to take raunchy magazines off shelves. *Blurred Lines*, an innocuous pop song by Robin Thicke, was portrayed across the media as a “rape anthem” for the line “I know you want it,” and banned across multiple college campuses in Britain and America. Any criticism or trolling of feminist commentators was portrayed in the media as an outbreak of society’s unquenchable misogyny.

If GamerGate hadn’t demonstrated just how fed up wide sections of the public were with this narrative in 2014, I suspect that the mainstream media would have attempted to keep the narrative going all through the 2016 election and beyond.

GamerGate, of course, was subject to its own furious narratives from the mainstream media. For their critique of feminism in video games, the gamers were labelled as misogynists and harassers of women. The games press behaved like a microcosm of the mainstream press -- just as every mainstream news outlet published an article about Mitt Romney’s alleged sexism the day after his “binders” comment in 2012, virtually every gaming publication published an article calling for the “death of the gamer identity” in the week that gamers rose up. Gamers, as the press quickly discovered, were an uncommonly relentless group of people, and never let their press forget the infamous “Games Are Dead” narrative.

¹⁷⁶ <http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2014/12/14/campus-rape-uva-crisis-rolling-stone-politics-column/20397277/>

We examine their exploits in full in another chapter, but they are also relevant to this one. Gamers proved that it was possible to fight the media narrative. Gamers didn't apologize, they held their ground, and they used social media to spread truth faster than the press could spread lies.

Knowingly or not, the Trump campaign followed the GamerGate model in 2016. Trump's victory, spectacular and total, was only the second-greatest humiliation of the American media. Before him, they were beaten by humble gamers fighting back from their basements.

Establishment conservatives should remember that when they wring their hands about how the media will make hay out of Trump's taboo-defying words.

A Reckoning

On Monday 21 November, as Donald Trump was preparing for his transition to office, he called some of the biggest names in American news media to Trump Tower. They reportedly expected that the meeting would be about access to the Trump administration during its time in office. Instead, they received a historic dressing down; what one source at the meeting described to *The New York Post* as a "fucking firing squad."

"Trump kept saying, 'We're in a room of liars, the deceitful, dishonest media who got it all wrong.' He addressed everyone in the room, calling the media dishonest, deceitful liars. He called out Jeff Zucker by name and said everyone at CNN was a liar, and CNN was [a] network of liars," the source said.

"Trump didn't say [NBC reporter] Katy Tur by name, but talked about an NBC female correspondent who got it wrong, then he referred to a horrible network

correspondent who cried when Hillary lost who hosted a debate — which was Martha Raddatz, who was also in the room.”

The stunned reporters tried to get a word in edgewise to discuss access to a Trump administration.¹⁷⁷

Kellyanne Conway would go on to tell reporters in the lobby of the Trump Tower that the meeting was “excellent.” I like to imagine her smirking internally as she said it.

Trump has been manipulating the media for decades with unparalleled brilliance. But I think they only really figured out they were being played on Friday 16 September, when Donald Trump’s announcement that he was going to make a statement on the “birther” conspiracy about Barack Obama at the soft opening of his new hotel in Washington D.C brought what seemed like the entirety of America’s political press corps to Trump’s doorstep. They probably expected he was going to say something crazy, the final wacky comment that would sink his campaign. I could almost hear MSNBC’s producers salivating.

Instead, reporters found themselves covering the opening of a new Trump hotel, and 20 minutes of veterans arriving in front of the cameras to endorse his run for president. Finally, at the very end, Trump appeared on stage to give a two-line comment on the birther issue.

“President Barack Obama was born in the United States, period. Now we all want to get back to making America strong and great again. Thank you very much.”

The press went crazy. “I don’t know what to say here,” said CNN’s chief national correspondent, John King. “We got played again, by the [Trump] campaign.” Meanwhile, Jake

¹⁷⁷ <http://nypost.com/2016/11/21/donald-trumps-media-summit-was-a-f-ing-firing-squad/>

Tapper, live on air, called it a “political rick-roll.” Tapper perhaps thought he was insulting Trump for engaging in the political equivalent of a prank invented by internet trolls.

Everyone else thought it was hilarious – especially me.

I was one of the first major conservative commentators to back Trump. My headline, published on Breitbart, called Trump “The King of Trolling His Critics” and argued that he would be “The Internet's Choice for President.”

At the time, few people saw the connection between Trump and internet trolling. Now, everyone sees it.

It was the perfect troll: it revealed suppressed truths, dismayed and entertained the public in equal measure, and was directed at a deserving target – the media. The entire broadcast media establishment, gloriously humiliated all at once, in front of everyone.

Only Daddy could have done it.

Don't Fear the Media

Establishment conservatives think that Republicans have something to lose by taking on the media. As gamers, and Breitbart, and Nigel Farage in the U.K, Trump and I have all proved, they don't.

The press has unloaded everything they have against us, and what has been the result? GamerGate gathered popularity for two years, unstoppable. Breitbart is one of the most popular news sources on the planet, and the most popular political news source on social media -- and we're still growing. Nigel Farage, condemned as a racist by the media, took his political party to unprecedented electoral successes and almost singlehandedly drove the Eurosceptic movement

that culminated in Brexit. Donald Trump, who attracted more media smears than everyone else combined, is president.

And look at me. Other than Trump, Farage, and possibly Ann Coulter, is there anyone in the English-speaking world that the mainstream media makes more of an effort to smear and misrepresent? I've been called a sexist, a misogynist, a racist, an islamophobe, a transphobe, a homophobe (yes, really¹⁷⁸), a white nationalist, a white supremacist, a villain, an attention-seeker (guilty!) and every other nasty label you can imagine.

And just look where it's got me. I wake up every day hoping the mainstream media continues trying to destroy me. It's doing wonders for my bank balance. Journalists think that by smearing me as a racist and sexist they are destroying my reputation. Actually, they are fueling my fame, because no one believes a word they say. Their lies and distortions heat my pool.

The truth is: In an age when nobody trusts the media, taking them on makes you popular.

So I implore you to do what the media doesn't want you to do: tell the truth bereft of politically-correct niceties. Be patriotic. Tell offensive jokes. Engage in "locker-room" talk.

The media will hate you for it. They'll call you names. They'll try and smear your reputation. But you really needn't worry -- no one is listening to them, except for a small group of their fellow blind, deaf and dumb journalists.

If I could tell my colleagues in the media four things, they would be:

1. Everyone hates you
2. No one is afraid of you
3. No one believes what you say
4. Nobody owes you anything.

¹⁷⁸ <http://www.latimes.com/books/jacketcopy/la-et-jc-milo-yiannopoulos-book-deal-20161229-story.html>

If every journalist in America realized those four things, their behavior would transform overnight, immeasurably for the better, and the US might finally get the fourth estate it deserves.

In the meantime, yes. All journalists are liars and frauds unless proven otherwise.

Make them earn your trust -- including me.

WHY ESTABLISHMENT GAYS HATE ME

These days, people don't come out as gay, they come out as conservative.

In February 2017, Chadwick Moore, a 33-year old gay New York journalist, penned an article for *The New York Post* explaining his rapid shift from left to right. The article's headline? "I'm A Gay New Yorker – and I'm Coming Out As a Conservative." Just three months prior, Moore had cast his ballot for Hillary Clinton. But now he was a self-proclaimed conservative. What happened?

It was simple: Chadwick got too close to the Dangerous Faggot.

In September 2016, Moore had been assigned by *Out* magazine to write a profile of me¹⁷⁹. The story was a gem; a rare piece of serious, nuanced journalism from the mainstream gay press. Its tone was largely impartial, describing the facts of my lifestyle, politics, and rise to fame. There was no virtue-signaling or moral grandstanding.

Don't get me wrong -- the profile wasn't completely free of bias (and likely couldn't be), and it included a trigger warning to warn fragile gay readers that they might encounter some conservative politics. They dressed me up in a clown costumer for the accompanying photoshoot (the article's title was "Send In The Clown: Internet Supervillain Milo Doesn't Care That You Hate Him"), and it incorrectly called me a "leader of the alt-right," as countless other publications had done before. But I was willing to forgive the error, because the rest of it was so good. And I didn't mind about the clown costume, because I still looked sexy as fuck.

¹⁷⁹ <http://www.out.com/out-exclusives/2016/9/21/send-clown-internet-supervillain-milo-doesnt-care-you-hate-him>

As you might expect, *Out* magazine got utterly skewered for daring to examine me fairly. In addition to an immediate outbreak of rage on social media, more than 40 gay journalists signed an open letter condemning the magazine for failing to “avoid fostering harm to queer people.”¹⁸⁰

Although the letter was directed against me, I admired the feat of getting 40 gay guys to agree on anything. But I guess the gay establishment has gotten so used to trashing conservatives for a living that when one of their number fails to do so, they consider it a hideous betrayal in need of a co-ordinated response.

The personal attacks against Moore were more severe. Chadwick quickly found himself ostracized by his circle of liberal friends. In his *Post* coming out story, he described how long-time friends and acquaintances began to turn their backs on him.

“I decided to go out to my local gay bar in Williamsburg, where I’ve been a regular for 11 years. I ordered a drink but nothing felt the same; half the place — people with whom I’d shared many laughs — seemed to be giving me the cold shoulder. Upon seeing me, a friend who normally greets me with a hug and kiss pivoted and turned away.

Frostiness spread far beyond the bar, too. My best friend, with whom I typically hung out multiple times per week, was suddenly perpetually unavailable. Finally, on Christmas Eve, he sent me a long text, calling me a monster, asking where my heart and soul went, and saying that all our other friends are laughing at me.

¹⁸⁰ <https://thinkprogress.org/out-magazine-milo-open-letter-e0d3db3fe7ac#.byw95ncrs>
<http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/09/21/15-most-triquestered-responses-to-milo-out-magazine-profile/>

I realized that, for the first time in my adult life, I was outside of the liberal bubble and looking in. What I saw was ugly, lock step, incurious and mean-spirited.¹⁸¹”

Chadwick Moore was becoming “red-pilled,” as we say on the internet. Like Neo in *The Matrix*, his eyes had been suddenly and dramatically opened to a new reality. Now aware of the left’s intolerance, Moore had no choice but to reconsider his entire worldview. And that’s how he ended up coming out as a conservative in the pages of the Trump-supporting *New York Post*.

It’s not just Chadwick, either. Other forward-thinking gays are also waking up to the dangers of embracing progressive intolerance. Dave Rubin, host of the Rubin Report, a show which was originally part of the progressive Young Turks network, is another ideological immigrant from the left: a former progressive who sensed the atmosphere of intolerance that was gathering steam in the movement, and now calls himself a classical liberal.

Here's how Rubin explained his position in a video for the conservative Prager University:

“I’m a married gay man, so you might think I appreciate the government forcing a Christian baker or photographer or florist to act against their religion in order to cater, photograph or decorate my wedding. But you’d be wrong. A government that can force Christians to violate their conscience can force me to violate mine.¹⁸²”

Rubin closed his video by conceding that defending his classical liberal values had “suddenly become a conservative position.” It’s my hope – and optimistic belief – that more gays

¹⁸¹ <http://nypost.com/2017/02/11/im-a-gay-new-yorker-and-im-coming-out-as-a-conservative/>

¹⁸² <https://www.prageru.com/courses/political-science/why-i-left-left>

will wake up, smell the intolerance, and come to the same realization. Unfortunately, Moore's story suggests that the rigid attitudes and prejudices of the fagstablishment may be tough to break down.

Gays have been battling intolerance for decades, and only recently won the full support and acceptance of society. And how have we responded? By becoming equally intolerant – not against people who have sex differently to us, but against people who think differently to us. Gays who go to the “dark side” get merciless treatment from their peer.

Take Lucian Wintrich, a gay Trump-supporting artist and photographer, who in 2016 unveiled a photography series called “Twinks For Trump,” featuring half-naked, waifish-looking men wearing “Make America Great Again” hats. Just five hours after I wrote a column praising Wintrich for his transgressive art project, he was fired from the New York ad agency where he worked¹⁸³.

Undeterred, Wintrich went on to host “Daddy Will Save Us,” the first ever pro-Trump art exhibit, featuring art pieces from a range of conservative figures, including me. (I bathed naked in a vat of pig's blood, representing the deaths at the hands of Islamic extremists and undocumented immigrants.) The response of the left was to bombard Wintrich's initial choice of art gallery with complaints, which caused the art gallery to panic, cancel the event and even threaten to sue Wintrich¹⁸⁴. A backup venue was found just in time, and the art show went ahead.

¹⁸³ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/08/29/twinks-for-trump-photographer-fired-after-being-praised-by-milo/>

¹⁸⁴ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/10/07/pierogi-art-gallery-lucian-wintrich-sue-trump/>

Imagine Madonna doing a video with barely-legal twinkles in MAGA hats. She wouldn't, of course, because these days she's more likely to be pandering to third-wave feminism and behaving gracelessly¹⁸⁵ than saying anything bold or original.¹⁸⁶

Wintrich, like me, delights in causing outrage. But you don't really have to try very hard. Polite, respectable gay conservatives get exactly the same treatment from the left. When mild-mannered entrepreneur Peter Thiel revealed his support for Donald Trump, gay website *The Advocate* published an article arguing that he could no longer consider himself a part of the gay community¹⁸⁷. The message from this, and from Chadwick Moore's experience, is clear: toe the party line, or be thrown out of the clubhouse.

It's genuinely shocking behavior from a community that was fighting against anti-sodomy state laws as recently as 2003.

Of course, establishment gays would argue that this is precisely why they're so suspicious of conservatives. But why should intolerance in the past be an excuse to commit intolerance in the present? Particularly when the current Republican President, Donald Trump, has a long history of standing up for gay rights? Surely the experience of dealing with prejudice and discrimination should make you less likely to assume the worst about people who are different to you, not more likely.

As I've known for some time, alas, this is not the case. In April 2013, I appeared on an edition of the British panel show *10 O'clock Live* to take part in a debate. The topic was gay marriage, a cause to which I was then opposed. My opposite number was Boy George, and it was

¹⁸⁵ <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/camille-paglia-how-age-disgracefully-hollywood-guest-column-960794>

¹⁸⁶ <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-4029528/Feminist-Camille-Paglia-hits-Madonna-s-claims-rebuffed-female-peers-start-career.html>

¹⁸⁷ <http://www.advocate.com/commentary/2016/10/14/peter-thiel-shows-us-theres-difference-between-gay-sex-and-gay>

a rare occasion in which I wasn't the most flamboyantly-dressed person on set (although even today, I would never wear anything like Boy George's purple eyeliner).

My mere opposition to gay marriage was enough to baffle the audience. In 2013, gay marriage had become a kind of litmus test of social acceptability for the left. If you were for it, you were a normal human being. If you were against it, you were a bigoted, malicious relic of the past -- something to be dumped in the trash-heap of history.

Yet I was fashionably dressed, and attractive, and charming, so they didn't really know what to make of me.

So they went with "bigot." Merely being introduced on the show as a gay Catholic opposed to same-sex marriage was all that was needed to baffle my fellow panelists. Before the show was over, I was called a "homophobic gay man" and accused of "self-loathing" for my opposition on cultural grounds to gay marriage.

I pointed out that gay marriage reinforced the idea that being gay is a normal or acceptable lifestyle choice, which I believe it isn't -- and shouldn't be. The very term "mainstream gay" is at odds with everything homosexuals have always represented, but nonetheless we are forced to use it because gays have become a monolithic political bloc.

To mainstream gays, as well as metropolitans who made up the bulk of the panel show's studio audience, my mere existence was and still is bizarre and shocking. I am a gay anomaly. And that's *before* I voice my opinions, which cause even more confusion to traditional left-leaning gay people.

Mainstream gays, many of whom are happy to cast scorn on the lives of, say, conservative midwestern families or southern evangelical Christians, simply can't allow the possibility that someone might cast scorn on *their* lives.

When everything is reduced to identity politics and political talking points, all gay people are expected to believe the same stuff. People stop listening to each other and everyone loses the ability to consider and discuss interesting ideas.

For instance, the gay establishment refuses to acknowledge that Donald Trump is a fabulously camp cultural figure. He's the drag-queen president! It's easy to see why so many gays I know secretly adore him. All that pizzazz and bluster! To say nothing of his strong position against Islamic homophobia. He *oozes* control and authority. He so obviously ought to be a gay icon.

That's why I coined the nickname "Daddy" for him,¹⁸⁸ which annoyed just about everyone.^{189 190}

Where's the Danger?

Ironically, some of the extreme members of the alt-right also have difficulty grasping the fact that I don't *want* gayness to be a good thing. When the *Daily Stormer* called me a "degenerate homosexual," they meant it as an insult. But I take it as a compliment: I became a homo *precisely because it is transgressive*. And I want homosexuality to continue being transgressive, and even degenerate.

One of the most alarming things I've witnessed over the past decade is how *safe* the gay community has become. As the cause of gay liberation advanced, our community's reputation went from feared purveyors of darkness, degeneracy, and moral corruption to cuddly, married, middle-class suburbanites with neat haircuts. In short, we have stopped being *dangerous*. It almost makes me miss the time when we had to stay in the closet.

¹⁸⁸ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/06/19/happy-fathers-day-daddy-donald/>

¹⁸⁹ <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/434570/donald-trump-not-your-father>

¹⁹⁰ <http://www.dailywire.com/news/4222/donald-trump-allfather-ben-shapiro>

The gay establishment is rightly horrified by that suggestion, because it goes against everything they've been working to achieve since the 1990s. But before then, gay men delighted in being transgressive. It was a part of our identity.

Just consider gay icons of the past two centuries. Obviously, there was Oscar Wilde, who delighted in appalling the stuffy sensibilities of Victorian society. His famous novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray* was chastised by one London newspaper as being “unclean, poisonous, and heavy with the odors of moral and spiritual putrefaction.”¹⁹¹ I live to get a review like that – hopefully Vox or BuzzFeed will say something similar about this book.

When Wilde went to America, a prominent member of the clergy complained that someone who had engaged in such “offences against common dignity” was being received so warmly by high society¹⁹².

Then there was Quentin Crisp, someone whose lifetime (1908-1999) saw the rapid acceleration of gay rights. The British writer and raconteur was, if anything, even more shocking than Wilde. Not only did he delight in taking a bazooka to society's sacred cows (he once described Princess Diana, perhaps Britain's most beloved public figure, as “trash”), but he also loved to needle the gay rights movement. He infuriated campaigners with his willingness to question his own gay instincts and lifestyle, once even stating that gayness was something that ought to be avoided if possible¹⁹³. He was a mischievous, rebellious hero.

Crisp was someone who would tolerate no limits on his independence. In the first half of his life, he plainly ignored society's rules against his gay lifestyle. And in the second, he flouted the gay community's expectations of him as well.

¹⁹¹ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/28/cultural-libertarians-from-history/>

¹⁹² http://www.classroomelectric.org/volume2/price/remembered/womans_journal.htm

¹⁹³ <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/commentators/peter-tatchell-quentin-crisp-was-no-gay-hero-1852122.html>

Just think of where gay people have lived and hung out in the past century. The seediest, most degenerate parts of town – think Soho in London – were also the gay parts of town. We were the outcasts, the corruptors, the devils poisoning society and corrupting its morals. We were on the very edge of culture, pushing its boundaries. And we were doing it just by being ourselves.

It's practically impossible for gays to transgress today. Hanging out in the Village, West Hollywood or Soho is hardly shocking or rebellious. Indeed, these places are now where you'll find hipsters and trend-followers, desperately trying to cling on to the fading aura of forbidden cool that is rapidly melting away from these neighborhoods. And just think of the horror of San Francisco! The unofficial capitol of camp has become the epicenter of America's new tech oligarchy, a new establishment for a new world. The city that once hated "The Man" has become it. Is there a city in America with a more moribund culture than San Francisco?

I'm ceaselessly amazed by the gay community's myopic eagerness to sacrifice everything that has made our lifestyle unique, exciting, and dangerous, in exchange for heteronormative domesticity.

As the great feminist critic Camille Paglia says, there's no way gays could be normal even if they wanted to be.

"Homosexuality is not normal. On the contrary it is a challenge to the norm. Nature exists whether academics like it or not. And in nature, procreation is the single relentless rule. That is the norm. Our sexual bodies were designed for reproduction. No one is born gay. The idea is ridiculous. Homosexuality is an adaptation, not an inborn trait.

Gay activism has been naive in its belligerent confidence that “homophobia” will eventually disappear with proper “education” of the benighted. Reeducation of fractious young boys on the scale required would mean fascist obliteration of all individual freedoms. Furthermore, no truly masculine father would ever welcome an feminine or artistic son at the start, since the son’s lack of virility not only threatens but liquidates that father’s identity, dissolving husband into wife. Later there may be public rituals of acceptance, but the damage will already have been done. Gay men are aliens, cursed and gifted, the shamans of our time.”

Smart gays who have been around the block like celebrity drag queen RuPaul understand this instinctively. He knows that going mainstream would be death to drag culture and once in a while he is brave enough to say so in interviews.¹⁹⁴ But even drag culture is slowly feeling the influence of the perpetually offended: RuPaul was the victim of a bit of social-justice censorship himself, when the trans lobby forced *RuPaul’s Drag Race* to stop using the phrase, “You’ve got she-mail,” in case any transgender people were offended.¹⁹⁵

RuPaul correctly tells gay men they should be striving to stay outside “the matrix.”

Even if we could achieve normality, would we want to? Our weirdness is our strength -- it gives us an edge, a power and a charm over everyone else. For decades, being gay has meant transgression and the violation of taboos. It’s been an act of rebellion; an automatic entry pass into society’s underworld. Why would we want to give all that up?

¹⁹⁴ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hnHEWU-WHGE&app=desktop>

¹⁹⁵ <http://www.pinknews.co.uk/2015/03/02/rupauls-drag-race-axes-youve-got-she-mail-catchphrase/>

Being perverse is okay. Listen to Camilla Paglia, my fellow fags. Realize you have an energy and power others would kill to access.

I don't want to have a spouse and kids and a front lawn. I want to be hurled out of a nightclub at three in the morning in a drug-fueled stupor.

In Trump's America, Gays Are Natural Conservatives

If gay people want to stay true to our historic reputation of transgression and cultural boundary-pushing, there is no better way to do it than become conservative. MAGA is the new punk rock. Orange County is the new WeHo. Being openly gay is no longer a risky, dangerous affair.

Being gay and openly conservative? Well, that's another matter entirely. Here's how Chadwick Moore described his twin experiences of coming out:

"When I was growing up in the Midwest, coming out to my family at the age of 15 was one of the hardest things I've ever done. Today, it's just as nerve-racking coming out to all of New York as a conservative. But, like when I was 15, it's also weirdly exciting."¹⁹⁶

There's a lesson for progressives here. Ramping up your political intolerance, as you are currently doing, will only backfire. It may cow a few easily-intimidated, easily-influenced gays into silence, but the best of us – the thrill-seekers, the explorers, the dark adventurers who are drawn to the forbidden and the dangerous – we'll be heading straight for the door. And we won't be coming back.

Gay organizations pour money into programs to stop kids using "gay" as a playground slur or calling people "faggots" on the web, but my "Dangerous Faggot" tour, watched by

¹⁹⁶ <http://nypost.com/2017/02/11/im-a-gay-new-yorker-and-im-coming-out-as-a-conservative/>

millions of young people around the world, has done more to reclaim the words gay and faggot than all the anti-discrimination workshops ever staged in America.

Straight kids from conservative households who used to beat up gay kids in the playground now see us as the dangerous, edgy ones – and as cool. We aren't outcasts anymore, even in conservative communities – we're tastemakers.

Peter Thiel was the first person to openly discuss his sexual orientation before the Republican National Convention. He went up on stage, before an audience of conservative delegates from all around the country, and announced that he was both proud to be gay, and proud to be a Republican. The audience got to their feet and cheered. Just think of the short-sightedness of the pearl-clutching leftist gays who tried to eject Thiel from the gay community over his support for Trump. Do none of them realize the historical significance of an openly gay businessman being applauded at the Republican National Convention? The party of Rick Santorum is now also the party of Peter Thiel.

Being one of the last boundary-pushers in the gay community pays its dividends. At the end of 2016, readers of *LGBTQ Nation* named me “Person of the Year.” Despite an outraged response from the gay community, the publication respected the choice of their readers, and even acknowledged that I had successfully become the “ultimate gay provocateur in a year of provocateurs.” If you're a fag who craves the limelight as much as I do, take note – it's conservative gays who all get the attention these days.

The progressive left will never, ever admit this, but Thiel and I have together, in less than a year, done more good for the image of gays in rural America than decades of political advocacy from left-wing groups. We've shown America that not every gay man is like Ross

Mathews. Mothers in the south and Midwest now know that just because their son likes sucking dick, he isn't necessarily going to turn into a screaming queen.

Just as mainstream gays are no longer the ones pushing boundaries, they're also no longer achieving their stated goal: winning more acceptance and tolerance for gays in America. Every time a conservative-hating gay like Dan Savage goes on TV to berate Christians for their bigotry and small-mindedness, all he's doing is preaching to the liberal choir, who are already well on board with gay rights, and alienating the rest of America. It's right-wing fags like me and Thiel who are doing the real work.

I'm especially eager for gays to be accepted by conservatives, because I think there is something naturally conservative about gays and our instincts. Male gays in particular are natural achievers: we tend to earn higher salaries than our straight counterparts, we have above-average IQs, and we're less likely to become fat¹⁹⁷.

In short, we value aspiration, success, hard work and talent – all values that have historically been associated with the right.

Nietzsche is a philosopher long associated with the political right. Although his philosophy is sometimes extreme in its condemnation of values like humility and empathy, he was correct insofar that the western moral tradition is tinged with envy, and often underappreciated the value of strength, wealth, cunning, triumph and power. Nietzsche wanted to restore those values to their proper place, and to encourage people to take some pride in their success, and the values that led to it.

¹⁹⁷ <http://www.advocate.com/commentary/2013/05/23/op-ed-are-we-more-successful-because-we%E2%80%99re-gay>
<http://qawker.com/5558318/qay-men-are-skinier-than-straight-men-duh>
<http://bloqs.discovermagazine.com/neuroskeptic/2012/04/11/homosexuals-are-smart/#.VYFn9BNVhBc>

Ayn Rand, a strong admirer of the German philosopher, analysed wealth through a Nietzschean lens. At a time when socialists and social democrats were on a tear across the western world, dominating elections and embedding their economic paradigms at the heart of official thinking, Rand - alongside Friedrich Hayek and other Austrian-school economists - boldly proclaimed the value of wealth, and humanity's quest for achievement. It's a perfect fit for gays, who have counted some of history's greatest geniuses among our ranks: Alexander the Great, Sir Francis Bacon, Alan Turing, John Maynard Keynes. We aren't an underclass any longer, so why would we stick with leftism and the politics of victimhood?

Championing the fortunate, the successful, and the able has never been particularly popular. People are naturally inclined to sympathize with underdogs, and to take pity on the less fortunate. But you occasionally need a Nietzsche or a Rand, to remind society why striving for greatness -- be it power, fame or wealth - is important. They remind us that sometimes, the best way to help the less fortunate is not to weep or proclaim their superior virtue, but to help them to improve their condition -- and that maybe, just maybe, you need the extravagance of elites to motivate the less fortunate.

And if there's one thing a good gay appreciates, it's extravagance. We aren't *all* divas who crave opulence and fame, but enough of us are for it to be considered one of our natural values.

I know I just said it but once again: let's not forget that gays are skinnier than average¹⁹⁸. And our love of good clothes, good hairdos, and good aesthetics is well established. So how, in the age of the horrifying "fat acceptance" movement, can we stick with the left? Good looks and glamour are two of my most cherished values, and unless something has gone badly wrong in the

¹⁹⁸ <http://gawker.com/5558318/gay-men-are-skinnier-than-straight-men-duh>

community, the same is true for many other gays. If we care about defending that value, we should look to Nietzsche, not hideous Queer Studies professors.

Return to Degeneracy

Gay men are chaos incarnate. We are gods of mirth, mischief, danger and subversion. And we should embrace it like a Hollywood celebrity embraces plastic surgery. We have an energy and power over everyone else, a dark, innate perversion and malevolence that other would-be rebels like goths and punks spend their lives imitating. We are meant to be transgressive. We should never try to be normal.

Existing as a gay man is an apocalyptic threat to oneself, to reality, to the social order. How can you provide a safe space to a community who put themselves in danger breakfast, lunch and dinner? When gay men exercise risk, they have an advantage -- as the chosen ones on the outskirts willing to be the outlet for anyone and everyone's fantasies. As society's subversive rebels, we can go further than anyone else. We can smash taboos. We can achieve greatness.

Family values are for straight people, not for us. Get married if you want, but don't pretend you won't be secretly browsing Grindr and scouting out darkened alleyways and toilet cubicles behind your husband's back. (He'll be doing the same.)

And, by the way, Christianity is not your enemy. Christianity is a secret friend. The devil needs the Church to stay in business, and naturally mischievous gay men need a book of rules to break. We need to be told that we're wrong, we need to be told that we're degenerate.

Part of the blame for all this certainly falls with gays, because we willingly accepted liberal victim-programming for so long. To this day, many in America still think the country is a terrible place for gays, ignoring the rest of the world. Part of the problem is that gays are

terminally insecure and vain, and don't fully understand that in America, it's perfectly okay for people to not like each other.

The reality is that social justice and progressivism are strangling gays and gay culture. Even VICE editors are noticing that it's Breitbart that publishes the radical gay editorials and provocative Britney Spears commentary these days, hosts gay porn star op-eds and refers to "resident gay thots."¹⁹⁹ ²⁰⁰ ²⁰¹ That's an absolutely remarkable state of affairs for the Left to find itself in.

I hope this chapter helps both the alt-right and mainstream gays understand my motivations. I do consider this part of myself to be wrong. But I also *like* being wrong. I get off on being a degenerate. And that's why I don't get angry when the alt-right use the phrase. On the contrary, I encourage it! Gays should be proud to be degenerate.

Rescue gay culture. Dump social justice. It's so much better being bad.

¹⁹⁹ <https://twitter.com/mitchsunderland/status/611976439546671104>

²⁰⁰ <https://twitter.com/mitchsunderland/status/744952880843493376>

²⁰¹ <https://twitter.com/mitchsunderland/status/760631754944196608>

WHY ESTABLISHMENT REPUBLICANS HATE ME

"Right after liberal Democrats, the most dangerous politicians are country club Republicans."

-- Thomas Sowell

"I don't believe in the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. I just believe in parties."

-- Samantha Jones, *Sex and the City*

In January 2016, I got into what I thought was a friendly Twitter spat with then-editor-at-large for *Breitbart*, Ben Shapiro. Ben is a more introverted and less professionally successful version of me who lost his audience by freaking out about Donald Trump.

Shapiro's distaste for me and his distaste for Trump are related. They're part of a wider story of insecurity and anger on the part of the establishment right: anger that their positions of power and influence over conservative politics are slowly slipping away. Anger that they are being replaced by a new generation of young, fashionable and funny conservatives who have no time for the 1980s hang-ups of older conservatives. I mean, yes, the fact that raising tax rates past a certain point actually decreases tax revenue²⁰² is *very interesting*, but proselytizing that message is not our number-one priority. We're nimble navigators who can get out to protests earlier because we're not still waiting for our hearing aids to charge. And we care first and foremost about culture, not politics.

²⁰² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Laffer_curve

The Thomas Sowell quote at the start of this chapter isn't just a catchy saying. It's completely true. In 2016, there was only one type of political creature as upset as the left -- if not more so - at the rise of Donald Trump. That was the establishment conservative.

Establishment conservatives were so upset by Trump that they made a pathetic attempt to torpedo his efforts against Hillary Clinton. Calling themselves "NeverTrump," some of them threw their support behind Clinton, while others rallied around the laughable Evan McMullin, a former middle-ranking CIA operative whom no one had heard of before he became the establishment's spoiler candidate.

Naturally, as the biggest and loudest Trump fan, the establishment also came for me. After I objected to their attempts to brand every web-based Trump supporter a frothing Neo-Nazi and anti-Semite, I attracted the attention of their queen bee, a rotund chap called Glenn Beck who's about as predictable as a feminist stepping on a bathroom scale.

Alas, poor Beck! *He* was once the left's favorite punching bag, the target of all their false accusations of racism. Unlike most establishment conservatives, he even *did* things -- he once led a massive march on Washington D.C in defense of American heritage, with some estimates putting attendance at nearly 500,000.

Now, alas, he's apologized for being too conservative in the past²⁰³ and even pens columns for the *New York Times* these days²⁰⁴. In the run-up to the election, he threw his support behind Hillary Clinton, saying that opposing Trump was the "moral and ethical choice," even if she were elected in his stead²⁰⁵.

²⁰³ http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/27/magazine/glenn-beck-is-sorry-about-all-that.html?_r=0

²⁰⁴ <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/11/opinion/glenn-beck-dont-move-to-canada-talk-to-the-other-side.html>

²⁰⁵ <http://edition.cnn.com/2016/10/11/politics/glenn-beck-hillary-clinton-moral-ethical-choice/>

Oh, and he's *obsessed* with me. He has, in various episodes on his sadly declining radio show, called me a "13-year old boy"²⁰⁶ and a "Goebbels" whose writings are "poison to the Republic."²⁰⁷ Poison to the Republic? I don't know. Poison to his ratings, maybe!

There's a reason why conservatives like Shapiro and Beck, who were once the best the movement had to offer, now represent the past, while people like me represent the future. That reason is simple -- they've spent the last decade losing to the left -- and conservatives were tired of losing.

I don't mean electoral defeats, either, although Mitt Romney's loss in 2012 could easily have been avoided by nominating a candidate that conjured up a compelling vision of America, and not a compelling vision of your high school principal. No, conservatives lost in arenas that were more important than electoral politics -- they lost academia, they lost Hollywood, they lost art, they lost music. As Andrew Breitbart famously said, politics is downstream from culture. Despite momentary political victories, the values spread by Hollywood eventually influence the ballots cast in voting booths. Conservatives lost culture, and until we win it back our political victories will only be temporary setbacks against the steady advance of leftist values.

Actually, they didn't simply lose the culture war. It's worse than that. The truth is, they never even bothered to fight.

The Culture War That Conservatism Forgot

Aside from beleaguered conservative student activists on campus, there has been no serious attempt from national-level politicians to push back against the liberal dominance of

²⁰⁶ <http://www.mediaite.com/online/glenn-beck-milo-yiannopoulos-is-a-hurt-13-year-old-boy-and-a-bully/>

²⁰⁷ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2016/03/28/glenn-beck-breitbart-milo-yiannopoulos-goebbels-his-evil-trump-twitter-defense-poison-to-the-republic/>

universities. The Foundation For Individual Rights In Education (FIRE), which campus conservatives rely on to protect their free speech, does an excellent job fighting the worst excesses of left-wing censorship on campus. Yet the group was set up and is run by moderate liberals.

Heterodox Academy, a group of academics pushing for more political diversity in the social sciences, is spearheaded by Steven Pinker and Jonathan Haidt -- also both liberals. It's not a bad thing that there are some liberals who still care about free speech and pluralism, but why are we letting liberals do the heavy lifting? Where are all the conservatives? With the exception of a few news sites like Campus Reform and The College Fix, It's almost as if they don't care.

Indeed, the few establishment conservatives who *do* care about campus issues -- and attract huge online followings of young people in doing so -- privately admit that their success is met with bemusement by fellow beltway conservatives who wonder what the fuss is about and why more people aren't interested in the latest appropriations bill or Russian naval maneuvers in the North Sea. Young conservatives, who are on the front lines of leftist intolerance every day, understandably have a different view.

It's the same in showbiz. Conservatives in Hollywood currently live an existence approximating dissidents in the Soviet Union -- a few brave souls are raising their voices, but most keep their heads down due to the overwhelming dominance of progressives in the industry. A conservative in showbiz is like a gazelle in a pack of lions; only the nimblest will escape unscathed. People like Clint Eastwood, whose record of success makes him untouchable, and Adam Baldwin, whose conservative views fit with the tough-guy persona he often plays on screen. (Having hung out a lot with Baldwin, I'm still not sure if he's not just method-acting all

his characters, all the time.) The rest have to wear lion suits and purr convincingly at feminists and Black Lives Matter activists.

Conservatives should pay attention to beleaguered pockets of resistance in culture and entertainment, like the conservative and libertarian authors of sci-fi and fantasy novels, Theodore “Vox Day” Beale, *Monster Hunter* author Larry Correia and others. Like the gamers of GamerGate, they’ve done an admirable job of fighting back in an industry otherwise dominated by leftists. For two years running, they’ve caused mayhem at sci-fi’s Hugo Awards, disrupting the progressive voting blocs that used to dominate the awards with their own bloc²⁰⁸. In doing so, they’ve created a means for otherwise-isolated conservative sci-fi and fantasy authors to band together.

All of this is a result of conservative laziness. For years, the only prominent right-winger who made an effort to organize the conservative Hollywood underground was Andrew Breitbart, a man despised by the beltway establishment. Isn’t it funny how successful conservative culture warriors always end up making enemies of the D.C. establishment? It’s almost as if they agree with leftists on everything except economics and foreign policy!

Unsurprisingly, it took the rise of Trump to give the cultural conservative underground the courage to come out into the open. I was overjoyed when Kanye West, one of my idols, came out as a Trump supporter after the election (this was promptly linked to his alleged mental health problems by Trump-hater Perez Hilton²⁰⁹). And at the 2017 Grammys, when previously unknown singer-songwriter Joy Villa shocked attendees by wearing a dress bearing the words “TRUMP” and “MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN,” she saw her album sales rise by

²⁰⁸ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-hollywood/2016/04/26/sci-fis-hugo-awards-swept-anti-sjw-authors/>

²⁰⁹ <http://perezhilton.com/2016-11-22-kanye-west-psychiatric-evaluation-breakdown-report#.WKMfnVWLTIU>

54,350,100 percent²¹⁰, proving that conservatism in showbiz could in fact be the opposite of career-ending. Of course, there's a long way to go yet: for every Joy Villa there's a Sarah Silverman, a woman who mistakes road construction symbols for swastikas²¹¹ who reacted to news of this novel with "YUCK AND BOO AND GROSS." And for every Kanye West, there's an Amy Schumer, who thinks anyone who isn't a feminist is "insane."²¹² Nevertheless, the new courage I'm seeing from conservative entertainers and celebrities in the wake of Trump's victory gives me courage that things will change, albeit without the help of beltway conservatives.

Stuffy beltway types really don't know what to do with me. I've introduced a brand new type of conservative to them. Listen, not everyone in the conservative movement is going to be cool and hip. But at least let's aim to attract new members who still have both of their hips.

Could it be that establishment conservatives want to lose? It's easy to see why "cuck" became such a popular insult in 2016.²¹³ It's a byword for needlessly relinquished manliness, for selling out and caving in. The original meaning of watching your partner getting slammed by another dude now simply means abandoned principles and a lack of backbone. It's a quick way to denote a beta male or coward. (See: the Republicans running against Donald Trump in the 2016 election.)

And just look at how young conservatives flock to the people who speak their language. Ask a dozen social-media savvy teens who they respect more: the editor of *National Review*, or the meme-spewing viral comedian Sam Hyde, and I guarantee Hyde will win every time. Look at Malik Obama, the former President's estranged Trump-supporting Kenyan brother. Previously

²¹⁰ <http://www.dailywire.com/news/13420/joy-villas-album-sales-rise-54350100-joseph-curl#>

²¹¹ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-hollywood/2017/02/13/sarah-silverman-mistakes-construction-markings-for-swastikas/>

²¹² <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-37291210>

²¹³ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/07/28/cuckervative-is-a-gloriously-effective-insult-that-should-not-be-slurred-demonised-or-ridiculed/>

unknown, he now has a massive following on social media. And how did he get it? Well, just look at his Twitter feed. It's pure memes, all day, every day²¹⁴.

Other legends of web culture could teach conservatives a thing or two about how to beat the left. Godfrey Elfwick is the pseudonym of a brilliant British troll who portrays an exaggerated satire of a social justice warrior on Twitter, complete with a bio that describes himself as a "genderqueer Muslim atheist." For nearly three years now, he has almost never broken character, and his persona has fooled many an onlooker – including the BBC, who invited him on the radio to explain why Star Wars is racist and sexist²¹⁵. Acts of high-impact trolling like Elfwick's, which expose the left through ridicule, are more likely to turn heads and change minds than the most brilliant column in a conservative weekly.

As well as missing opportunities to beat the left in winnable fights, conservatives have done virtually nothing to lay down deeper roots in high culture. Besides a few investments from David Koch and *The Spectator's* arts section, what is there really? It's no match for the myriad of leftist and government-run foundations that fund concerts, film and comedy festivals, art shows. They provide grants and funding to eager young creators, who are more than happy to pander to fashionable progressive values if it means getting the money to get ahead. A search for "race," "gender," or "diversity" on the website of Grantmakers in the Arts, the umbrella group for private arts funding organizations in the U.S, returns opportunities that look like *Salon* articles²¹⁶. (Are you aware that members of theater community experience "injury every day

²¹⁴ <https://twitter.com/ObamaMalik>

²¹⁵ <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2015/04/17/star-wars-reeks-of-misogyny-sjw-satirist-punks-bbc-world-service/>

²¹⁶ <http://www.giarts.org/>

from being marginalized”? Do you want a “Radical guide to fighting discrimination in the arts?” Grantmakers in the Arts have you covered.²¹⁷)

The efforts of Lucian Wintrich, the gay Trump-supporting photographer responsible for the “Twinks for Trump” photo series and the “Daddy Will Save Us” art exhibit, show how profoundly hostile the art world has become to conservative values. As well as being fired from his job at a New York ad agency after “Twinks for Trump,” Wintrich also faced expulsion from a Pierogi art gallery and legal threats from the venue owner when he attempted to host his pro-Trump art show at the gallery. Thanks to conservative complacency, the art world today is a one-party state.²¹⁸

The kids and teens who idolize left-wing pop stars, watch movies made by left-wing film directors and produced by left-wing film studios, and laugh at the jokes of left-wing comedians grow up to be -- surprise! -- left-wing voters. This cannot continue.

(Incidentally, this isn't an argument for obsessive representation of all kinds on screen. Black kids and lesbian kids and disabled kids don't need to see themselves on screen so much as they need to be exposed to a wide variety of *ideas*. Diversity of skin color is nothing compared to diversity of opinion, and the idea that people can't identify with movie or video game characters because they don't have the same race or gender is a ludicrous invention of the progressive left.)

Conservatives need to realize that they will continue to be beaten by the left if they keep ignoring the importance of culture. They need to spend less time obsessing over the Pentagon, and more on the National Endowment for the Arts. Only then will the left-wing stranglehold on culture be beaten.

²¹⁷ <http://www.giarts.org/blog/steve/your-radical-guide-fighting-discrimination-arts>
<http://www.giarts.org/article/more-equitable-world-because-theatre>

²¹⁸ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/08/29/twinks-for-trump-photographer-fired-after-being-praised-by-milo/>

I don't think the Endowment ought to be disbanded completely, as some conservatives urge, as art, museums and theatre are all important parts of America's heritage, but its focus should be on supporting great American artists, not meeting diversity quotas and pandering to progressives. And if that can't realistically be done given the political biases of the art world, then yeah: Just get rid of it for a while.

It's not as difficult as it may seem. Over the past decade, political correctness in culture has grown to the point where even left-wing creatives are feeling its stifling effect on free expression. Liberal comedians like Chris Rock and Jerry Seinfeld now refuse to perform to college audiences, who they say have become too sensitive for their comedy routines, even though they aren't remotely right-wing. If conservatives make a serious effort to get back into the culture wars, they will find no shortage of grateful artists and creators eager to throw off the chains of political correctness.

On the other hand, political correctness isn't just confined to the left.

The Political Correctness of the Right

I'm an ardent Zionist, and it isn't just because I have a thing for tanned, muscular IDF men with big guns. I'm ethnically Jewish on my mother's side, and in my younger days I could be spotted on BBC appearances sporting a full-on Jewfro.

My Jewish ancestry is another reason for me to personally oppose the migration of millions of Muslims, many of whom are as anti-semitic as they are homophobic. Rising anti-semitism in the Muslim world is another reason why I also feel strongly about the need for a strong, secure refuge for Jews in the state of Israel.

Another thing I feel strongly about is free speech and the freedom to tell jokes. Alas, some of my peers on the conservative right don't feel the same way.

I was baffled when in 2016, conservative commentators suddenly became preoccupied with the allegedly nefarious threat to the Jewish community posed by a couple hundred internet nobodies who were posting offensive memes on social media. I am of course referring to the alt-right -- or at least, their shitposting, memester batallions, for whom breaking taboos is less about advancing white nationalist ideology as it is about the fun of watching the outraged reactions of their elders.

Jewish advocacy organizations, fueled by an alt-right panic ginned up by the likes of *National Review*, *The Daily Beast* and, eventually, the Clinton campaign, went so far as to declare war on memes. I'm not joking. Two months before the election, the Anti-Defamation League, a venerable, respected name in the fight against anti-semitism, nearly torpedoed their own credibility by declaring the internet meme Pepe the Frog a "hate symbol."

Pepe, for the uninitiated, is a cartoon frog that became an object of fascination for the young architects of web culture who anonymously populate the underbelly of the internet. Initially, Pepe was just a "reaction image" -- there was sad Pepe, smug Pepe, and happy Pepe. Over time however, the frog was remixed in more subtle ways, the way all memes draw variations -- mockingly "rare" pepes in the style of glittery collectible cards, pepes themed on the Egyptian frog-god "Kek" (the word "Kek," incidentally, is another internet meme, which I won't explain here. My dictionary of memes will be released later. Suffice to say, the world wide web is a strange, even *magical* place.)

Then came the political Pepes -- Pepe as Donald Trump, Pepe in a MAGA hat, Pepe as Vladimir Putin, and the more provocative, alt-right Pepes in Nazi uniforms and white

supremacist tattoos. These were the ones that started the media feeding frenzy, much to the delight of the trolls that used them.

I won't make excuses for anti-semitic memes, particularly when they come from genuine Neo-Nazis. These sad specimens, consigned to a few irrelevant blogs like the Daily Stormer, declared a "holy crusade" against me in late 2016. Unlike the ADL I find this laughable rather than threatening -- I don't have anything to fear from these people, especially not from the Stormer's editor, Andrew Anglin, who I am told stands a mere 5'2 tall. Anglin is, to borrow a line from Star Wars, a little short for a stormtrooper.

I will, however, defend their right to speak and post freely on the internet, even on social media, without the threat of being banned. The best antidote to silly, pathetic hatred is to defeat it publicly, not push it into the shadows where it will fester and grow. This is something that leftists, and a worrying number of establishment conservatives, simply don't understand. They worry that the more people see Neo-Nazis, the more they'll be persuaded. I have a sunnier view of human nature, and human reason.

I have no argument with those who want to condemn the Stormers and their ilk. But I do have an argument with those who lump everyone who uses offensive memes in with them, as part of the same "basket of deplorables" (to quote Hillary Clinton's much-derided campaign term for Trump supporters). Because as Allum Bokhari and I highlighted in our widely cited article on the alt-right, many of the people using offensive memes aren't genuine Nazis at all, but provocateurs and trolls. They don't want to destroy multicultural societies or restore racial hierarchies. They just want to raise hell and smash taboos. From our article:

Ironically, they're drawn to the alt-right for the same reason that young Baby Boomers were drawn to the New Left in the 1960s: because it promises fun, transgression, and a challenge to social norms [their generation]just doesn't understand.

Just as the kids of the 60s shocked their parents with promiscuity, long hair and rock'n'roll, so too do the alt-right's young meme brigades shock older generations with outrageous caricatures, from the Jewish "Shlomo Shekelburg" to "Remove Kebab," an internet in-joke about the Bosnian genocide. These caricatures are often spliced together with Millennial pop culture references, from old 4chan memes like Pepe the frog, to anime and My Little Pony references.

Are they actually bigots? No more than death metal devotees in the 80s were actually Satanists. For them, it's simply a means to fluster their grandparents. Currently, the Grandfather-in-Chief is Republican consultant Rick Wilson, who attracted the attention of this group on Twitter after attacking them as "childless single men who jerk off to anime."

Responding in kind, they proceeded to unleash all the weapons of mass trolling that anonymous subcultures are notorious for — and brilliant at. From digging up the most embarrassing parts of his family's internet history to ordering unwanted pizzas to his house and bombarding his feed with anime and Nazi propoganda, the alt-right's meme team, in typically juvenile but undeniably hysterical fashion, revealed their true motivations: not racism, the restoration of monarchy or traditional gender roles, but lulz.

Even I will admit these kids sometimes go too far, and that not all the taboos they want to break are in need of destroying. There is a reason why anti-semitism and racism are not

acceptable, and never should be. But the response of the establishment right, chillingly familiar in tone and character to the career-destroying mobs of the SJWs, is worse. These are, after all, kids -- they don't deserve to have their lives and careers destroyed because they posted dangerous memes or flirted with dangerous ideas on the internet.

If you're expecting a tearful nod to the awful plight of rich DC consultants and professional gender activists on account of the mean, mean, mean words they sometimes read on the internet, you've come to the wrong place. Get a grip, snowflakes. It's words on a screen.

The internet is a melting pot of wacky and beyond-the-pale personalities, norms, and memes, which naturally attracts the millennial generation's most rebellious and adventurous souls. This is the generation, after all, that helped bring down dictatorships during the Arab Spring armed with nothing but Guy Fawkes masks, anonymous online message boards, and computing know-how. Indeed, it doesn't do these young people justice to simply rebut the establishment's misguided allegations of retrograde racism. These people aren't just not-racists, they're among the best and brightest of their generation -- talented, creative, and funny. Conservatives should be embracing them, not pushing them away -- and certainly not ruining their careers.

No one's life is ruined by bitchy messages on a computer screen.

But that's the implication of the arguments of people like Ben Shapiro, who openly said that "racists ought to lose their jobs." If that sounds reasonable to you, keep in mind that he doesn't see a difference between the people I just mentioned and the likes of Andrew Anglin. This is a slippery slope. If we keep the definition of racism and bigotry as broad as Shapiro wants it to be, progressives will widen the net until it includes people like Brendan Eich, the

Mozilla CEO who was forced to resign because he donated to a campaign against gay marriage in 2008 – a year when even Barack Obama was still officially opposed to gay marriage.

Well I disagree. This, in my view, is nothing more than the political correctness of the right. Just like the political correctness of the left, it deliberately ignores context, treating an offensive meme posted by a Daily Stormer Nazi and a harmless hellraiser from 4chan as just the same, without pausing to examine the motives and values of the individual. Like the left's political correctness, is it is collectivist and reductive in its logic. Like the left's political correctness, it will destroy the lives of innocent people if it goes unchecked. And of course, like the left's political correctness, we must fight against it until it dies.

And can I just say that the cause of Israel is not helped by hysterical conservatives and mainstream media outlets comparing the slogan "America First" to Charles Lindbergh-style isolationism²¹⁹. Nor is the fight against anti-semitism helped by people like Bill Kristol playing into *Daily Stormer* talking points by suggesting that America's white working class should be replaced by immigrants ("I hope this thing isn't being video taped or every shown anywhere" said Kristol as he made the comment – which was of course videotaped). I'm a staunch defender of Israel and an opponent of anti-semitism. I have no doubt Kristol is too. But unlike him, I'm not making things worse²²⁰.

Debate Club Conservatives

"Donald Trump isn't a *gentleman*." "He's so *vulgar*." "I have to cover my kids' *ears*."

There's something noble about trying to preserve the standards of decorum that existed prior to

²¹⁹ <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/america-policy-echoes-group-opposed-fighting-nazis-article-1.2951883>

²²⁰ <http://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2017/02/bill-kristol-white-working-class-replaced-immigrants-video/>

the 1960s, where a single swear word at home could lead to a week of being grounded, and a boycott campaign if said on TV or the radio. And if you're a conservative over 65, that worldview is completely understandable.

If you're under 40, however, it's likely that you fall into the unfortunate, slightly laughable group that I call "debate club conservatives." And it's time to snap out of it.

If you don't have the stomach to do what it takes to win, chances are you're going to lose. And that's exactly what Debate Club Conservatives did when faced with Donald Trump. Again and again, the Republican candidates tried to convince their base that they shouldn't vote for Trump because, well, he was just so *unkind*. And again and again, voters didn't listen.

"The man is a pathological liar ... a bully ... a narcissist at a level I don't think this country has ever seen," said Ted Cruz in May. Republicans voted for Trump.

"Seriously, what's this guy's problem?" Jeb Bush allegedly told a donor in August. "He's a buffoon.... A clown... An Asshole." Republicans voted for the buffoon, the clown, the asshole.

"I will not vote for a nominee that has behaved in a manner that reflects so poorly on our country" said John Kasich, long after his inevitable primary defeat. "Our country deserves better." Republican voters didn't think so.

The *American Conservative's* lament that the "graceful, dignified" Jeb Bush had been beaten by the tactics of a man who "lacks character" sums up the attitude of Debate Club Conservatives to elections, and to contests in general: it's better to lose with dignity than to win without it. In the Republican primaries, they mostly got their wish, although Jeb Bush's entreaties for audiences to "please clap" for him were anything but dignified.

In the general election, the obsession with winning with dignity is what gave rise to the "Never Trump" movement and their absurd candidate, former whatshisname and current nobody

Evan McMullin. One could well argue that the whole purpose of Evan McMullin was to *lose* with dignity.

The conservative sense of fair play is disastrous when it comes to fighting the Democrats. Elections are not college debates, no matter how much Ted Cruz might wish it so. They are not fought with facts and opinions, but with sloganeering, media spin, opposition research, and other forms of cloak-and-dagger tactics. In politics, victory goes to those with cunning, mettle and deviousness, not those who have facts and principles on their side. It *helps* to have facts and principles on your side (as conservatives usually do), but they aren't enough to win.

There's another reason why the debate club attitude is so damaging to the conservative movement: most people aren't political obsessives. They don't care about your 14-point refutation of Obamacare. They don't care about the intricacies of the Laffer Curve. They don't have the time to listen to a 30-minute string of irrefutable arguments. They want to hear things that relate to their own experiences, not abstract policy debates.

One comment from Ben Shapiro, made on the Dave Rubin Show in February 2016, sums up this conservative myopia.

“The problem with Trump is he fails to distinguish political incorrectness from just being a jackass ... There's a difference between being rude and being politically incorrect. Being rude is telling Megyn Kelly she's bleeding from her wherever. Being politically incorrect is saying some immigrants coming across our southern border are criminals. That's politically incorrect but it's not rude.”

Shapiro is thinking of a world where only politics matter. To him, political correctness is a problem because it suppresses *facts* that are relevant to current affairs -- and that's it. But for most other people, the stultifying rules of political correctness go far beyond the suppression of

facts -- it's the suppression of jokes, it's the suppression of banter, and yes, it's also the suppression of rudeness. Political correctness is a problem because it interrupts everyday human experiences, threatening to turn every single personal matter into a public one. You can no longer slip up in conversation without worrying if the person you're talking to is going to tell the whole world what you said, potentially ruining your life forever if you violated a particularly sacred taboo. The internet's erosion of privacy with the resurgence of politically correct taboos is a terrifying combination. That's why so many people were drawn to Trump.

Debate club conservatives don't understand this because they think politics is, well, a debate club. In their imagined political ideal, elections would be fought issue-by-issue, with each candidate presenting their arguments on foreign and domestic policy in neat little 30 minute segments. In reality, politics doesn't work like that -- and if it did, voter turnout would be in crisis.

There's perhaps no better example of debate club conservatives being outplayed by aggressive hellraisers than the replacement of Megyn Kelly, formerly the face of Fox News, with Tucker Carlson. Kelly, now at NBC, is a milquetoast moderate conservative who, during the election campaign, attracted attention for playing the resident feminist, attacking Donald Trump for making demeaning comments about women. Carlson is a Trump-friendly warrior of the airwaves who lives to skewer progressives in front of a national audience. In his first week, Carlson ended up almost doubling Kelly's ratings, including a 45-percent increase in the all-important 25-54 age demographic²²¹. His show is great. Fox News has provided the roadmap for conservative media organizations seeking to rescue themselves from decline: just bring in someone who isn't a total cuck.

²²¹ <http://ijr.com/2017/01/778808-fox-hoped-tucker-carlson-could-live-up-to-megyn-kellys-popularity-now-the-ratings-are-in/>

I understand that it must be impossibly frustrating for conservatives, who constantly see their values eroded despite (usually) having all the facts on their side. But it's time to wake up. Politics isn't won by commanding the facts, but by connecting with people's experiences. That's why it's so important for conservatives re-engage with culture and entertainment, which are the commanding heights of peoples' experiences in the modern world. All our brilliant political victories will come to an end if we don't win the culture. Indeed, the fact that Donald Trump's signature election promise – enforcing immigration laws – was seen as so controversial is a testament to how well progressives have ingrained their values in our culture. As recently as the 1990s, such a suggestion was uncontroversial. This is how progressives manage to keep winning the battle for America's soul, despite temporary setbacks on election day.

And that's why, in a society increasingly frustrated by political correctness, conservatives need to grit their teeth and come to terms with the necessity of gauche, bragging provocateurs like me -- and Donald Trump.

Bringing Conservatism Together

I'll be the first to admit that we need Debate Club conservatives. It is immensely valuable that we have people who can utterly dominate the left in an argument -- just compare the power and rigor of a George Will column with a Jessica Valenti one. The strongest mind on the left today is probably Slavoj Žižek -- and he supported Trump over Clinton! When the public ignores the left's entreaties not to watch or read or listen to conservatives because of their "bigotry," it's rare for them not to be swayed by our arguments.

But arguments aren't enough. We can't let the left continue to dominate culture, entertainment, and the norms of everyday language itself and expect to win elections. We can't

hope that every member of the public will see through the left's lies and eventually discover George Will's columns at the *Washington Post*. Much of conservatism is kept hidden from the public, especially in institutions like schools and colleges, where young people are figuring out who they are and what their values are.

As Ann Coulter said, there will be a time for elegant, polite, Mitt Romney conservatives once we've saved America from the leftists²²². But until that happens, we need our brawlers and our fighters. Whether establishment conservatives like it or not, the culture war will be won by men like Steve Bannon and Donald Trump, who use straightforward language and never apologize.

One man who has long understood what Republicans need to do in order to win is Roger Stone. A legendary political operative known for pulling dirty tricks, he has been variously described as "henchman," a "hit man" and a master of the "dark arts" – sometimes in the same article²²³. Although he made his career in the Nixon administration, Stone has been backing anti-establishment figures for decades, including Ronald Reagan in 1976 and Donald Trump in 2016. Stone knows how to pick a winner, and given that he named me on his 2016 "best dressed list," it's clear the man has good taste in more than just political candidates.

We also need all our attention focused on conservative, issues, not leftist ones. We need to stop following the agenda of the Daily Beast and the New York Times. Let the left worry about insignificant "threats" like Pepe the Frog and the six-or-so remaining Klansmen in America. We need to be turning our attention to issues that the left either doesn't care about, or doesn't want us to notice -- like their domination of academia and pop culture. Until we make serious progress on those fronts, everything else is just noise.

²²² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=or8zp-rLXkl>

²²³ <http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2016/07/roger-stone-donald-trumps-hit-man>

Politics is more complicated than assembling facts and writing good arguments. It's a brutal battle for the attention of the public, and always has been, even before the era of Donald Trump. That's why fabulous, irrepressible faggots like myself, so original and compelling compared to the 45339th copycat leftist celebrity in a colorful outfit, are so perturbing to the left. Much as it might irk debate club conservatives, politics is showbiz today -- and if we want to win, there will need to be more people like me in the future.

There is a blessing for the establishment here. By focusing attention on provocateurs like me, it gives breathing space to everyone else to develop their arguments and present them to the public without censure. After an encounter with a force of pure irreverence like me, a George Will column must seem like a nice break!

The left would like to shut the Overton Window and push conservatives out of public view altogether. Ironically, establishment Republicans would like to do the same. Before I arrived on the scene, they were seriously close to succeeding. Even consummate moderates like the libertarian columnist Cathy Young were being banned from campuses.

That's how the left fights. They take control of culture, and use it to smear even moderate conservatives as racists, sexists, and bigots. By the time America's youth reach college-age, a significant proportion of them are frothing at the mouth, desperate to suppress conservatism, which they believe to be synonymous with bigotry. When they reach that point, there is no hope of them listening to our arguments, no matter how good they are.

That's why this civil war has to end. Conservatism needs its great thinkers and its brilliant minds, to persuade voters who are already open-minded. But we also need provocateurs and clowns, to grab the attention and challenge the biases of those who don't want to be challenged.

No movement has ever survived with just moderates and intellectuals, and no movement has ever survived with just hell-raisers.

If we want to win, we need both.

WHY MUSLIMS HATE ME

Sometimes interviewers ask me, a bit furtively, about a guy I used to live with who had a Muslim-sounding name. They're nervous about pushing too hard because they think questioning a gay person about his private life is somehow homophobic, even if there's obviously public interest or it might expose hypocrisy.²²⁴

It's true. I did. For a really long time!

This chapter explains why I don't any more.

* * *

First of all, I'd hate to be thrown off a roof.

In the summer of 2015, Europe opened its doors to millions of people who would very much like to kill me -- and, most likely, you too, even if you delete your search history and don't think people know what videos you're watching. After a viral picture of a drowned Syrian mboy pulled at the heartstrings of liberals, globalist elites like Angela Merkel exploited a moment of global sympathy to do what they'd been longing to do for some time -- lower the drawbridge of an entire continent, welcome millions of Muslim migrants, and move another step closer to the project of eliminating national borders, a project that was until then best represented by the European Union.

²²⁴ <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/10/30/apple-ceo-tim-cook-comes-out-as-gay-fine-now-can-we-start-reporting-on-him-properly/>

The implicit message from the media was clear *all* the migrants were just like the drowned boy; innocents fleeing oppression, hunger and death in war-torn Syria. In reality, fewer than half of the people admitted to Europe in the months following the viral photo were from Syria²²⁵. Most weren't refugees at all: they were economic migrants, from regions of the world even more radical than the country that currently hosts the Islamic State. And they certainly weren't boys.

The globalist media and political elites sought to extend the rare moment of pro-migrant sentiment for as long as possible. Journalists flocked to German train stations to take pictures of teary-eyed liberals hugging the smirking new arrivals, and holding placards stating "refugees welcome."

Over a million Muslims poured into the Mediterranean to cross into Europe.

It only took a few months for the leftist dream to turn into a nightmare. On New Year's Eve 2015, as one current year turned into another, the new arrivals introduced Germany to Muslim misogyny. An estimated 2,000 migrants, acting in gangs, unleashed *taharrush gamea* - an Arab word meaning collective sexual harassment - on German women returning from and attending the New Year's celebrations.

The attacks took place mainly in the city of Cologne, but soon reports were heard from cities across Germany - Hamburg, Frankfurt, Dortmund, Düsseldorf, and Stuttgart were all affected in the worst night of sexual assaults in Germany since the Red Army's invasion. By the night's end, police estimated that at least 1,200 women had been groped or otherwise sexually assaulted, including at least five rapes²²⁶.

²²⁵ <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3240010/Number-refugees-arriving-Europe-soars-85-year-just-one-five-war-torn-Syria.html>

²²⁶ https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/07/10/leaked-document-says-2000-men-allegedly-assaulted-1200-german-women-on-new-years-eve/?utm_term=.e4a508573a0a

Germany was not alone. Sweden, which welcomed more than 140,000 migrants during the crisis, also found itself beset by sexual assaults. A report from the Gatestone Institute referred to a “Summer Inferno of Sexual Assault” in Sweden which had largely been suppressed by the police and the media²²⁷. Analyzing Swedish crime data, the report found a particular surge in reports of group sexual assaults on young girls aged 14-15. Virtually all of the attackers apprehended by the police were citizens of Afghanistan, Eritrea, or Somalia -- three of the four largest refugee groups in Sweden. Thanks to Muslim immigration, Sweden now has rape statistics that actually do come close to what feminists claim.

But the rapes were just the beginning.

Next came the murders.

On the 22nd of March, 2016, two bombs exploded in Brussels Airport, killing 13. An hour later, another explosion went off in the town of Maelbeek, killing 20. The attack’s mastermind, who also planned the November 2015 Paris attacks, was a man called Abdelhamid Abaaoud, a Belgian native who had travelled to Syria to fight for the Islamic State before returning to Europe at some point during the refugee crisis.

European states suspected of letting him pass through their borders on his return to Belgium immediately issued flustered denials²²⁸. But the truth is, no-one was looking that closely at the streams of migrants flooding across the continent’s borders.

Abaaoud’s attacks, encouraged by the Islamic State, inspired a string of copycat strikes in Europe’s summer of terror. One month later, a police officer and his wife were stabbed in Magnanville, France, by Larossi Abballa, acting on the orders of ISIS. One month after that, on

<https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/2523332/migrants-sexually-assault-14-women-and-1000-strong-gang-throw-fireworks-at-police-as-chaos-hits-nye-events-across-germany-despite-heightened-security/>

²²⁷ <https://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/8579/sweden-sexual-assaults>

²²⁸ <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/reuters/article-3325789/No-evidence-Paris-attack-mastermind-Greece-Greek-official.html>

Bastille Day, a Muslim driving a 19-tonne truck ploughed through celebrating crowds on the Promenade des Anglais in Nice, France. 86 people were killed, and more than 400 were injured.

Two weeks after Nice, Germany was hit by a stabbing in Würzburg and then, a week later, a suicide bombing in the town of Ansbach, both at the hands of Islamists.

Two days after Ansbach, Islamic State terrorists stormed a Catholic church in Normandy, slitting the throat of an 86-year old priest before taking hostages before French anti-terrorism police shot both terrorists and rescued the remaining hostages. Ten days later, in Charleroi, Belgium a man attacked police officers with a machete while shouting “Allahu Akhbar.” One month after that, two police officers in Molenbreek, Belgium were stabbed by a migrant, also shouting “Allahu Akhbar.”

Three more ISIS-motivated stabbings would take place before the year’s end: in Rimini, Italy, in Scharbeek, Belgium, and in Cologne, Germany.

The United States, of course, also faced its own terror attack in 2016. The Orlando shootings, the most deadly terrorist attack on American soil since 9/11, and the deadliest act of homophobic hate in the country’s history.

I spoke outside Pulse nightclub shortly afterwards about the threat posed to women and gays by Islam, and even though the various online versions of my talk have been viewed millions of times, not a single cable or broadcast channel chose to show any of it.²²⁹

I often call myself a “warning from Europe.” I don’t want America to make the same mistakes we did, or Omar Mateen will be just the beginning. In Europe, they now have to hand out flyers to incoming migrants explaining why groping women and bashing gays is bad²³⁰.

²²⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xLqkiz>

²³⁰ <http://www.spiked-online.com/newsite/article/why-is-europe-giving-muslim-migrants-sex-ed-lessons/17939#.WDMUy9WLTIU>

If America opened its doors to Islamic migrants as Europe did, it would face a similar catastrophe, if not worse.

It is a uniquely American trait that your country has relied on foreigners to take the true stock of American culture. Before I was saying America can be Great Again with Trump, it took a Frenchman named Alexis de Tocqueville to document the miracle of American democracy in his 1835 book “Democracy in America.”

I share something else with de Tocqueville: he was also a critic of Islam. He was right about America, and he was right about Islam when he said, “I studied the Quran a great deal. I came away from that study with the conviction there have been few religions in the world as deadly to men as that of Muhammad.” Those are not my words. Those are de Tocqueville’s.

In electing Donald Trump, America may have saved itself. I hope that he follows through on his pledge to freeze Muslim immigration as soon as possible. Naturally, he was attacked as a racist and a bigot throughout the campaign, both by Merkel-like establishment conservatives and by the American left. But such behavior doesn’t really surprise me anymore.

The left has been selling out to Islam for years.

Islam and the Left

During my college talks, I’m often asked what arguments to use when debating with the regressive left. I always have the same answer: Islam.

There is nothing else which better exposes the modern left’s rank hypocrisy, their disregard for the facts, and their hatred for the West and its values than their attitude to Islam. Every noble value that the left claims to uphold, from rights for women to gay liberation, even

diversity itself dies on the altar of its sycophantic defense of Islam, despite many of its current repressive practices.

The twentieth century saw liberalism do battle with totalitarian ideologies of every stripe, from fascism to Bolshevik communism. Both of those ideologies inspired their own radical devotees, their own revolutions, and their own massacres, causing untold suffering around the world. Yet even those ideologies did not inspire the same kind of grim fanaticism we have seen with the rise of radical Islam, which tells its followers that the atrocities they commit are sanctioned by a higher power.

Marx once called religion the “opium of the masses,” deluding its followers into abandoning their own interests in service of an otherworldly power. If you look exclusively at their attitude to Christianity, you might think that the left still believes in this message. The progressive left’s comedians and columnists never miss an opportunity to belittle and denigrate the people who still cling to “Bibles and guns,” even though the worst offense of conservative Christians these days is to be picky about who they bake wedding cakes and pizzas for.

Their critique of religion, which animated a range of brilliant thinkers from Bertrand Russell to Bill Maher, has singularly failed to tackle the problem of Islam. Maher, Sam Harris, Richard Dawkins and Christopher Hitchens have all been frustrated by this question: Why is the left refusing to lift a finger against the most radical, dangerous, socially conservative and oppressive religion on earth?

The Muslim reformer Maajid Nawaz coined the term “regressive left” to describe the identity-obsessed leftists who defend a religious minority at the expense of, well, every other minority. Sam Harris sums up the backwards attitude of this group with his characteristic clarity.

These people are part of what Maajid Nawaz has termed the “regressive Left”—pseudo-liberals who are so blinded by identity politics that they reliably take the side of a backward mob over one of its victims. Rather than protect individual women, apostates, intellectuals, cartoonists, novelists, and true liberals from the intolerance of religious imbeciles, they protect theocrats from criticism.²³¹

Examples of this behavior are not hard to find. Indeed, the problem is less finding examples than picking the best ones to use. Every month seems to bring a new outrage, each more eye-popping than the last.

Take the aftermath of the gruesome assault on the offices of *Charlie Hebdo* in Paris, a rare example of a leftist newspaper that understood radical Islam to be a force of the radical religious right -- actually, that’s too mild, it’s really the radical *medieval* religious right.

Now I know members of the radical Christian right in the United States, and they are scary. But nowhere near as scary as Islamic terrorists. They may believe I’m going to burn in eternal hellfire, but they aren’t in a rush to send me there personally.

Charlie Hebdo had the temerity to stand against religious bullies by publishing cartoons of the Prophet Muhammed. They were one of the few magazines after the Danish cartoons controversy of 2005 to stand on the side of free speech in the face of Muslim riots. They correctly understood that allowing people to intimidate artists and writers by setting cars on fire and threatening violence was the first step on the road to a terrified, censored society.

So they stood with *Jyllands-Posten*, the Danish newspaper that triggered the 2005 controversy with their “blasphemous” drawings, and published their own humorous cartoons of the Prophet Muhammed. On 7 January 2015, 12 employees of the newspaper paid for it with

²³¹ http://www.salon.com/2015/11/25/harris_and_illig_correspondence/

their lives, when two armed Muslim siblings forced their way into *Charlie Hebdo*'s offices in Paris and opened fire.

Charlie Hebdo is a leftist publication. Marxist, in fact. Their opposition to Islam flows from their opposition to the right. They are just as strident in their criticism of the National Front as they are of Islam. I may happen to think the National Front deserves a more nuanced approach, but unlike the rest of the left, I can't fault *Charlie Hebdo* for lacking consistency. They say they oppose bigotry, and they do -- whether they perceive it in the European right or in Islam.

So what did other leftists do when 12 of their comrades were gunned down by religious thugs? Did the old ideal of socialist solidarity finally kick in?

No, of course it didn't.

As most of the civilized world adopted the slogan "Je Suis Charlie," a few leftist columnists refused to relinquish their Islamophilia, even for a moment of mourning.

It only took two days for *The New Yorker* to publish an essay entitled "Unmournable Bodies," attacking *Charlie Hebdo* for "racist and Islamophobic provocations."²³²

Before the month was out, a number of British student unions²³³, including the University of Manchester²³⁴, had banned *Charlie Hebdo* under their "safe space" policies, arguing that it made Muslims students uncomfortable.

It made Muslim students uncomfortable? Well, I'm not sure that's quite in the same league as making non-Muslim cartoonists *dead*. That, in a nutshell, is the modern left for you.

²³² <http://www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/unmournable-bodies>

²³³ <http://www.theweek.co.uk/68699/uk-universities-are-attacking-free-speech-says-report>

²³⁴ <http://mancunion.com/2015/03/05/80-per-cent-of-uk-universities-restrict-free-speech/>

There was no collective display of solidarity from the left-wing literary class either. To an ordinary observer, the fact that the prestigious PEN America literary award for freedom of expression went to *Charlie Hebdo* in 2015 would not be particularly surprising news, much less a moral outrage. Yet 204 members of the organization, including established authors like Joyce Carol Oates, Lorrie Moore and Junot Diaz thought so. They boycotted the awards, signing an open letter condemning *Charlie Hebdo* for making a “marginalized community” feel uncomfortable.

To the section of the French population that is already marginalized, embattled, and victimized, a population that is shaped by the legacy of France’s various colonial enterprises, and that contains a large percentage of devout Muslims, *Charlie Hebdo*’s cartoons of the Prophet must be seen as being intended to cause further humiliation and suffering.²³⁵

What suffering! What horror! Cartoons, published in a newspaper with a minor circulation that Muslims don’t even have to buy if they don’t want to. I’m sure the friends and families of the dead *Charlie Hebdo* cartoonists feel thoroughly ashamed of their loved ones’ actions.

The author Salman Rushdie, who faced an Iran-backed *fatwa* (religious decree) calling on Muslims to murder him in the late 80s for the crime of writing about a forbidden area of Islamic theology, summed up the stance that the boycotters had taken.

The massacre of cartoonists, wrote Rushdie, was a

²³⁵ <https://theintercept.com/2015/04/30/145-pen-writers-thus-far-objected-charlie-hedbo-award-6/>

...hate crime, just as the anti-Semitic attacks sweeping Europe and almost entirely carried out by Muslims are hate crimes. This issue has nothing to do with an oppressed and disadvantaged minority. It has everything to do with the battle against fanatical Islam, which is highly organised, well funded, and which seeks to terrify us all, Muslims as well as non-Muslims, into a cowed silence.

These ... writers have made themselves the fellow travellers of that project. Now they will have the dubious satisfaction of watching PEN tear itself apart in public.²³⁶

The boycott failed, and *Charlie Hebdo* got their award, presented to them by Neil Gaiman, who stepped in after other writers pulled out²³⁷. I have to wonder how he must have felt to see so many of his peers in the left-wing literary establishment choose to attack murdered cartoonists rather than standing against the ideology that created their murderers. Embarrassed for the left, I hope.

This chapter will show that censorship in the name of Islam has been the norm in the west for some time, and that the problem is only getting worse.

Islamic terror is having its desired effect -- frightening the West into silence. A book on the original Mohammed cartoon controversy in 2005 was published by Yale University Press in 2009. The authors' original draft of the book included images of the cartons as well as other depictions of Mohammed. In what was criticized as an assault on academic freedom, Yale

²³⁶ <http://scroll.in/article/723627/salman-rushdie-slams-fellow-writers-for-boycotting-ceremony-to-honour-charlie-hebdo>

²³⁷ <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/may/05/neil-gaiman-pen-award-charlie-hebdo>

University intervened in the YUP's editorial process, submitted the cartoons out of context to external consultants, and published the book without the cartoons²³⁸.

The reaction to the *Charlie Hebdo* shooting is just one example among many of the left's suicidal attitude towards Islam. After every terrorist attack (and there are a lot more of those in the west these days, thanks to Angela Merkel), the response becomes more even more outrageous.

When Paris again fell victim to Islamic terrorism in November 2015, with over 100 slain in a series of attacks masterminded by the Islamic State, Salon.com published the extraordinary headline "*We Brought This On Ourselves: After Paris, It's Time To Square Our "Values" With Our History.*"²³⁹

The article blamed the West "behaving horrifically in the Middle East for decades" for the deaths in Paris. Liberals blaming the West for the terrorist attacks has become depressingly predictable after each new atrocity. In March 2016, after Muslims killed 35 in Brussels, Salon.com allowed the same writer to run virtually the same article under the headline "*We Brought This On Ourselves, And We Are The Terrorists Too.*"²⁴⁰

In a way it's not surprising. The left has always wagged its finger at the West over the foreign policy of success democratically elected governments. It's a tradition that goes back further even than Vietnam; all the way to World War One, in fact, when leftist pacifists urged young men to stay home. Then, at least, they had more of an argument -- why *were* young working-class boys being sent to die for the sake of a collection of treaties in the Balkans?

²³⁸ <https://www.thefire.org/cases/yale-university-censorship-of-mohammed-cartoons-at-yale-university-press/>

²³⁹ http://www.salon.com/2015/11/15/we_brought_this_on_ourselves_after_paris_it_is_time_to_square_our_values_with_our_history/

²⁴⁰ http://www.salon.com/2016/03/27/we_brought_this_on_ourselves_and_we_are_the_terrorists_too/

But somehow I doubt that Bertrand Russell, a fervent opponent of World War One in Britain, would have been quite so peaceable if Islam were a serious threat in his time. An ardent atheist, Russell understood the ideology of Islam far better than today's leftists.

Those who accept Bolshevism become impervious to scientific evidence, and commit intellectual suicide. Even if all the doctrines of Bolshevism were true, this would still be the case, since no unbiased examination of them is tolerated... Among religions, Bolshevism is to be reckoned with Mohammedanism rather than with Christianity and Buddhism. Christianity and Buddhism are primarily personal religions, with mystical doctrines and a love of contemplation. Mohammedanism and Bolshevism are practical, social, unspiritual, concerned to win the empire of the world.²⁴¹

What really cements the left's betrayal of its own values over Islam isn't so much its opposition to wars in the Middle East, but its opposition to liberal Muslim reformers. Perhaps the best example of this is Maajid Nawaz, one of the few moderate Muslims making an effort to drag his religion kicking and screaming into the modern age. For his work combating extremism, supporting interfaith tolerance, and challenging bigotry in the Muslim community, he is rewarded with polite silence from the left at best, and scornful disdain at worst.

New heights of absurdity were scaled in 2016 when the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) added Nawaz to a list of 15 "anti-Muslim extremists." The entire list was ridiculous. It included FGM survivor and women's rights activist Ayaan Hirsi Ali and Islam critics Daniel Pipes, Pamela Geller, and David Horowitz. But the addition of Nawaz, precisely the sort of

²⁴¹ https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Practice_and_Theory_of_Bolshevism/Chapter_I_9

moderate Muslim that anti-bigotry, anti-intolerance groups like the SPLC ought to be encouraging, summed up just how morally bankrupt the left's attitude to Islam has become.²⁴²

Nothing should be off-limits for humor, but you can't even laugh at Islamic terrorists any more without being accused of "Islamophobia." Of all the groups the Left desperately protects, Islam is the most inherently hilarious.

Is there anything more darkly funny than the crybully faux-victimhood of those who worry about "islamophobia" and hijab-pulling in the wake of terror attacks that leave dozens dead?

Is there -- and perhaps this is just my gallows humor -- anything more amusing than a religion so thin-skinned that cartoons designed to provoke it give rise to deadly shootings, as though precisely to prove the point of those French cartoonists?

Is there anything more *preposterous* than the phrase "The Religion of Peace"?

I'm not trying particularly hard here. Because I don't need to. What an indictment of America's supposedly "brave" comedians that not a single one dares to tell a decent joke about Islam on prime-time television.

How to *Really* Fight Bigotry

The left claims it opposes bigotry. Yet Islam, the most bigoted ideology that exists today, is given a pass. And I'm using "the most" on purpose, not only because it's true, but because I want you to remember exactly what the progressive left is so desperate to defend.

²⁴² <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/10/maajid-nawaz-splc-anti-muslim-extremist/505685/>

Here are a few things that Muslims in Britain -- who are often portrayed as one of the more integrated western Muslim communities -- believe.

A Gallup poll of Muslims in the UK found that *not a single Muslim* in the 1,001 people polled thought that homosexuality was morally acceptable.

The same poll found that just 35% of French Muslims and 19% of German Muslims thought homosexuals were morally acceptable.

In my opinion those percentages have probably cratered following Europe's importation of hordes of young Muslim radicals, known affectionately on the continent as "rapefugees." Here are some more numbers specific to British Muslims, from poll carried out by left-wing broadcaster Channel 4.

52% believe homosexuality should be illegal

23% would like to see Sharia law in England

39% believe a woman should always obey her husband

31% consider it acceptable for a man to have multiple wive

When it comes to Islamic immigration, assimilation doesn't seem to be an option. It's, "When in Rome, rape and kill everyone and then claim welfare."

Andrew Bolt on Sky News Australia, whose show I go on regularly because they get the lighting just right, perfectly encapsulated Islam's integration problem in the west.

He recalled the case of Dr. Ibrahim Abu Mohammed, the grand mufti of Australia, who gave a speech to explain to Australians that they are wrong to think Muslims can't integrate into Australian culture. There's just one problem. The Grand Mufti, one of the foremost Islamic

scholars in Australia, delivered the speech in Arabic. He has lived in Australia for 19 years, and his integration speech is in Arabic.

That's what I call chutzpah.

There were 1.6 billion Muslims in the world as of 2010 – roughly 23 per cent of the global population – according to a Pew Research Center estimate. But while Islam is currently the world's second-largest religion after Christianity, it is the fastest-growing one.

The growth of Islam ought to be concerning for liberals. Here is a religion that sanctions forcing women into submission, a religion that sanctions the execution of gays, a religion that sanctions the killing of non-believers.

They're the Westboro Baptist Church on steroids, except they're not mental trolls from Kansas. They *mean* it.

And they're spreading. Islam preys on the most vulnerable in society, offering them a sense of higher purpose. They have especially high conversion rates in jails, which should be especially concerning to the left but is not.

For years, the left has been tormenting the right with tales of bigotry. We're supposed to consider frat boys singing lewd songs about women as an example of "rape culture."

We're supposed to look at critics of Black Lives Matter as racists.

And we're supposed to consider Christian bakeries uncomfortable with gay weddings as the leading example of homophobia in society today.

Well, there is a *real* rape culture in the west. And there is real homophobia in the west. And there is real out-group intolerance in the west. But barely any of it comes from frat boys or Christian bakeries -- it all comes from Islam. Of course, if you were to do so in Europe, you might be arrested for hate speech, so don't. And if you were to post a picture of your deed on

social media, you'd probably be banned. Before I was banned from Twitter, I had my account locked for posting a picture of a dead child; one of the victims of the Nice terrorist attacks. The same iconic picture had been shared by dozens of journalistic outlets, yet Twitter was too sensitive for it.

Facebook, you will recall, responded to the Orlando shootings by banning one of the west's leading critics of Islam, Pamela Geller, from its platform.

So never again let the left tell you that they are the ones fighting bigotry. They are, in fact, its greatest defenders. They are the ones standing in the way of Pamela Geller, Geert Wilders, Donald Trump, Nigel Farage, Douglas Murray, Maajid Nawaz, Sam Harris, Ayaan Hirsi Ali, and me. All the people who are *actually* doing something to fight what we see as the most intolerant, bigoted ideology in the world today face a constant pushback from the very same people who, if they were true to their own values, would be on our side.

But it's no matter. With Daddy elected in the United States, and Brexit underway in the United Kingdom, I'm confident we can win without the regressive left.

Defeating Islam

Islam today is like communism in the early stages of the Cold War. They're presenting young, disaffected people with an idealistic, tribal, utopian vision that is drawing in millions. And like communism, it's inspiring violence all around the world.

If there's one thing we learned from the battle with communism, it's that the West can't compromise on its values. It can't apologize for itself, like the left constantly wants us to do.

It was no accident that the Berlin Wall collapsed at the end of the 1980s. It was the end of a decade when America and, to a lesser extent, Britain had shaken off the malaise of the 1970s

and recovered their national sense of self-confidence. Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan proudly walked the world stage, aggressively asserting the superiority, and, well, the greatness of their respective nations. In the increasingly backwards, increasingly poor Warsaw pact, the choice between the West and communism quickly became a no-brainer.

At the same time, western governments poured money into programs designed to undermine the idea of communism. With state funding, Radio Free Europe and Voice of America ceaselessly broadcast news of anti-communist activities — as well as jazz and rock music — across the Iron Curtain. The propaganda campaign was so successful that KGB memos asserted that up to 80 percent of Soviet youth were listening to western radio broadcasts.

As Reagan and Thatcher were boldly asserting the superiority of western capitalism to communism, western radio broadcasts, offering tantalising glimpses of life and culture in the west, proved it.

That's a long way from western leaders' attitudes to Islam, isn't it? Far from asserting the superiority of western liberalism to the theocratic east, they're wearing headscarves, bowing to Saudi monarchs, and grinning stupidly in mosques. In the Cold War, there were some western leaders who advocated peaceful coexistence with the Soviet bloc, sure, but I don't think any of them ever donned Mao suits or sang "The Internationale."

Instead of drawing attention to the problems with the Islamic way of life — and the superiority of the west's — our leaders harp on about "the religion of peace," seeking to present the increasing violence of the religion's followers — against gays, nonbelievers, and women — as the actions of a tiny minority who will soon be defeated.

But they won't be defeated. The Islamic State may be crumbling in Syria, but it represents a world view that is attracting swathes of young people. Because the west has done

nothing to stand up for its own superior values, an entire generation of young Muslims came to view muftis as their rock stars and mosques as their concert halls. Western leaders talk about challenging the radicalization of young people, and then turn around and talk about how wonderful Islam is.

The results are inevitable and devastating.

It's theoretically possible to peacefully coexist with Muslims, but that's only possible if they can find a way to remove the radical element from contemporary Islam. Too many of the current generation are attracted to an ideology that insists on imposing their way of life on everyone else — or killing us, if we refuse.

And the Muslims who don't actively identify with the most poisonous end of their ideology are perfectly happy to turn a blind eye to its horrors, as poll after poll have demonstrated — to say nothing of the horrendously socially regressive attitudes of Muslims living in the west.

Like communism, we are dealing with a viral meme that needs to be fought head-on.

The old talking points about “violent extremists” are no longer working. Indeed, they never worked to begin with.

We're fighting an idea, and the only way to beat it is to show that the west is the best. Western leaders need to talk about what makes our society great: freedom, tolerance, equality of opportunity. Like Reagan and Thatcher, they need to tirelessly assert their country's greatness.

Islam has to be made uncool. This is a war of culture as much as it is a war of politics or faith, and we have to start fighting it now, in music, books, journalism, art and with every other means of creativity at our disposal, demonstrating as we do so what is possible with the free

expression we so cherish in the west and which made America the greatest country in the history of human civilization.

But more than that — and this is what they really don't want to do — our leaders need to talk about what makes Islamic societies *bad*.

So Why DO Muslims Hate Me?

As you might expect, I frequently receive all manner of death threats. Most of them, I don't take seriously. As for some of the more poetic ones, which describe my tortuous demise in particularly exquisite detail -- well, I treat those as free erotic fiction.

So, last summer, I annoyingly had to resign myself to the fact that I could not lead a gay pride march through the gay district of Stockholm, as I had been planning for some months. By that point, I had given my speech at Ground Zero of Omar Mateen's brutal attack on the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, and my security team informed me that the risks were too great. By that time, I had already been subject to a deluge of Arabic death threats (and one bomb threat) on Twitter (which promptly suspended me for a day).

When I kissed Canadian shock-jock Gavin McInnes as a fuck-you to radical Islam, I didn't realize that we were performing the Britney-Madonna VMA kiss for culture in 2016.

I have little love for western feminists and leftists, not least for their relentless denial of everyday realities. But at least their willful ignorance rarely comes with a body-count, at least not directly (indirectly, in the form of their immigration policies, it certainly does). It is only Muslims who are so fanatically devoted to their 6th-century delusions that they will murder anyone who dares challenge them.

"Islam is a religion of peace" we are told -- and yet so many AK-47s dare us to deny it.

It's little wonder that I'm well on my way to becoming a hate figure for Muslims, then, given that my mission is to tell the truth no matter how offensive it may be. (All right, I'll be honest -- offensive truths are my favorite kind.) What they really can't stand is that I tell the truth about *them* -- their brutal treatment of women, gays, and Christians; their rape-sprees in European cities, their fanatical willingness to kill and die in the name of a sixth-century pedophile warlord.

The gap between what Muslims believe Islam to be, and how it is actually practiced in many Islamic nations, is so wide that it's hard to imagine any Islamic Reformation taking place in the near future.

Well, there's a little phrase I like to say that Muslims had better be prepared to hear more often: *Sorry, no offense, but it's true.* With so much of the western media determined to play the ostrich on Islam, don't be surprised when the public turn to Dangerous Faggots to give them the real story.

Because unless you happen to be in the service of a fanatical, murderous religion, most people still love the truth.

START BOX

MILO'S PERSONAL BEAUTY REGIME

I wake at 8.30am. My personal trainer, Will, brings me 4 eggs, scrambled, and either two rashers of bacon or a sausage with a plate of raw spinach, a cup of black coffee and chilled San Pellegrino or Perrier. I have not drunk tap water since 2005.

My figure has improved dramatically from a year ago. I have started to look excellent in clothes. Though I have lost five inches off my waist in the last six months and over fifty pounds, I still have my bubble butt. Often I will remove my pajamas and examine myself for a few minutes in the mirror, appreciating the subtle curves of my upper body and the more obvious shapes of my lower body.

Push-ups and curls are making my arms bigger. Every other day I do military presses to ensure my shoulders and back grow in proportion to my biceps. It's important not to exercise just one muscle group if you want an attractive physique. I burn between 400 and 600 calories a day on the treadmill walking for 45 minutes at an incline of 13.5 degrees. I walk instead of running because I am usually in the Eastern time zone and I often take calls with my European staff early in the morning.

Will stands on my feet and we do crunches. I don't really need him to stand on my feet any more but I enjoy the human contact. It is not sexual. Now my body fat percentage is dropping, my abs are starting to come through. I can imagine finding myself attractive in a nightclub or bar.

In the shower I use a menthol and eucalyptus foaming gel, because I like to start my day feeling fresh and alert. I wash my body carefully and thoroughly. Because soap can be drying, I apply body butter or Kiehl's moisturising cream to my arms, chest and back. I use La Mer hand lotion.

I shave twice a week; I use a mid-priced green shave gel because I prefer to see the hair as I remove it. I use an aftershave balm with tea tree oil, even though I have never had a pimple.

Every day I use La Prairie skin cream, which is expensive but the best I have found. Sometimes I apply it over a serum if I will be outside in low temperatures. I enjoy kissing my boyfriend often, so I ensure my lips are plump and soft with a mint or mango lip balm.

I blow dry my hair enough to apply a moisturising base texturiser followed by a harder wax, usually one from Aveda. I use softer finishing cream from the same brand to add shine and glossiness, and a new hairspray I found in a boutique salon in East London. It is called Bumble and Bumble and it holds the hair in place without residue.

END BOX

WHY GAMERS DON'T HATE ME

Every supervillain has an origin story. The Joker fell into a vat of chemicals which drove him insane. Banc is born in a prison, where he hones himself into a physical juggernaut. Doctor Doom decides he has to take over the world after a vision of the future reveals humanity destroying itself.

Like these luminaries, I too have an origin story. I'd like to say it was similar to Doctor Doom's, as I too believe that humankind would be lost without me.

My origin story in fact involved a controversy called GamerGate, a bitter war involving gamers, anonymous internet trolls, hectoring feminist scolds, and left-wing journalists. The scandal went on for so long that its initial name, GamerGate, is now also used to describe the culturally libertarian, pro-free speech movement of gamers that it gave birth to.

For over two years, video games' greatest culture war raged across all corners of the internet, involving every young subculture that had emerged with the rise of social media, and every dirty web-based harassment tactic thought of by anonymous trolls and unscrupulous activists. Predictably, only the complaints (real and imagined) of one side – the left-wing, anti-GamerGate side – were ever acknowledged by the mainstream media.

GamerGate, often considered a bewildering topic, is in fact relatively simple. In early 2014, a group of gamers congregating on anonymous message boards and social media platforms started to raise questions about the professional standards of the gaming industry's media class. In response, the gaming media -- then dominated by left-wingers -- chose to first ignore and then ridicule the gamers, their own audience. When that didn't work, they unleashed a barrage of the

familiar smears against their critics, calling them sexist, bigoted, misogynist, right-wing online harassers.

What could have been a small dust-up in a niche press corps about professional ethics turned into a bitter culture war that split the world of gaming -- the primary hobby of the millennial generation -- in two. Journalists waged war against gamers, and gamers responded in kind. The battle spanned more than a year, giving rise to an anti-leftist political awakening amongst young people that fed directly into the rise of cultural libertarianism, the alt-right, and Donald Trump. GamerGate itself continues to this very day, known by other names, in isolated skirmishes around the web.

The snowflake that started the avalanche was a journalist called Nathan Grayson of the Gawker-run gaming blog Kotaku, who was discovered to have written favorably about *Depression Quest*, a game for which he acted as a consultant, without disclosing his involvement in the project. Grayson's connection to the game and its creator, feminist games designer Zoe Quinn, was discovered after an exposé from Eron Gjoni, one of Quinn's ex-boyfriends, written on the blogging platform Tumblr.

Gjoni claimed to have been emotionally abused by the games developer (I'm not sure I buy that, but keep in mind Gjoni was surrounded by SJWs who cry "abuse" if someone criticizes their shade of hair dye) -- but, more interestingly to gamers, he revealed that Quinn had enjoyed friendly and romantic relationships with a number of games journalists -- among them, Nathan Grayson. Gamers began to suspect that game developers and journalists were in bed with each other -- literally and figuratively.

I will be bold and say that few people beyond journalism professors really care if a reporter is friends, or even romantically connected to, one of their reporting subjects. Given the

private nature of these relationships, disclosure is sometimes difficult. So I have some sympathy for Quinn and Grayson. Sure, what Grayson did wasn't really ethical, but in normal circumstances it shouldn't lead to a culture-war cataclysm. But thanks to the dreadful professional track record of the games press, and their appalling response to gamers' concerns, it just happened to become *a thing*.

Following the discovery of the Grayson-Quinn connection, gamers across the web embarked on one of the greatest acts of collective internet-sleuthing in history. Virtually overnight, "GamerGate" discussions sprang up on some of the web's biggest communities -- the anonymous discussion forums 4chan and Reddit. Online chat channels known as "IRC," which long ago were used to organize the Anonymous hacktivist movement. And of course the #GamerGate Twitter hashtag, which remains active to this day.

Gamers quickly uncovered a web of connections between games journalists and their reporting subjects. Games journalists had reported on their friends without disclosure, and in some cases had even donated money to their reporting subjects. Critical Distance, a hub of social justice-oriented games critics, repeatedly gave favorable coverage to reporting subjects who had given them monthly donations through the crowdfunding site Patreon²⁴³, including Rami Ismail of Vlambeer studios, games produced by the leftist creative consultancy Silverstring Media, and former Polygon games editor Ben Kuchera²⁴⁴. Others, like former Gamasutra editor-at-large Leigh Alexander, had published dozens of articles lauding their personal friends²⁴⁵. Multiple

243
http://www.deepfreeze.it/outlet.php?o=critical_distance

244
http://www.deepfreeze.it/outlet.php?o=critical_distance

245
http://www.deepfreeze.it/ourno.php?l=leigh_alexander

other journalists were found to have similarly dire track records, which are now catalogued at the GamerGate-created website DeepFreeze.it.

All of this was embarrassing for the games media, and revealed their shoddy ethical standards. But it was hardly an international scandal. The games press wasn't unlike any other sort of trade press: it was characterised by pathetically low journalistic standards, an ideologically homogeneous atmosphere, cliquy politics and innumerable overlapping conflicts of interest. The difference was that video games were at \$90 billion industry, and hard-core gamers by nature have an innate respect for fair play.

The reason GamerGate became a gigantic story was the response from these gamers to the snobbish, arrogant elites of their media outlets when the latter were exposed as hopelessly ethically compromised.

“These obtuse shitslingers, these wailing hyper-consumers, these childish internet-arguers -- they are not my audience” wrote Gamasutra editor-at-large Leigh Alexander in the early weeks of the controversy. “They don't have to be yours. There is no ‘side’ to be on, there is no ‘debate’ to be had.”²⁴⁶

For Alexander, there could be no quarter given to gamers. She attacked Kotaku for its half-hearted attempt at dialogue. “Part of a writer's job in a creative, human medium is to help curate a creative community and an inclusive culture -- and a lack of commitment to that just looks out-of-step, like a partial compromise with the howling trolls who've latched onto ‘ethics’ as the latest flag in their onslaught against evolution and inclusion.”

²⁴⁶

[http://www.gamasutra.com/view/news/224400/Gamers dont have to be your audience](http://www.gamasutra.com/view/news/224400/Gamers_dont_have_to_be_your_audience)

[Gamers are over.php](#)

In the space of 48 hours, a dozen articles were published in a similar vein. All op-eds, all repeating the same opinion -- that gamers were bigoted white males trying to make the world of video games less inclusive. Gamers, wrote Arthur Chu at the Daily Beast, were “misogynist losers” who were “making us all look bad²⁴⁷.” The gamers of GamerGate were, according to Kotaku’s Luke Plunkett, “reactionary holdouts that feel so threatened by gaming's widening horizons.²⁴⁸”

Vice lamented that Eron Gjoni’s “embarrassing relationship drama” was “killing the gamer identity²⁴⁹” while The Daily Dot described GamerGate as a “sexist crusade to destroy Zoe Quinn²⁵⁰.”

At the same time, across the web, a vast campaign of censorship was taking place. A discussion about the ethics of games journalism on Reddit’s gaming subforum, one of the largest gathering-places for gamers on the web, was completely nuked. Over 20,000 comments were deleted, making it one of the largest -- perhaps *the* largest suppression of discussion in Reddit’s history²⁵¹. NeoGAF, already known for its ban-happy owners, started kicking GamerGate

²⁴⁷
<https://archive.is/9NxHy#selection-615.147-615.184>

²⁴⁸
<https://archive.is/YIBhH#selection-2977.81-2977.156>

²⁴⁹ <https://archive.is/L4n6p>

²⁵⁰ <https://archive.is/ILNXC>

²⁵¹
https://www.reddit.com/r/gaming/comments/2dz0gs/totalbiscuit_discusses_the_state_of_games/

supporters off the platform left right and centre. Popular YouTuber Boogie2988 was banned just for taking a neutral stance on the topic²⁵².

Even 4chan, the freewheeling anonymous discussion board known for hosting discussions about anything, no matter how vile, rolled out a blanket ban on GamerGate in mid-September. The decision sent shockwaves through its pro-free speech userbase, leading to a massive exodus to alternative site 8chan²⁵³. Fallout from the decision would eventually convince Christopher “Moot” Poole, the site’s founder, to leave 4chan after 10 years at the helm²⁵⁴.

Gamers started to wonder what the hell was going on.

If there’s one concept that left-wingers are persistently unwilling to accept, it’s the Streisand Effect -- that’s the idea that the more you try to censor information in the age of the internet, the more interest that information will generate. People don’t like the idea that something is being deliberately kept from them, and are inclined to jump over the hurdles of censors to get to it.

That’s precisely what happened with GamerGate, which wouldn’t have got off the ground without a great deal of assistance from would-be censors. The very first YouTube video about the drama surrounding Eron Gjoni and Zoe Quinn attracted a meagre 4,599 views on its initial run²⁵⁵. Then Quinn decided to lodge a false copyright claim against the video, taking it

²⁵²
https://www.reddit.com/r/KotakuInAction/comments/2j5s1k/boogie_banned_from_neogaf_threats_against_him/

²⁵³ <http://knowyourmeme.com/memes/events/gamergate#CensorOn4chan>

²⁵⁴ <http://www.theverge.com/2015/3/14/8214713/gamergate-scandal-convicted-4chan-founder-moot-to-leave-the-site>

²⁵⁵ “From the time of posting the “Hell hath no fury” to the dmca the video only had 4599 views ... It really wasn't rising that much.” - Matt “MundaneMatt” Jarbo, 8/12/15

offline, and the internet exploded. It's weird that someone like Quinn, who was deeply embedded in web culture, would make such a mistake -- after all, it was false copyright claims that propelled the rise of Anonymous, another famous millennial movement that was born on the web²⁵⁶.

Shortly after the games media launched its volley of articles smearing gamers as sexist, misogynist bigots, the GamerGate hashtag surged in activity, picking up thousands of new users. It would retain its position for much of 2014, and well into 2015²⁵⁷. The decision of Zoe Quinn, internet moderators, and the games media to respond to their critics with smears and censorship had backfired on a gargantuan scale.

By late 2014, it was apparent that GamerGate no longer described a scandal, but an entrenched consumer movement -- tens of thousands of gamers who were fully prepared to wage war against a gaming media that had turned on them, calling them names they didn't deserve to distract from its own failings.

GamerGate wasn't going to be a flash-in-the-pan controversy. It was here to stay.

PROFESSIONAL VICTIMS

The early evolution of GamerGate raises a number of bewildering questions. Why did so many games journalists simultaneously reach for accusations of "misogyny" when challenged to a debate about ethics? Why did so many previously-free online communities engage in such an unprecedented level of censorship? Was this really just about reporters getting too close to their reporting subjects? How could such a small issue spark such a huge firestorm?

²⁵⁶ <https://arstechnica.com/uncategorized/2008/09/scientology-fights-critics-with-4000-dmca-takedown-notices/>

²⁵⁷ https://unsubject.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/topsy_gamergatehashtag.png

Answering these questions is impossible without considering the wider political context of 2014. The years following the Democrats' "war on women" narrative, which they deployed so effectively in 2012, were something of a heyday for online feminism. From the "Slutwalk" marches that sprung up in virtually every western city (I'm still not sure exactly what their point was, but they involved feminists taking their clothes off to protest being called sluts) to viral campaigns like #EverydaySexism (a hashtag where women shared stories of appalling incidents of sexism, like men discussing attractive women²⁵⁸), feminism had the appearance of a rising force, at least on Twitter.

In 2013, the left-leaning *Guardian* newspaper proudly proclaimed that the "fourth wave of feminism" was upon us²⁵⁹.

But the "fourth wave" had a problem -- with so much of their activism linked to the internet, that meant they had to encounter *dissent*. Sometimes a great deal of it, considering how unpopular feminists actually are with the public. Comment threads under notorious feminist provocateur Jessica Valenti's column regularly attract thousands of critical comments²⁶⁰. Hashtags like #YesAllWomen, intended to protest "misogyny," were met with parody hashtags like "#YesAllCats"²⁶¹. Critics of feminism on YouTube began to attract as many views as the

²⁵⁸ <https://www.avoiceformen.com/just-plain-crazy/a-woman-asks-the-everyday-sexism-project-seriously-everydaysexism/>

²⁵⁹ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/dec/10/fourth-wave-feminism-rebel-women>

²⁶⁰ <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jun/06/mansplaining-explained-expert-women>

²⁶¹ <http://thelibertarianrepublic.com/yesallcats-twitter-users-poke-fun-feminist-yesallwomen-hashtag/>

feminists themselves, while dissident communities like Reddit's Men's Rights hub ballooned in size.

We already know how the regressive left responds to criticism on campus -- they try to shut it down. They behave exactly the same online. Feminists used politicians²⁶², activist groups²⁶³ and sympathetic media outlets²⁶⁴ to apply relentless pressure to social media companies to clamp down on "harassment," by which they meant people who disagreed with them.

On Reddit -- still a bastion of free speech in the years preceding GamerGate -- feminists gathered on a subforum called "Shit Reddit Says," calling on site owners to tackle "hate speech" and slowly working their way into positions of power in other Reddit subforums. Feminist activists complained that online harassment was giving them PTSD²⁶⁵.

The result was that legitimate criticism of feminists, throughout the "fourth wave" era, was frequently portrayed in the media as "trolling," "harassment," "misogyny" and "abuse."

262

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/womens-life/11127782/Stella-Creasy-Twitter-troll-hell-I-cant-get-the-last-year-of-my-life-back.html>

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/apr/20/yvette-cooper-calls-for-greater-monitoring-of-online-harassment>

263

http://www.slate.com/blogs/xx_factor/2014/11/07/women_action_media_and_twitter_team_up_to_fight_sexist_harassment_online.html

264

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/dec/01/tech-companies-online-harassment-courts-social-media>

265

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2605888/Woman-claims-PTSD-Twitter-cyberstalking-says-bit-war-veterans.html>

Take the “Donglegate” scandal, in which tech evangelist and ardent feminist Adria Richards overheard a couple of men making lewd jokes about “dongles” at a tech conference, decided it was sexist, and got one of them fired. When the internet reacted with outrage against Richards, WIRED magazine cited the scandal as evidence of “misogyny in tech culture²⁶⁶,” rather than what it was: an insane overreaction cooked up by a professional malcontent and grievance-monger.

GamerGate represented the apotheosis of this trend. Anita Sarkeesian, once an unknown vlogger who whined about alleged sexism in video games on YouTube with cherry-picked data and banal lefty social theory, rose to prominence after she tapped into the trolling panic. After trolls from 4chan and other communities decided to mock her in 2012, posting rude comments underneath her YouTube videos and photoshopping her into porn, Sarkeesian attracted a wave of media attention.

A online fundraising project for her upcoming series on women and video games soared past its target of \$6,000, ultimately receiving almost \$160,000 in donations. Sarkeesian was invited to speak at the video games studio Bungie, and to TEDxWomen 2012.

Two years later, Zoe Quinn was having publicity problems. Her new game, a rudimentary point-and-click adventure called *Depression Quest*, needed thousands of votes from gamers to be “greenlit” for publication on Steam, the largest digital distributor of video games. Guess how she got that publicity? By complaining about online harassment, of course.

Quinn said that she was being tormented by trolls from a little-known online community called Wizardchan, a 4chan clone populated largely by men with social anxiety, even claiming that they had sent her harassing phone calls. She never provided any evidence for this beyond a

²⁶⁶

<https://www.wired.com/2013/03/richards-affair-and-misogyny-in-tech/>

single thread on the forum criticizing her game for misrepresenting depression. Despite this, the games press followed the Sarkeesian formula like clockwork -- articles immediately appeared in the games press claiming that Quinn was facing “extreme harassment because she’s a woman.”²⁶⁷ One of the sites that ran with the story, *The Escapist*, later apologized for the error -- but only after GamerGate called attention to the issue²⁶⁸.

Less than a year after that, a male-to-female transgender game developer, Brianna Wu, after deliberately antagonizing GamerGate with a trolling campaign, used the resulting backlash to claim that she, too, was a victim of online harassment. Claiming to have “fled her house” because of anonymous death threats, she then did what any traumatized victim would do, and immediately went on a media tour, talking to MSNBC, the *Guardian*, the *Boston Globe*, and any other media outlet who’d listen to her. Previously a nobody, she’s now running for Congress²⁶⁹.

Isn’t it weird how these women all end up far better off *after* their trolling ordeals? If this is what a harrowing trolling ordeal looks like, sign me up.

Feminists in gaming capitalized on the buzzwords and campaigns that had appeared in the “fourth wave” of feminism. Those who criticized alleged victims of harassment, or suggested

²⁶⁷ <http://www.gameskinny.com/o3t09/depression-quest-dev-faces-extreme-harassment-because-shes-a-woman>

<http://www.escapistmagazine.com/news/view/130525-Depression-Quest-Dev-Faces-Harassment-after-Steam-Submission-Update>

<http://www.dailydot.com/irl/zoe-quinn-depression-quest-greenlit-steam/>

²⁶⁸ <http://www.escapistmagazine.com/articles/view/video-games/editorials/12223-The-Escapist-Publisher-Issues-Public-Statement-on-Gamergate.4>

²⁶⁹ <http://thehill.com/homenews/news/311302-game-developer-brianna-wu-eyeing-run-for-congress-in-2018>

they might be provoking antagonism on purpose for professional advantage, were “victim-blamers.”

Fake threats, trolling, and lewd remarks on the internet weren’t just flippant jokes by teenagers -- they contributed to “rape culture.” Criticizing feminists for being too rude or obnoxious was “tone-policing.” Feminists, by 2014, had an entire arsenal of buzzwords to help them sideline dissent and paint any and all critics as bigots and rubes.

No matter how legitimate the criticism, gaming journalists were committed to their narrative: it was feminist heroines saving gaming versus evil misogynist trolls who just wanted to terrorize them. If a single troll from 4chan sent a single death threat (and let’s be clear, *all* of these “threats” were hoaxes) to a feminist, then that was the story, not the legitimate concerns of gamers.

It says a lot that the video that arguably kicked off GamerGate, “The Five Guys Saga” by the “Internet Aristocrat,” published on 18 August 2014, was able to predict with near-perfect accuracy what was going to happen over the course of the following months:

“I guarantee you, we’re going to see articles published by the likes of Kotaku, GameRanx and others that are going to ignore these kinds of [ethical] accusations, and they’re going to focus on how poor Zoe Quinn is just a victim, or she’s being slut-shamed, or whatever other buzzword they’re going to pull out of their ass to dodge the bullet coming at their head²⁷⁰.”

The other thing the Internet Aristocrat predicted was censorship, across the internet. This, again, was something that could easily be foreseen -- it was the logical conclusion of the feminist-led campaign against “online harassment.” Once again, he was right.

270 https://youtu.be/qIsiStPp_OA?t=1346

It should be clear by now that GamerGate was about considerably more than one journalist breaching a single subsection of the Society of Professional Journalist's code of ethics. It was also about issues that would become dividing lines in the emerging millennial culture wars, as well as in the 2016 general election: free speech, the future of the open internet, and a nightmarishly partisan press corps that demonized critics of fashionable progressive causes as hate-filled bigots, while holding up their spokesmen (and spokeswomen) as saints who could do no wrong. This, the same political atmosphere that gave rise to cultural libertarianism, Brexit, Donald Trump, and me, also gave rise to GamerGate.

The left-wing crusade against "trolling" has brought about the death of the open internet, causing platforms like Reddit and Twitter, which previously boasted of their commitment to free speech, to go down the road of aggressive censorship of political opinions and certain kinds of speech. GamerGate was its flashpoint.

A COOL FAGGOT, LIKE FREDDIE MERCURY

I entered the story in the early days of GamerGate, when an anonymous Twitter account with the handle "@LibertarianBlue" and an anime profile picture sent me a couple of tweets explaining the controversy. The account belonged to Allum Bokhari, now one of Breitbart's most gifted writers. He spoke of journalists engaging in nepotism, censorship and critics being smeared as misogynists. I was instantly hooked, and asked for more.

Out of our collaboration emerged my first story on the controversy, which was the first story published to unapologetically take the side of gamers. While the rest of the media lamented the alleged "hate-campaign" against women in gaming, I took the ethics concerns of gamers seriously, and listened with an open mind to their complaints about a partisan political press and

out-of-control feminist narratives that were slamming the lid on open discussion in the games world. *Feminist Bullies Tearing The Video Games Industry Apart* was the headline I chose -- understated, as always.

It turned heads, to say the least, and it set the tone for later coverage. Having watched the “online harassment” panic grow to absurd heights over the past year, I was determined to show that criticizing and even mocking feminists did not make you a misogynist. As for exposing the biases and ethical failings of the press -- well, that was, if anything, even more important. It was also trivially easy to accomplish, thanks to an anonymous source who is now one of my most trusted contacts in the industry.

A month after the gamers and games journalists went to war, I was handed the most explosive story of the entire controversy: a series of leaks from “Game Journo Pros,” a secret email list used by journalists from gaming and tech publications including Kotaku, Polygon, Ars Technica, Rock Paper Shotgun, WIRED, PC Gamer and The Verge. I knew when I read the logs, which showed journalists co-ordinating their responses to various controversies, that GamerGate would not be over for a very, very long time.

I wasn't sure why I had been chosen to deliver these logs to the public, but I did know exactly what to do with the logs: publish them all on Breitbart²⁷¹, and watch as the flames of the greatest lulz-fire on the internet leapt ever higher into the sky.

The logs confirmed the gamers' worst suspicions about collusion behind the scenes in the gaming media. It gave them an insight into the depth of co-operation between games journalists from rival publications. Journalists from competing outlets appeared to be in cahoots, making decisions about what to cover and how to cover it.

²⁷¹ <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/09/17/exposed-the-secret-mailing-list-of-the-gaming-journalism-elite/>

Kyle Orland, games editor of Ars Technica and the founder of the email list, was seen calling the concerns of gamers “bullshit,” and encouraging other editors not to cover the GamerGate controversy at all, and instead use social media to reproach gamers.

The games press was revealed to be biased beyond belief. An editor at one publication, Polygon, was seen urging the editor of another publication, The Escapist, to censor discussion of GamerGate on The Escapist's message boards. Orland was also seen encouraging other journalists to contribute to a fundraiser for Zoe Quinn. At this point, Kotaku journalist Jason Schreier wisely pointed out that a fund-raising campaign for a feminist games developer might not be the best idea at a time when games journalist were facing mass allegations of collusion and political bias.

For gamers, even the fact that such a thing had even been suggested, by a games editor at a major tech publication, said it all.

There's no better feeling for a journalist than breaking a big story that other publications are afraid to touch, and I was already having a great time. But I was having an even greater time because at last, I had discovered a corner of the internet to call my own. I had discovered *web culture*.

Shortly after I began my reporting on GamerGate, I took a trip to the video games board of 4chan, known as “/v/,” then one of the hubs of the movement. I was immediately met with what I would later discover were called *memes* and *shitposting*. Virtually everyone told at least one gay joke.

My face was photoshopped onto a picture of the interracial gay porn movie *Poor Little White Guy*. Another 4chaner posted an image proclaiming that I was not simply a faggot, “but a cool faggot like Freddie Mercury.” Having spent my professional career in the stultifyingly

politically-correct world of tech journalism, I was amazed -- and overjoyed -- to discover that there was still one place of pure, unfiltered mirth in the world.

I had found my people.

If I were a disingenuous left-wing blogger, I could of course have found ample opportunity to paint my anonymous hosts on 4chan as the vilest of homophobes and bigots. But that wouldn't have been true, would it? It was obvious on its face that the people talking to me were not bigots of any kind, just irreverent teenagers with a healthy disregard for language codes. This was their way of showing affection, not disdain.

Furthermore, the GamerGate supporters who came from /v/ and its more politically incorrect sibling /pol/ didn't even meet the standard progressive definition of bigots. From the pages of the *Guardian*, Jessica Valenti -- with no evidence whatsoever -- denounced GamerGate as a "last grasp at cultural dominance by angry white men." They were angry, sure -- but they weren't white men. As GamerGate gathered steam, thousands of female, gay, and ethnic minority gamers took to the #NotYourShield hashtag to protest at having their identities used as "shields" to deflect the concerns of gamers.

Not unsurprisingly, the first reaction of the games media was disbelief. A piece in *Ars Technica*, perhaps the most brazen report of the entire controversy²⁷², claimed that accounts posting to the #NotYourShield hashtag on Twitter were just "sockpuppets" and not genuine minorities, despite multiple female and minority GamerGate supporters revealing their faces on camera. As always, the left just couldn't deal with the reality of dissident minorities.

There are few things that make my face truly light up with joy, but one of them was watching leftists on social media accuse female Twitter users of being white dudes, only to see

²⁷² <https://arstechnica.com/gaming/2014/09/new-chat-logs-show-how-4chan-users-pushed-gamergate-into-the-national-spotlight/>

them dumbfounded as the users responded with face pics clearly identifying themselves as women and/or minorities²⁷³. The leftists were so butthurt that they often ended up blocking the users. Is there anything more revealing than leftists shutting out the voices of women and minorities because they're telling them things they don't want to hear? This is the true story of GamerGate, not the "misogynist white dudes" narrative you've heard from the mainstream media.

The irreverence of 4chan, I discovered, was the product of an anonymous online environment, which minimized the usual social consequences associated with taboo-defying speech. Progressives and feminists, the modern-day guardians of social mores, naturally think this is terrible -- and leftist actor Wil Wheaton has even suggested banning anonymity in online video games as a result²⁷⁴.

I, of course, think it's wonderful -- and the fact that so many online video games and gaming communities employed anonymity or pseudonymity instantly clued me in on why they were proving to be such tough adversaries for the biased progressive media, and for the feminist architects of the new moral panic.

THE NEW MORAL PANIC

For most of the twentieth century, entertainment was subject to a creeping takeover by the cultural left. Literature, theater, high art, music, and of course Hollywood all gradually came to be dominated by a politically-correct progressive elite who forced political dissenters into the

²⁷³ <https://archive.is/MLyWf>

<http://knowyourmeme.com/photos/829804-notyourshield>

<https://archive.is/UGbsA>

²⁷⁴ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2014/11/11/anonymous-trolls-are-destroying-online-games-heres-how-to-stop-them/>

shadows. Just look at the outpouring of anger and grief from pop-culture icons like Miley Cyrus and Lady Gaga, and celebrity actors in the wake of Donald Trump's victory. Trump supporters in Hollywood -- many of whom I know personally -- kept quiet, even though their candidate had won.

Video games, a far younger medium that only seriously began to take off in the 1980s, managed to escape the first wave of the left's cultural takeover. Because of their battles over violence in games with the conservative right in the 1990s and early 2000s, they developed a resistance to politicization of any kind. "I just wanted to play video games" was one of the slogans of GamerGate. Gamers took pride in their hobby's resistance in the face of an increasingly politicised world. Gamers just wanted to be left alone.

There's a reason for this. Whenever the medium has attracted attention from either side of the political spectrum, it has been negative. Political commentators are universally critical of the pastime: those on the left accuse video games of being sexist and bigoted, and those on the right declare them unwholesome and anti-family.

Researchers can find no evidence that games make anyone violent or sexist.²⁷⁵ The studies that leftists and moral crusaders frequently cite are those that show a link between violent video games and *aggression*²⁷⁶ – but similar links are also found with sports games. You play a high-adrenaline sport, and you become more aggressive for a while. Who knew! But that's nowhere near the same as video games turning people into killers.

²⁷⁵ Ferguson, C.J. and J. Kilburn. "Much ado about nothing: the misestimation and overinterpretation of violent video game effects in eastern and western nations: comment on Anderson et al. (2010)," www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov, March 2010, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20192554> (accessed March 25, 2015).

²⁷⁶

<https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:1o0GIYr4qBEJ:https://twitter.com/radicalbytes/status/439947821999857665%3Flang%3Den+%&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=uk>

A lack of evidence never gets in the way of a good storyline. You may remember Elliot Rodgers, the “killer virgin” who went on a shooting rampage in May 2014²⁷⁷. Naturally, the fact that he played video games was invoked. No evidence that the games had anything to do with his killing was ever presented, but no evidence was needed. The storyline that video games must be involved in bad behavior was simply too compelling to pass up for the media²⁷⁸.

The one place you might have imagined would stick up for video games was the games press: those outlets and writers dedicated to reviewing games and exploring every detail of the entertainment genre that, after all, evokes intense passion in its ardent fans. And for a while the games press played this role: applauding their virtues, and defending them from charges that they make players violent. At least, they did while gaming critics were mostly conservatives.

In the 2000s, Jack Thompson, a conservative lawyer, filed a lawsuit against Take Two Interactive, then publishers of the *Grand Theft Auto* series, on the grounds that it inspired murder. He was mercilessly ridiculed in the games press, which then appeared to be performing its function as the defenders of creative freedom against absurd political crusades.

But something went wrong about a decade ago, when feminist critics began taking tentative steps into the sphere of games criticism. The new allegation was now that, even if games can't make you violent, they can make you sexist. These were not psychologists or researchers who had data to back their claims. They were “gender activists and hipsters with degrees in cultural studies,” according to feminist scholar Christina Hoff Sommers. They didn't

277 <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/05/27/virgin-killer-was-not-a-misogynist-but-a-madman/>
278 <http://www.ibtimes.com/after-gamerqate-connection-between-video-game-violence-real-world-behavior-complicated-1710360>

<http://www.alternet.org/culture/8-things-you-may-not-know-about-elliott-rodgers-killing-spree>

know much about video games, they didn't have degrees in psychology... but they knew heteropatriarchal capitalist oppression when they saw it. And they saw a *ton* of it in video games.

This was no accident. What I call the left-wing war on fun has a long academic pedigree, stretching back to the rise of “critical studies” in the late 60s and 70s. Critical studies viewed art, literature, and entertainment through only one lens -- how it critiqued, or failed to critique, dominant “power structures” (capitalism, Christianity, patriarchy and all the rest).

No longer were these forms to be criticized on their ability to inspire, awe, shock, fascinate, illustrate, or depict: all that mattered was how well (or how poorly) they critiqued the bogeymen of gender studies departments.

The hunt for culture-war implications in every expression of culture led one writer at the Chronicle of Higher Education to compare the culture critics of academia to “detectives” on the hunt for hidden meanings²⁷⁹. Like overzealous Freudian psychologists who manage to link virtually every human experience back to childhood sexual trauma, progressive cultural critics find a way to interpret every artistic expression through their own particular lens – usually, the search for racism or sexism.

Lisa Ruddick, an English professor at the University of Chicago (an institution in the running for the smartest and most forward-looking university of modern times) is one of a growing number of dissidents challenging this orthodoxy. In her influential essay, “When Nothing Is Cool,” she describes how one scholar used critical studies to turn Buffalo Bill, the sadistic antagonist of *Silence of The Lambs*, into a gender-defying feminist hero.

By removing and wearing women's skin, Bill refutes the idea that maleness and femaleness are carried within us. “Gender,” Halberstam explains, is “always posthuman, always

279 <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Whats-Wrong-With-Literary/23848>

a sewing job which stitches identity into a body bag.” The corpse, once flayed, “is no woman”; “it has been degendered, it is postgender, skinned and fleshed.”

Halberstam blends her perspective uncritically with the hero-villain’s posthuman sensibility, which she sees as registering “a historical shift” to an era marked by the destruction of gender binaries and “of the boundary between inside and outside.”²⁸⁰,

The lunacy here isn’t just that a serial killer who targets only women could in any way be a feminist hero, it’s that the scholar who wrote it actually thought his interpretation was believable. To most people, *The Silence Of The Lambs* is simply a masterly example of a psychological thriller, full of compelling characters, emotionally impactful moments, and no deeper meaning beyond the protagonist’s terrifying and engrossing journey through a world of cannibals and serial killers.

To a left-wing culture critic like this author, however, it’s unacceptable that a movie could simply be intended to entertain, shock, or amuse. It *must* say something about sexism, racism, homophobia, or transphobia, even if its creator didn’t intend it to. And if a piece of art or entertainment *really* seems designed with no hidden political message? Well then, that means its creator and those who enjoy it must be just fine with the status quo – this makes them either blind, or the enemy.

To a culture critic, everything is political, even when it’s deliberately trying not to be. Even *La La Land*, a happy-go-lucky film about a man who wants to play classic jazz music and a woman who wants to be an actress, is, according to Vox, actually about a conservative hankering for the past.

Little wonder that culture warriors hate video games, many of which are clearly designed for no purpose other than wild abandon. Imagine the fury of Anita Sarkeesian and her dour

280 <https://thepointmag.com/2015/criticism/when-nothing-is-cool>

erstwhile male assistant Jonathan McIntosh as they scoured games like *Team Fortress 2* and *Pong* for hidden political messages! Imagine as it dawned on them that the millions of people who log into *World of Warcraft* every day are doing so primarily to have fun with their friends, and not to consider how well Illidan Stormrage symbolizes inexorable patriarchal forces.

To a leftist, where everything is political and nothing is fun, gamers were a nightmare. Gamers felt the same about the critics.

Another problem for the feminists and left-wingers trying to attack gaming culture is that it is naturally resistant to political correctness. Online video games were the original social networks: gamers were socializing and chatting on games like *Everquest* and *Runescape* years before Facebook and Twitter came into their own. And, crucially, communication in these games tended to be anonymous. Like 4chan and Reddit, the furthest most people would come to identifying another player was via their pseudonym -- and there's not much you can do to track someone down when the only lead you have is a username.

Anonymity, mixed with the competitive nature of many online games, led to a culture of "trash talk" amongst gamers.

Keemstar, a popular YouTuber, explains how alien and shocking gamer culture must seem to polite society. "People have given me death threats, I've received many death threats. I've been told that I'm going to be raped. People have said they were going to do sexual things to me while I was playing these games, because it's part of gaming culture. Now, I'm not saying it's right. I'm not saying it's right, but any real gamer has experienced this, and they know it to be somewhat normal. From the outside looking in, this must sound crazy. But if you're a gamer, you know this is normal stuff. This is what people say online to each other while they are

gaming. [...] And these media outlets that don't know gaming, that don't understand gaming, are eating it up.²⁸¹"

If you're not familiar with gaming culture, the whole idea that this kind of talk is "normal" seems very strange. Even stranger are the examples of insults, jokes and banter that the media has held up as "gamer behaviour" from social media and message boards on the web. But this is merely the kind of joshing that goes on between best friends, especially in young and especially in male communities. Nobody feels threatened because everyone know the rules of the game: it's a friendly kind of banter that is not to be taken seriously, expressed within a close-knit community.

For example: "Hey filthy fucking dickwaffle," might be used a friendly greeting. Some of the most common topics for casual jokes include rape, pedophilia, necrophilia, and Nazism. If someone thinks you're behaving stupidly or disagrees with you, "go kill yourself" will be a common, almost automatic, offhand remark. But the biggest mistake you can make—and the mistake that the mainstream media has been far too eager to make—is to take any of this language at face value. Sure, it may be jarring for someone who's not used to the conventions of this speech community, but that is no excuse for immediately condemning it as bigoted or misogynist, when it clearly is not.

And, if you don't like it, online games afford multiple opportunities to set up your own gaming servers with stricter rules.

Mainstream society finds it impossible to reconcile this language with the reality that most gamers are actually left-wing, and completely comfortable with diverse, tolerant societies. To leftists, rejecting their language codes is the same as being racist, sexist, or homophobic.

281 "Anita Sarkeesian: #GamerGate A call to Boycott Sponsors of News Media," Youtube video posted by FaZe Keemstar, January 20, 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KcMBr8yHeEw> (accessed January 25, 2015)

Gamers know it isn't. And that made them the perfect enemies for an increasingly progressive movement hell-bent on shaming ordinary people for violations of their dreary, stultifying language codes.

GAMERS VS SHAMERS

In the years preceding GamerGate, left-wing social justice warriors had turned social media into their personal playground. With the aid of web-savvy outlets like BuzzFeed, Gawker and the *Guardian*, they engaged in relentless public shaming campaigns to socially ostracize individuals, businesses and organizations that failed to abide by their increasingly restrictive set of politically-correct norms. Justine Sacco, a communications executive whose life was upended by Gawker after she tweeted a joke about white people not being able to catch AIDS (she was, believe it or not, trying to make a point about the injustice of white privilege) is the most well-known example, but there are dozens more.

These were not like the “trolling” campaigns complained of by feminists – Sacco wasn't just facing nasty messages in her inbox or crude photoshops of her face, although I'm sure she received those too. The point of public shaming isn't merely to offend or annoy, but to cause total social ostracism – the ultimate punishment for violating society's taboos.

Video games did not escape the rise of public shaming. In May 2014, a small-time video games developer, Russ Roegner, discovered his career was in jeopardy. No fewer than three editors from major gaming publications had told him that if he didn't shut up, his future in the industry was over.

“Be careful with me,” warned Gamasutra's Leigh Alexander. “I am a megaphone... I wouldn't mind making an example out of you.”

“Watching someone burn down the beginnings of their career on social media,” remarked Ben Kuchera.

“Really. Just. Stop.” said the editor-in-chief of GameRanx. “You’re not helping your case.”

What had Roegner said to attract such warnings?

His offense was disagreeing with another developer, Rami Ismail, about sexism in the gaming industry. “There’s no issue with gender equality in the game industry. I wish people would stop saying there is,” said Roegner. “Everyone has the same opportunities ... there’s nothing in their way of realizing their dreams.”

Expressing such apparently inoffensive views was apparently career-endangering in the video game industry of 2014. One games journalist condemned Roegner with a single word: “#hasjustinelandedyet?” It was a reference to Justine Sacco – and a warning.

Another infamous case of media-led public shaming in the gaming industry was the campaign against Brad Wardell, CEO of software and games development company Stardock. In 2010, Wardell was falsely accused of sexual harassment by a former employee. The case was dismissed in 2013, and the former employee apologized for her claims.

This was even though the games media had done everything in its power to lend credence to her salacious and baseless claims. Games journalist Ben Kuchera wrote an article initially claiming that the case against Wardell had “damning evidence,” and included some of the most disgusting accusations from Wardell’s accuser (including the claim that he asked her if she “enjoyed tasting semen.”). Wardell was not contacted for comment before the article ran²⁸².

²⁸² <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2014/09/23/how-sloppy-biased-video-games-reporting-almost-destroyed-a-ceo/>

Kotaku ran the same story, covering the accuser's allegations in similarly lurid detail. The article, which Kuchera referenced in his own piece, contained the full allegations of Wardell's accuser, but, deplorably, no counter-arguments from Wardell or his legal representation. That was because Kotaku had only given Wardell an hour of normal business hours to respond with his side of the story²⁸³.

As a result of this sloppy, *Rolling Stone*-tier journalism, Wardell faced years of smears and attacks from social justice warriors, and even told me that his kids were being bullied at school because the first Google result for his name was the Kotaku article. It is worth noting that Wardell is one of the few open political conservatives with a position of prominence in the gaming industry, which might explain why the campaign against him was so relentless.

The campaign – and the bullying – has now largely stopped, says Wardell. Furthermore, the editor of GamePolitics, one of the outlets that reported on the unsubstantiated allegations against him, apologized for his sloppy reporting²⁸⁴.

Wardell isn't the only victim of the games media who received apologies.

One of the editors who joined the pile-on against Roegner apologised, acknowledging that he “contributed to an atmosphere of intolerance and aggression.”²⁸⁵ An industry figure who threatened Roegner admitted that her comments represented a different era, one where public Twitter comments were a “big deal.”²⁸⁶

The witch-hunters were apologizing. What had caused this dramatic shift in attitudes? GamerGate had come and gone.

²⁸³ <http://kotaku.com/stardock-lawsuits-dropped-ex-employee-apologizes-1377925759>

²⁸⁴ <https://archive.is/yI34h>

²⁸⁵

<https://archive.is/7uQYm>

²⁸⁶

<https://archive.is/r3tRQ>

Public shaming relies on isolating its victims, who are made to believe that they are alone against an overwhelming tide of majority opinion. It's a feeling that was shared by Donald Trump supporters – until they started winning. In reality, the shamers are usually part of a vocal minority, allowed to dominate the conversation by terrifying others into silence.

But gamers are hard to frighten. During GamerGate, they came out in droves to show the world how small and hysterical the purveyors of social ostracism really were.

A brief comparison between their online communities is all it takes to reveal this truth. KotakuInAction, the leading Reddit community for GamerGate supporters, has more than 70,000 subscribers, whereas GamerGhazi, the hub for feminists and social justice warriors in gaming, has a mere 11,000. Feminist hashtags like #YesAllWomen and #BringBackOurGirls were lucky if they maintained activity on Twitter for more than a month. The #GamerGate hashtag retained high levels of activity over a year after its creation.

Through numbers and tenacity, gamers broke through their fear of social justice warriors. The months following the controversy saw a full-scale backlash against SJWs. Before GamerGate, victims of public shaming like Justine Sacco had virtually no allies in the press. Many disagreed, but did not want to get on the wrong side of the social justice mobs. After GamerGate, victims like Dr. Matt Taylor, the British astrophysicist who was driven to tears after he was attacked for wearing a shirt featuring allegedly “sexualized” drawings of sci-fi women could rely on an increasingly confident community of moderate liberals and conservatives who loudly and sternly condemned their persecutors. The silence had been broken. And we had gamers to thank for it.

UNLIKELY HEROES

GamerGate was enormously significant. It was the first time that consumers of a major entertainment medium staged a mass resistance to the influence of the political left. Hollywood, music, literature, the arts, and virtually every other cultural arena had fallen prey to the relentless co-option machine of the cultural left. In Hollywood, deviation from politically correct norms triggers instant outrage -- just look at the actress Kaley Cuoco, who was cowed into an apology by baying left-wing culture warriors simply for saying that she did not identify with feminism²⁸⁷.

Thanks to the heroic efforts of their consumers, video games would not suffer the same fate -- and in the process, they showed frightened, isolated dissidents that it was possible to fight the cultural left and win.

No one was more amazed than me. I once described gamers as dorky weirdos in yellowing underpants. And, let's be fair, some of them are. Probably perfectly nice people. Yet here were these dorky weirdos, taking on the fury of the leftist media-activist complex without flinching. Unpaid, undisciplined, and in some cases, yes, unhygienic -- but they were winning cultural victories that eluded even million-dollar conservative PACs.

After GamerGate, never again will I mock gamers as awkward losers. Well I mean, they might be awkward, but they're definitely not losers. In a Breitbart column on the movement's one-year anniversary, I compared them to Hobbits -- unlikely heroes who just wanted to be left alone, but ended up saving the world²⁸⁸. In retrospect, it's perhaps not so surprising that a bunch of people who spend all their spare time conquering kingdoms, killing dragons, and racking up high scores knew how to win. After all, isn't that the end goal of all video games?

287 <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/big-bang-theorists-kaley-cuoco-sweeting-apologises-for-saying-shes-not-a-feminist-9956393.html>

288 <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/09/01/sneaky-little-hobbitses-how-gamers-transformed-the-culture-wars/>

The left didn't know what they were getting themselves into when they went after video games. This was the hobby of the millennial generation, enjoyed by millions around the world – often together. What chance did the left have, with their usual allegations of bigotry, against such a naturally diverse hobby? The sight of the left attacking innocent gamers as a menacing force of intolerance was laughable.

Social justice warriors still haven't learned their lesson years later, by the way. When the character Tracer from the popular multiplayer game *Overwatch* was revealed to be a lesbian, SJWs gloated over what they anticipated would be a gamer outcry against a gay character. In fact the only outrage was from SJWs who were upset that the gamemakers had picked the girl with the hot ass to be the dyke. Gamer reaction ranged from not caring since it didn't affect the game to reposting lesbian porn they had made of Tracer months previously.

But perhaps the fears of the left weren't so hysterical. After all, gamers were the first group of people to beat the left in the millennial culture wars. Their tactics helped inspire the cultural libertarians, the “Sad Puppies” and was the first coming-together of the movement that put Trump in the White House. When the *Washington Post* called Donald Trump the “GamerGate of American Politics,” they weren't entirely wrong²⁸⁹.

While most of the hard work was conducted by tireless, relentless, and often anonymous gamers who received no thanks for it beyond smears from the mainstream media, I was proud to be a part of the movement as well.

It was the first time we took on a major narrative of the left and comprehensively beat it, in what would be a blueprint for the battles to come. Gamers taught me that with humor, memes, and a little bit of autistic single-mindedness, no battle is unwinnable.

289 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/act-four/wp/2015/12/07/donald-trump-is-the-gamergate-of-republican-politics/>

WHY MY COLLEGE TOUR IS SO AWESOME

It was humiliating. Vile. I was in the middle of a speech at Rutgers University in New Jersey, and three hysterical young ladies in the audience had stood up and smeared what looked like blood on their faces, before hysterically shrieking “BLACK LIVES MATTER” over and over.

None of the students, incidentally, were black.

I later discovered that the “blood” was fake, but that didn’t make it any less absurd, or any less troublesome for the janitors, who had to deal with the trail of red paint left by the protesters after their two minutes of fame were up. Peaceful attendees who had come to hear a speech instead found themselves splashed with fake blood, while at least one attendee was assaulted by a protester who deliberately smeared him with the stuff.

More surprising to me than the protests at Rutgers, which was par for the course on college campuses, was what happened the following morning.

I awoke to a stream of messages about the fact that administrators at Rutgers were offering a therapy session to students who had been shaken by my presence on campus. Yes, you heard that correctly - students at Rutgers University were so traumatized by my visit that the administration held a group therapy session.

Those who attended the event reported that students described “feeling scared, hurt, and discriminated against,” because of my innocent lecture about the importance of free speech on campuses.

It's flabbergasting when you think about it -- if a few comments from me about the free and open exchange of ideas are enough to put college students in a therapy session, what's going to happen to them when they encounter someone who's *actually* intolerant and bigoted? Have a heart attack, I presume. Thank God it's the Kurds fighting ISIS, and not American millennials.

When my tour started, I'd spent almost a year in the spotlight as a rising star of the online right, fighting battles against the whiny, spoiled social justice warriors of the internet. Having grappled some of their more absurd web-based campaigns, like the fight against "online harassment" (which, like "hate speech," mostly just means: anything they disagree with), I was now prepared to break out of tech journalism and take the fight to them in meatspace. It sure was fun triggering them on the internet, but as I'd discovered during my protest of the 2015 Los Angeles Slut Walk²⁹⁰, it was a lot more fun to hear their banshee-like shrieks of distress when encountering a challenge to their worldview in real life. I knew my opponents were prone to emotional hysterics. I called my jaunt across college campuses the "Dangerous Faggot" tour for that very reason -- to mock the students who seriously believed that a flouncing queer from across the pond really posed some kind of "threat" to students. But nothing quite prepared me for the howling, frenzied madness that is the coddled American college student of 2016.

Rutgers was the first stop on my tour where I saw the madness first-hand (*therapy sessions*, for God's sake!) but it certainly wasn't the last. After Donald Trump's election, for example, leftist students demanded time off class to deal with the emotional trauma, and at least one student group even staged a "cry-in," which is exactly what it sounds like²⁹¹.

²⁹⁰ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2015/10/03/breitbart-editor-ejected-from-amber-rose-slut-walk-by-police/>

²⁹¹ <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2016/11/10/canceled-classes-cry-in-and-more-college-campuses-reel-from-trump-win.html>

At other campuses across the country, coloring books and puppies have been provided to students too fragile to encounter conservative opinions or cope with the outcome of elections.²⁹²

Soon after Rutgers, I arrived at Bucknell University, a small liberal arts college located in the sleepy rural town of Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. The chaos at my previous stop brought me the attention of the administrators there, who booted me from the on-campus guest residence over concerns that I presented a safety threat to the community. As if I might corrupt the basketball team, or something.

I was relocated to a grim motel next to a high-security penitentiary. (See! Everything happens for a reason.) In the end, some generous fraternity brothers took pity on me and put me up in their house. But I've never forgotten the paranoia of those Bucknell administrators.

By Thursday evening, Bucknell administrators had decided that students wouldn't be permitted to speak to me directly, but rather that they'd have to write their questions down on an index card, with my host Tom Ciccotta, now a Breitbart reporter, reading them aloud to me. Furthermore, the Bucknell University Conservatives Club wouldn't be permitted to film the event. Instead, the administration would film the lecture and then release the footage to Tom in the event that the proceedings didn't reflect poorly upon the university.

Shortly after I left Bucknell, Tom was removed from his position as class president. They said it was because he had missed a few meetings, and who knows, maybe he had. But everyone on campus knew the real reason the rules were suddenly being applied so rigidly. To me, this was just another in a long list of incidents in which the social justice leftists who run the modern American university were revealed to be a nasty and toxic influence on the lives of young students all around the country. And so very, very petty.

²⁹² <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/11/16/elite-campuses-offer-students-coloring-books-puppies-to-get-over-trump.html>

Did Bucknell's administrators really believe that I was such a threat, such a corrupting influence on young minds that I couldn't be allowed to speak to students directly? Did they believe I really was dangerous? Nah. It was just another kind of censorship; another pointless restriction designed to make conservatives on campus suffer.

Rutgers and Bucknell weren't outliers. As my tour progressed, it quickly became apparent that lunacy was the norm, not the exception, on American college campuses. At the University of Pittsburgh, the Student Government Board held a meeting to discuss my appearance on campus the previous evening. The student government president told college reporters that he "teared up" when he heard the stories of traumatized students. Another board member argued that my words constituted "real violence" and that left-wingers at the event felt they were in "literal physical danger."

"Free speech should not trump safety," she said.

Protesters were also in the crowd at Pittsburgh, although they were less rowdy than the ones at Rutgers. Even the placards were quiet! They used tiny signs printed on dorm ink jet printers making them too small for me to see. I had to have them read aloud because I couldn't see them. Really, Pittsburgh protesters -- you were a disappointment.

The tour as whole though, was anything but a disappointment. I mean, it involves me - OF COURSE it was a success! Videos of my talks, filmed on a shoestring, were attracting millions of views on YouTube. Stories on Breitbart about the chaos and hysterics at my events were getting tens of thousands of comments and shares. I was exposing the angry, and incredibly poorly dressed underbelly of American campus politics, and the world was rapt.

By the time I reached Pittsburgh, it was only February 2016. I was not a month into my tour, and had performed at fewer than six colleges -- yet it was already clear that I'd tapped into

something massive. And so, after a brief series of meetings at *Breitbart's* Los Angeles offices and in Cannes during the film festival, I was told to go out, double down, and be more outrageous than ever.

By then, word had spread to other colleges that there was a dangerous faggot on the loose. This caused protesters to up the ante. At DePaul University in Chicago, I stood transfixed as a Black Lives Matter activist, local minister and alumni Edward Ward, stormed the stage with an angry look in his eyes. Once I calmed my raging boner, I realized that he had grabbed the microphone from my student host and had essentially taken over the event. Meanwhile, a shrieking female accomplice had jumped on stage too and began to swing her fists and inch from my face.

The police did nothing, something that I later found out was a result of administrators ordering them to stand down²⁹³. I ended up cancelling my talk and leading my supporters outside for a protest march in defense of free speech. Despite groveling to the left-wing protesters who wreaked havoc at the event, the University President, Dennis H. Holtschneider would just two weeks later tender his resignation after pressure from left-wing students and faculty members who were angry that he hadn't banned me from campus altogether²⁹⁴. Although the response of the university was pathetic, no-one had been seriously hurt, and I was glad to see that my words were so vexing to the campus left. Rage was building.

Now, I find it difficult to understand how anyone could hate me. But such was the anger that I was confronted with at every event, that I came up with some theories. And those theories all boil down to one very simple fact: I'm tremendous.

²⁹³ http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/university-admins-surrender-to-violent-protesters-shutter_us_57454738e4b00853ae7b5ae3

²⁹⁴ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/06/13/depaul-president-step-facing-backlash-milo-event/>

I'm not just incredible for the fact of my existence: a gay right-winger. That's becoming increasingly common these days. Indeed, Peter Thiel, whom I like to call "one of the normal gays," is now one of Donald Trump's leading advisers.

No, I'm incredible because I have single-handedly flummoxed the campus censors. In the years before my arrival, they had been on a roll, stopping even mild-mannered conservative columnists like George Will from speaking on their campuses.²⁹⁵ Yet here I was, a magnificent blond bastard who told edgy jokes and – horror of horrors – occasionally said celebrities were ugly, freely romping into their cherished safe spaces. And there was nothing they could do to stop me. I had resources, I had the backing of Breitbart, the most fearless news organization in America, a brilliant team of twentysomething mischief-makers and I was riding a wave I had helped to create -- a new movement of young, politically-dissident troublemakers.

Just as I was attracting fanatical hatred, I was also attracting a devoted fan base. The shouts and shrieks of my protesters were loud, yes, but not as loud as the chants of "MILO! MILO!" and "USA! USA!" from eager audiences. At UC Santa Barbara, my fans even started the tradition of carrying me into the lecture hall on a golden throne. Finally, I was being treated like a human being.

As my college tour progressed, it was clear that conservatives, libertarians, and other political dissidents on campus were becoming bolder and more mischievous with every passing day. The old order of political correctness was crumbling around us -- we could all sense it. This was, after all, the glorious summer of Donald Trump's presidential campaign, when all it took to generate campus hysterics was a pro-Daddy slogan scrawled in chalk on a campus sidewalk.

²⁹⁵ <http://claremontindependent.com/george-will-uninvited-from-scripps-college/>

At the University of Michigan, college crybabies went so far as to call the police after spotting to pro-Trump chalk on campus²⁹⁶. Other students went further with their triggering pranks, even constructing mock “Trump walls” on campus, an homage to the then-candidate’s pledge to build a wall across America’s southern border²⁹⁷. If George Will were to arrive on a campus that summer, leftists would have been too busy protesting a dozen other outrages to notice.

Sometimes people don’t understand just how loopy college campuses are. So let me tell you about one of the things campus crybabies get most upset about, and try to stop me from bringing up.

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

The Final Fantasy series borrows from George Lucas, who borrowed from Akira Kurosawa, who borrowed from Dostoyevsky and Shakespeare. Without appropriation, culture as we know it would not exist. Civilization would resemble a Nickelback album.

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

²⁹⁶ <https://www.truthrevolt.org/news/u-michigan-students-call-police-over-trump-2016-stop-islam-chalk-markings-0>

²⁹⁷ <http://www.spokesman.com/stories/2016/sep/09/wsu-students-plan-to-raise-a-controversial-trump-w/>

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

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

Few things betray the short-sighted, joyless, anti-human stupidity of the left as much as cultural appropriation. Virtually every book, film, play, video game, and work of art is the result of a long history of cultural appropriation.

But, to the campus left, it’s just another form of racism.

Rise Of The Dangerous Faggot

Typical behavior of the power-mad, leftists on campus made desperate attempts to reassert control. Their primary hope was university administrations, which were often either full

to bursting with leftists themselves, or so terrified of controversy that they'd pull any trick, no matter how dirty, to stop me appearing on campus.

At UC Irvine, administrators initially allowed our event to proceed. I don't think anyone at the time realized how subversive it was that I, a gay guy who loves black men, wore police fetish gear while scolding Black Lives Matter for not giving a shit about black lives. Maybe they were right to be unsettled – because no one in pop culture is making statements like that any more.

After I left UC Irvine, the College Republicans were slapped with a one-year ban by the university for having the temerity to invite me back. Their justification for the ban was that the College Republicans had failed to provide a certificate of insurance for the security hired for my initial event on campus. Although, given that the college administrators issued their ban just one hour after a meeting with College Republican president Ariana Rowlands, during which she revealed her intention to invite me to UC Irvine a second time, the excuse was suspect from the start.

After heavy coverage in Breitbart and the conservative media, as well as a terrific show of force by Rowlands, who refused to compromise with the administration by submitting to an appeals process, UC Irvine eventually engaged in a humiliating u-turn, lifting the suspension on the College Republicans and allowing me to return.

As my tour has gathered steam, the tactics used by frightened administrators to stop me have gotten more underhand and slippery. At the University of Alabama, administrators lulled my student hosts into a false sense of security before hitting them with a \$7,000 security fee at the last minute. Again, after negative coverage in the conservative media and some stern

lawyering, the university said that the College Republicans would not face any expense for security, and that they had been “trying all along” to help them host a successful event.

Other universities tried similarly slimy methods. The University of Miami cancelled over “security concerns,” which mysteriously arose mere days before my event was scheduled to take place. The University of Maryland unwisely decided to copy the University of Alabama, slapping student organizers with a \$6,500 security fee a few days before my event. Their defiance won’t last. I’m coming for them, and they know it. We will hold an event at the University of Maryland, come hell or high water, because they are a public institution and they are prohibited by law from denying their students the right to hear differing opinions. The student hosts brave enough to invite me, and earn the enmity of their administrations, deserve no small amount of praise.

Despite the road bumps, by fall 2016 I could tell that we were making a difference. The groundswell of attention that the Rutgers incident brought to my tour forced organizers to move my lectures to bigger venues. The 400-seat venue at Bucknell University filled to capacity in just 15 minutes and another 50 students were turned away at the door. At Louisiana State, where I appeared in drag as my alter ego Ivana Wall, we sold out a 1,200-seater in just 48 hours. Everywhere I go there are lines around the block.

Are these students simply seduced by the controversy and mystery surrounding me and my lectures, or have I actually kick-started a full-scale revolt populated by disenfranchised young people who are fed up with political correctness, safe spaces, trigger warnings, and social justice?

I wasn’t sure, mid-2016, but I am now. This is a movement, and it’s going to take back American college campuses. And it’s already so much fun.

The Fag Bus Rolls In

Picture a tour bus. You know, like the ones rock stars and rappers have. Hold the image in your mind -- a beautiful, sleek steel beast, coated in black. Only, the picture on the side isn't of a singer or a supermodel -- it's a giant picture of my face, staring directly at you, beside giant bold text that reads "DANGEROUS FAGGOT."

By the time the second leg of my tour rolled around in September 2016, I was a superstar. So naturally, I got my own tour bus. I decided to call it "Anita," because I knew the bus would end up more famous than GamerGate antagonist Anita Sarkeesian. (I was right.)

I once thought I was so hot that nothing could make it any easier for me to pick up dates. It turns out I was wrong. Having a tour bus with your face and name on it helps tremendously. Anita the Fag Bus was soon spotted on dozens of college campuses, until she was eventually retired after being vandalized by Californian anarchists.²⁹⁸

After my early successes in triggering America's college crybabies, the invitations came pouring in, so we staged a 38-date tour of the entire country. We began in Texas, wound our way through Louisiana's coastline down into Florida, and then drove up through Georgia, Alabama, and the Carolinas to the east coast, leaving a trail of furious college lefties and jubilant college conservatives in our wake.

This time, we were doing it properly. I had a full camera crew, a creative director, a speechwriter, a personal trainer, and a small Mexican dude I kept around to carry my bags and manage my vast wardrobe. We had a disciplined and organized tour manager. We had the

²⁹⁸ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/02/02/milo-tour-bus-vandalized-leftist-leaks-location-online/>

creative, resourceful, and devilishly handsome Allum Bokhari, who coincidentally wrote this sentence. We were prepared for anything.

At first, protests were surprisingly disappointing. Then again, we were travelling across the south, which is MILO country. Many was the time in Texas we were stopped by a burly, aviator-clad biker or a cowboy-hat wearing pickup truck driver for autographs, even when I toppled out of the bus into a truck stop wearing a silk robe or a dress. Exactly the sort of people that Democrats call bigots and homophobes were stopping by the Dangerous Faggot's bus to get his autograph.

Contrary to the progressive stereotype of bigoted, backwater hicks, my audience are far more open-minded than a leftist safe-space dweller. When I sold out Louisiana State and tried to troll my own audience by appearing in full drag, they gave me a standing ovation.²⁹⁹

This leg of the tour offered up magical moments beyond count. At the first new stop, in Houston, Texas, a military veteran gifted me his dog-tags, which actually brought a tear to my eye.

By the end of the tour I'd gone all-out on the theatrics. I submitted myself to a college "hazing" live on stage at Dartmouth.

Sometimes, and even I must admit it, some of the audience members stole the show. At the University of South Florida, an Arab girl called Sarah Torrent, who fled a Muslim marriage in her home country, called on leftists and feminists to meet her outside "for an ass-kicking" if they still insisted on bringing her persecutors into the west³⁰⁰.

In Clemson, South Carolina, where the school banned references to the deceased gorilla Harambe and the internet meme Pepe the Frog over racism concerns (no, really), we discovered

²⁹⁹ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/09/21/milo-louisiana-state-university-live/>

³⁰⁰³⁰⁰ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2016/09/26/watch-arab-girl-destroys-arab-apologists-milos-usf-event>

a budding James O’Keefe. Conservative student Caleb Ecarma spent months infiltrating an anti-Milo group on campus ahead of my visit, mapping out their connections to faculty members and monitoring their attempts to block my visit. I was amazed by the passion and devotion that my tour was inspiring.

As Anita the Fag Bus headed up the east coast, we began to encounter more protests. At West Virginia University, masked “anti-fascists” (they call themselves that, yet they seem awfully keen on political violence) appeared in ski-masks carrying placards. One of these said “MILO SUCKS.” Given that the statement was, frankly, perfectly true, I decided that I must possess the placard, and a helpful fan was able to obtain it for me during the grapple going on between protesters, attendees, and campus security in the hallway.

During a particularly bitter winter stop at Michigan State University, members of my crew and I thought it would be good fun to don ski masks and join the protesters ourselves. It was a daring operation, which we made more exciting by deliberately misspelling our placards. Would anyone notice? Would our cover be blown? Thankfully, our tactic worked -- the placards were so badly spelled that they must have assumed we were on their level of intelligence.

Berkeley In Flames

The protests on the east coast were tumultuous, but nothing could have prepared me for what lay ahead in Seattle, Berkeley, and other west coast campuses. I am now writing in the aftermath of those events – and what events. We did survive, but only just. I don’t believe there were Molotov cocktails, but there were a host of other pyro-weapons and dangerous hurled

missiles. After their campus cry-ins in the wake of Trump's victory, the west coast proved to me that leftists have moved on to throwing tantrums... extremely destructive tantrums.

The first signs of trouble were at UC Davis on Friday 13 January, where I was due to hold a discussion with entrepreneur and Wu Tang Clan fan Martin Shkreli. The discussion never happened. Protesters rushed the venue around thirty minutes before my event was due to begin, overturning barricades and throwing them at campus police officers. Reports of protesters wielding hammers and smashing windows to gain access to the venue quickly spread. Meanwhile, outside the venue, an ABC10 reporter was attacked with hot coffee, while my own cameraman Matt Perdie was shoved and spat on³⁰¹. It was pandemonium.

Within minutes of the barricades being overturned, campus officials were on the phone to my team and the College Republicans, urging them to cancel the event. The Republican group later said they were intimidated by the UC Davis administration, who they said told them that they would be held "personally liable for property damage and injury to people and even death." University officials also made a big point to the College Republicans about hammers and smashed windows, although these turned out to be just rumors. No pictures or video footage of smashed windows ever emerged³⁰².

I was determined not to let UC Davis's cowardly response, their intimidation of the College Republicans and the thuggery of left-wing protesters result in a victory for censorship. So, the next morning, I led a protest march across campus in defense of free speech. The protesters returned, but didn't dare attack anyone in broad daylight. I even took a few selfies with them.³⁰³ All was as it should be – violence and intimidation had not won the day.

³⁰¹ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/13/milo-abc-uc-davis-hot-coffee/>

<http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/13/watch-uc-davis-protestors-assault-spit-milos-cameraman/>

³⁰² <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/15/uc-davis-lied-say-college-republicans/>

³⁰³ <https://www.facebook.com/myiannopoulos/posts/820979491373281>

But the tumult at UC Davis was just a warning, a sign of the far greater violence and destruction that was to come. The far left had responded to Donald Trump's victory with panic and fury, making dangerous analogies to 1930s fascism, Nazi Germany, and something they called "The Resistance."³⁰⁴ A host of militant grassroots organizations sprang up, with threatening names like "Disrupt J20" (January 20 was the date of Trump's inauguration) and "By Any Means Necessary"³⁰⁵. James O'Keefe, a legendary conservative journalist who specializes in infiltration and exposure, caught activists on tape threatening to "fight the police" and burn houses a few days before the inauguration³⁰⁶.

Inauguration day saw protesters in D.C. torching trash cans, engaging in running battles with the police, and burning a limousine (ironically, it belonged to a chauffeur service owned by a Muslim immigrant³⁰⁷). Elsewhere in the city, white nationalist leader Richard Spencer took a punch to the face while he was giving an interview, to the joy of left-wing commentators, who quickly set about turning "punch a Nazi" into a meme. "Do Punch Nazis" wrote a columnist for *Observer* who argued that the "violent nature" of white supremacy made the punch an act of self-defence³⁰⁸. (Spencer actually rejected political violence in the very interview during which he was punched).

Newsweek reported that many liberals had, through watching the video of the punch, rediscovered "the joy in life"³⁰⁹ *The Independent* published a "supercut" of Nazis being punched

³⁰⁴ <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/02/resistance-tea-party/516105/>

³⁰⁵ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2017/02/06/radical-berkeley-anti-milo-protest-leader-no-regrets/>

³⁰⁶ <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2017/01/16/new-james-okeefe-video-leftists-planning-stink-bombs-deploraball/>

³⁰⁷ https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/local/wp/2017/01/25/thats-not-somebodys-honda-owner-of-limo-torched-on-inauguration-day-unsure-if-insurance-will-cover-damages/?utm_term=.bac335dd2612

³⁰⁸ <http://observer.com/2017/01/do-punch-nazis-anti-semite-white-supremacist-richard-spencer/>

³⁰⁹ <http://europe.newsweek.com/richard-spencer-punch-nazi-ethicists-547277?rm=eu>

in the face, with the Spencer punched featured alongside clips from *Indiana Jones* and *Inglorious Basterds*.

Punching Nazis sounds almost reasonable – but only almost – until you recall that the left, particularly the “anti-fascist” left, known for dressing up in black masks and wearing brass knuckles, consider anyone to the right of Jane Fonda to be racist, fascist, neo-Nazi, or some combination of the three. If that sounds like an exaggeration, remember what’s prompted their violence: the election and inauguration of Donald Trump, a social liberal from New York who took Ted Cruz to task because the Texas Senator was opposed to Caitlyn Jenner using women’s bathrooms. And then there’s me -- homosexual coal-burning Jew from Britain. I also face the same ludicrous allegation that I’m a jackbooted white supremacist. Sorry, but if this is what counts as a Nazi in 2017, we’re *all* going to get punched – literally everyone reading this book.

The extreme political violence from the left became more and more apparent as I travelled up and down the west coast, where the temper tantrums and physical attacks began to escalate. When I arrived at the University of Washington in Seattle, on Inauguration Day, I was greeted by a banner bearing the brand of Disrupt J20, urging onlookers to “STAB MILO.” University officials quickly took it down, but it was a portent of the violence that would take place later that night. I was, after all, in the city that hosted the “Battle in Seattle”, an outbreak of left-wing violence in 1999 in which 40,000 protesters and more than 200 thugs from the “black bloc” – black-masked left-wing anarchists known for their love of political violence – caused massive damage to the city. (Ironically, the 1999 rioters were there to protest globalism, the very ideology that Donald Trump is busily fighting in Washington, DC.)

Daddy’s inauguration brought similarly massive protests to Seattle. Rehearsals for my show had barely begun before a huge mass of protesters arrived on campus, where they began

throwing buckets of paint and burning things in front of rows of riot police. The police helicopters buzzing in the sky – a first for me – testified to the seriousness of the situation. Outside the venue, my cameraman, Matt was assaulted yet again, taking a punch to the face and having his equipment broken³¹⁰.

Soon we heard an even more sinister report from outside the venue. Someone had been shot. I was in the middle of a talk and decided to carry on with it, refusing to have my talk cancelled by violence, but after the show police evacuated attendees through an underground car park, telling them to remove their Make America Great Again hats. By now, the anti-MILO protesters had been joined by anti-inauguration protesters from elsewhere in the city, and the crowd swelled to over a thousand. As the critically-injured man was rushed to hospital, reports emerged that the police had confiscated wooden poles, heavy pipes and other weaponry from the black-clad protesters³¹¹.

More details of the shooting trickled out the following morning. The man who fired his weapon had been released, after claiming self-defense. He had told police that the man he fired at “looked like a white supremacist,” although it later emerged that the victim was one of the left-wing protesters. The precise circumstances of the shooting remain murky, but it was clear that things were getting out of hand. Safe spaces and “cry-ins” are laughable responses to disagreement, it’s true, but violence is something else. I continued to preach more speech as the only appropriate response to ideological disagreement.

The final stop on the Dangerous Faggot tour was UC Berkeley, perhaps the most famous left-wing college in America. In the 1960s, Berkeley was host to Mario Savio’s Free Speech Movement, which fought against the administration’s restrictions on political activities on

³¹⁰ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/20/milo-cameraman-assaulted-equipment-broken/>

³¹¹ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/01/20/seattle-police-recover-wooden-poles-metal-pipes-shields-milo-protesters/>

campus. Savio was an ardent left-winger, yet he operated at a time when the left fought against censorship rather than in favor of it.

A shy chronic stutterer, Savio understood the importance of speech. It was no accident that he founded a movement that stressed the value of free speech as inherent to human dignity.

I wrote earlier in this book that conservatism is the new counter-culture, and the inversion of values that has taken place on American college campuses makes my point for me. Once again, at Berkeley, violence from left-wingers would prevent me from speaking.

As at UC Davis, protesters showed up around 30 minutes before I was due to speak. As at the University of Washington, they were well-organized, obviously privately funded, armed, clad in black masks, and determined to cause mayhem. They immediately stormed over police barricades, smashed windows, and lit several fires.

These weren't the sporadic, disorganized outbreaks of violence that had taken place on inauguration day. The black-masked protesters arrived in a single group and attacked as a single group, storming the building as a unit before melting back into the crowd of "peaceful" protesters, who of course happily concealed them. Attendees of the event caught outside were treated mercilessly: one man appeared on camera with a bloody face. A girl wearing a "MAKE BITCOIN GREAT AGAIN" cap was pepper-sprayed in the middle of an interview with a local news channel. Later in the evening, video footage emerged of a man lying unconscious on the ground while protesters surrounded him.

The rioters – let's dispense with "protesters" – were not satisfied with the cancellation of my event. After word spread that my speech would not happen, the thugs marched into the town of Berkeley itself, where they proceeded to vandalize businesses. These included four local bank

branches, and a Starbucks. The final estimated crowd size was 1,500³¹² and the total damage was estimated at \$100,000 on campus and \$500,000 in Berkeley itself.

The response of city and campus officials was depressingly predictable. The police did not lift a finger to stop the ongoing riot. They did not even form a shield-wall as they had done at the University of Washington. John Bakhit, a lawyer for the union representing the UC system's police force, later complained that the police officers "weren't allowed to do their jobs."³¹³

"UC Berkeley's attitude amounts to this," wrote the *San Francisco Chronicle*. "We'd rather deal with broken windows than broken heads."³¹⁴ The article noted the lawsuit that had emerged from the Occupy protest at UC Davis in 2011, in which the University of California had to pay out \$1 million in a legal settlement after a university police officer pepper-sprayed a protester. The fires and smashed windows, by contrast, cost UC Berkeley around \$100,000. It's not hard to do the math, although it remains unclear who issued the order for police to stand down.

The Mayor of Berkeley, Jesse Arreguin, was similarly feeble in his response. A Democrat whose candidacy had been endorsed by Bernie Sanders, Arreguin started the evening by condemning me, tweeting that "Using speech to silence marginalized communities and promote bigotry is unacceptable" and that "hate speech isn't welcome in our community." (The idea that speech can somehow "silence" others is an insidious progressive meme used to justify censorship).

³¹² <http://patch.com/california/berkeley/violent-demonstration-uc-berkeley>

³¹³ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/02/07/questions-arise-hands-off-police-response-berkeley-riot/>

³¹⁴ <http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/matier-ross/article/Why-UC-police-let-anarchists-run-wild-in-Berkeley-10908034.php>

As violence broke out, Arreguin returned to Twitter to half-heartedly proclaim that “Violence and destruction is not the answer.”³¹⁵ The following morning he put out a statement condemning the violence, also condemning me as a white nationalist. Naturally, my lawyers forced him to retract and apologize³¹⁶.

Leftist attempts to shut me down backfired, just as you would expect. After the forced cancellation at UC Davis, I dominated headlines, with coverage in *The Washington Post*, *The Daily Mail*, CNN, FOX and every other outlet in the English-speaking world – along with some in the non-English speaking world. And after UC Berkeley, President Trump himself intervened, tweeting that if UC Berkeley could not defend free speech, he might consider withdraw federal funding. I was invited on both the TODAY show and *Tucker Carlson Tonight* (I went with Tucker, obviously), and my media profile soared. Once again, the left had tried to strike me down, and once again, they had made me more powerful – and more fabulous – than they could possibly have imagined.

But that does not mean we should celebrate the left’s dark turn. Under the banner of “anti-fascism,” the left is bringing the actual tactics of fascists – armed political violence – to America’s streets. Some on the left have realized how much this hurts their cause, which is why former Labor Secretary and current Berkeley professor Robert Reich has pushed the ludicrous conspiracy that the riots were part of a plot by Steve Bannon, Breitbart and me to discredit the left. With one of the leaders of the protest, a local organizer for “resistance” group By Any Means Necessary boasting to the media about the riot’s “stunning success” in shutting me

³¹⁵ <http://twitchy.com/samj-3930/2017/02/02/clueless-mayor-of-berkeley-jesse-arreguin-tweets-bs-about-hate-speech-regret-tweets-3-hours-later/>

³¹⁶ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/02/02/mayor-berkeley-apologizes-retracts-claim-milo-white-nationalist/>

down³¹⁷, this was a difficult argument to maintain, and even *The Washington Post* poured scorn on the theory³¹⁸.

But it was nonetheless telling that Reich felt the need to make it. It was bad enough when the radical left was beclowning itself by running to safe spaces and therapy sessions whenever a conservative speaker arrived on campus. Now it was shocking America in another way, by bringing armed political thuggery to the nation's streets in response to respectable, mainstream conservative and libertarian opinion.

First there was irrational, cowering fear. Then there was irrational, violent anger. One day, perhaps, the left will realize that the only way to claw back credibility is to meet their opponents with calm, reasoned debate. But if Berkeley, Seattle, and UC Davis were any guide, that day is still a long way off.

Happy Warriors

Despite the hellraising, my campus tour was about more than just causing a ruckus. There was method to my madness. For too long, the American campus has been the preserve of leftists, who funnel funding into crackpot Gender Studies courses and radicalize students against political tolerance, openness to opposing ideas, and ultimately against reason itself. For too long, they've gone unchallenged.

So how do we fight back? How did we fight back against an American educational system where Karl Marx's *The Communist Manifesto* is the most assigned textbook³¹⁹? How do

³¹⁷ <http://www.breitbart.com/milo/2017/02/08/organizer-calls-berkeley-riot-stunningly-successful-warns-repeat-if-milo-returns/>

³¹⁸ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2017/02/06/did-yiannopoulos-secretly-send-more-than-one-hundred-thugs-to-berkeley-to-break-up-his-own-speech/>

we fight back against an American educational system that provides coloring books, warm cookies and emotional support puppies to students who can't handle the kind of classy, unthreatening feminism of Christina Hoff Sommers?

The problem of censorship only gets worse when you go to a country that isn't protected by America's First Amendment, that pesky little rule that regularly foils political correctness and the progressive left. In the U.K, for example, I was prevented from giving a speech at my old high school, the Simon Langton School for Boys, after the government's counter-extremism unit contacted the school. That's right: I've become so shocking that arms of my own national government are intervening to stop me!

The school's principal had been keen to host me, his old student, but the idea of the Dangerous Faggot corrupting the minds of young schoolkids was clearly too much for some British bureaucrats. I suppose we should concede a point to the civil libertarians here: institutions that were originally created to fight Islamic terrorism are now being used to silence flamboyant gay dudes who tell offensive jokes.

I feel for those last remaining bastions of sanity, truth, and fun in Britain. People like James Delingpole, whose penchant for winding up the left and needling politically correct sacred cows rivals my own. If I'm being banned for "extremism," how long will they last? I can only wonder what horrific tortures they have in store for Delingpole at the re-education camps: fat lesbians explaining why wind turbines are man's greatest invention, perhaps (James, being a man of good taste, loathes both wind turbines and fatties). All I can say to my conservative colleagues across the pond is – get your green card before it's too late.

³¹⁹ <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/communist-manifesto-among-top-three-books-assigned-in-college-2016-01-27>

A big part of why I've been so successful is that I know how to have fun, and so do my fans. Conservatives typically don't have fun. When I think of an American conservative, I think of stuffy bores like Ted Cruz, who, while brilliant, puts me to sleep.

My brand of conservatism is marked by three things absent from the tired "suit and tie conservatism" with which students on American college campuses are so familiar. I've injected a humor, mischief, and sex appeal into right-wing politics, and thus during my tour we've developed a new and growing coalition of young conservatives and libertarians.

My inbox is now constantly overflowing with messages from students who appreciated the message that I was bringing around the country.

My Dangerous Faggot Tour has made great strides in the battle that is being waged on the American college campus. Despite the setbacks and punishments laid out by regressive administrators who want to halt our progress, we have earned several significant victories along the way. After my visit to Rutgers, university president Robert Bachi released a statement³²⁰ in which he reaffirmed the institution's commitment to free speech and academic freedom:

"Both academic freedom and our First Amendment rights are at the core of what we do. Our University policy on speech is clear. All members of our community enjoy the rights of free expression guaranteed by the First Amendment. Faculty members, as private citizens, enjoy the same freedoms of speech and expression as any private citizen and shall be free from institutional discipline in the exercise of these rights. In addition, they also enjoy academic freedom of expression when functioning in their roles as faculty members...While I will not defend the content of every opinion expressed by every member of our academic community, or

³²⁰ <http://president.rutgers.edu/public-remarks/speeches-and-writings/rutgers-president-free-speech-and-academic-freedom>

of speakers who we invite to our campus, I will defend their right to speak freely. That freedom is fundamental to our University, our society, and our nation.”

At Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, students protested and rallied outside of the office of the president after students took to the campus sidewalks with chalk to express pro-Trump sentiments. The special snowflakes at Emory University told reporters that they felt threatened by the pro-Trump students, and that the campus was no longer a safe space for them.

I knew immediately that I had to make a trip to Atlanta. When I finally made it to Emory, there was anxiety from students concerned over my impending arrival. Although they spent time preparing signs and chants, their protest efforts were largely ignored. The event was so well-attended that students filled the hall around the venue, listening to the event and hoping to get a chance to peek in. At the end of my typical lecture, I led the Emory students out onto a center quad, and encouraged them all to express themselves on the sidewalk.

Students surrounded me as I started things off. I took a piece of chalk and wrote “Dangerous Faggot” in the middle of the quad. After I finished, I took the bucket of chalk and passed it around to the students in attendance. Students wrote everything from “Fuck Milo” to “Build the Wall.” It was a glorious example of what an American university should be!

This wasn’t our only victory at Emory. Shortly after my visit, the university’s president James W. Wagner took a piece of chalk himself to the sidewalk right next to where I had laid down my own message, and wrote in big letters “EMORY STANDS FOR FREE EXPRESSION.”

In turns out that Wagner attended Emory for his undergraduate studies. In a statement, he spoke about the importance of viewpoint diversity on college campuses and the role that it played in his own education:

“It was always [a] great, friendly, challenging discussion that really taught you to critically think,” Wagner said, noting the discussions helped to both hone his political opinions and prepare him for his career as an attorney. “I took that with me to law school where I was challenged more on my viewpoints. It’s really important to understand the opposing side and their arguments, where they’re coming from, and to form your own opinions. It’s formative. And it’s absolutely required, in my opinion, at the university level.”

So there you have it. With a few pieces of chalk, what started off as a light-hearted prank to trigger leftists on campus gradually morphed into a symbol of political free speech that was endorsed by the president of the university. We started off having fun, and we ended up winning a major ideological victory. That’s the beauty of being a happy warrior -- you achieve victories without even realizing you’ve been fighting.

All Roads Lead to Chicago

At a high school in Des Moines, Iowa in September 2015, an ageing, soon-to-be-unemployed man addressed a room full of students to challenge the idea that they ought to be protected from competing points of view.

“I don’t agree that you, when you become students at colleges, have to be coddled and protected from different points of view,” he said. “Anybody who comes to speak to you and you disagree with, you should have an argument with ‘em. But you shouldn’t silence them by saying, “You can’t come because I’m too sensitive to hear what you have to say.” That’s not the way we learn either.

The man in question was Barack Obama, then still president of the United States.

It says a lot that even Obama, well to the left and far more supportive of identity politics than many moderate Democrats, thinks there's a problem on America's college campuses. But he's not alone. Many of the voices now joining conservatives in their critique of coddled students are moderate liberal ones: Jonathan Chait, Judith Shulevitz, and Jonathan Haidt to name a few³²¹.

In May 2016, Nicholas Kristof, a *New York Times* columnist who once published an article titled "When Whites Just Don't Get It," and, more recently "Trump Embarrasses Himself And Our Country," released a rare admission that progressive intolerance had gone too far on college campuses.

"We progressives believe in diversity, and we want women, blacks, Latinos, gays and Muslims at the table — er, so long as they aren't conservatives.

Universities are the bedrock of progressive values, but the one kind of diversity that universities disregard is ideological and religious. We're fine with people who don't look like us, as long as they think like us."

Although he moderated his opening by saying that it might be a "little harsh" Kristof went on to conclude that:

"Universities should be a hubbub of the full range of political perspectives from A to Z, not just from V to Z. So maybe we progressives could take a brief break from attacking the other side and more broadly incorporate values that we supposedly cherish — like diversity — in our own dominions."³²²

If Nicholas Kristof and Donald Trump (who called student protesters at the University of Missouri "babies" and criticized the college's "weak, ineffective leadership" for caving in to

³²¹ <http://nymaq.com/daily/intelligencer/2015/01/not-a-very-pc-thing-to-say.html>
<https://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/22/opinion/sunday/udith-shulevitz-hiding-from-scary-ideas.html>
<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/>

³²² <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/08/opinion/sunday/a-confession-of-liberal-intolerance.html>

their demands) agree that there's a problem with out-of-control lefties on college campuses, then we truly have a broad consensus. The question is, what next?

Putting pressure on colleges to follow the University of Chicago's lead would be a good start.

Chicago told its 2016 intake of students point-blank not to expect any trigger warnings or safe spaces at their educational establishment.

"Fostering a free exchange of ideas reinforces a related University priority -- building a campus that welcomes people of all backgrounds," wrote the Dean of Students, Jay Ellison, in a letter to freshmen. "Diversity of opinion and background is a fundamental strength of our community. The members of our community must have the freedom to espouse and explore a wide range of ideas."

The University of Chicago is distinguishing itself as a home of free expression, with feisty professors like medievalist Rachel Fulton Brown, who writes the popular blog *Fencing Bear*.³²³

If college administrators want to stop me, then all they need to do is follow this example. When colleges start to take intellectual and political diversity as seriously as they take the more superficial forms of diversity, then there will no longer be a need for Milo.

Until then, look for the Dangerous Faggot at a campus near you. In America and beyond, I will continue to fight for my vision of campus life -- one of constant intellectual and political simulation, where dangerous ideas are welcomed rather than shunned. I will fight for the sound of laughter in the hallways and quads. Where violating some great taboo will lead to spirited debate, not a trip to the office of an Orwellian "Bias Task Force."

³²³³²³ <http://fencingbearatprayer.blogspot.com/>

Colleges should be aware that there's a price for quashing free speech and caving in to the radical, hateful activists of the regressive left. If you let things get as bad as Berkeley, you might see your campus set on fire, be denounced by the President, and have to cooperate with an F.B.I investigation³²⁴. You might see a MILO Bill show up in your state legislature.

In some cases the government won't even need to get involved. Just look at the case of the University of Missouri, which became the poster child for left-wing radicalism in 2015 after activists forced the resignation of the college president and demanded the administration submit all students in all departments to a "racial awareness and inclusion curriculum" created and overseen by board comprised of "students, staff, and faculty of color."³²⁵ In the wake of the protests, and the university's decision to cave in to them, Missouri suffered a massive shortfall in enrolments and alumni donations. Its lack of enrolments forced it to shutter two halls of residence, which were ironically called "Respect" and "Excellence."³²⁶ The lesson? Stand up to political bullies, or lose Respect and Excellence.

There are already signs that UC Berkeley might become afflicted by the Mizzou disease. Soon after the riots on campus, and the woeful response from campus police, Scott Adams, the creator of the syndicated comic strip "Dilbert" and a Berkeley alumni, announced he would no longer donate to the college³²⁷. Once again, colleges need to learn this harsh lesson: if you lose your balls, your money will follow.

³²⁴ <http://abc7news.com/news/fbi-investigating-violent-uc-berkeley-protest/1744164/>

³²⁵ <http://www.foxsports.com/college-football/story/missouri-protesters-issue-list-of-demands-to-university-110815>

³²⁶ <http://fox4kc.com/2016/04/10/mizzou-closes-two-dorms-due-to-lack-of-students-applying-for-housing/>
<http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/education/turmoil-at-mu/university-of-missouri-fundraising-takes-million-hit-in-december-as/article-ed7cfd5b-3b3e-5b18-95d9-f2945ac51172.html>
<http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/431854/university-missouri-pays-high-price-its-public-meltdown>

³²⁷ <http://www.mercurynews.com/2017/02/08/dilbert-creator-scott-adams-ends-uc-berkeley-support-over-milo-yiannopoulos-protests/>

During my college tour, I learned that not all millennial students are pampered, sheltered snowflakes. There are thousands upon thousands of students up and down the country ready to fight back against the intellectually stifling environment that surrounds them. Students who are no longer willing to sit back and be bullied by administrators, faculty members, and leftist activists who want to shut their views down.

We can't assume any more that the entire millennial generation is made up of snowflakes. Remember, some of the social justice left's greatest foes are millennials themselves. Just look at Lauren Southern: she was still a college student when she almost single-handedly destroyed the feminist "slut walk" movement with a series of viral counter-protests. Not satisfied, she went on to cause the resignations of a number of social justice warriors in the Libertarian Party of Canada, stalling its descent into hand-wringing leftism. Now she's a rising star of the right, producing powerful journalism on the Islamic takeover of Europe. If the millennial generation can produce women like Southern, it's hardly fair to call them all "snowflakes."

Dissident professors who want to follow the example of the University of Chicago should suffer in silence no longer; now is the perfect time for them to start a resistance movement. There will be pushbacks and reprisals in the beginning, sure, but in the long run it'll pay off. The defenders of the status quo are too few and unpopular to cling on to power for very long.

Dissident faculty members, I've given you an army -- use it!

There is no better time to achieve a revolution on college campuses. Potential allies are starting to multiply. Everywhere you look, there are moderate liberals conceding defeat to

conservatives and admitting that political correctness has gone too far³²⁸. A new coalition is waiting to be built.

Look at what I've already accomplished. Universities backing down over security fee-shenanigans, faculty committees penning letters in defense of free speech,³²⁹ and a host of moderate liberals who are now prepared to defend free speech again just if it means I'll go away and stop visiting their schools.

I can live with that.

I've also become ever-more notorious -- the most disinvited campus speaker of 2016.³³⁰ But that's just a bonus! There's a revolution brewing on college campuses. My tour is one important component. Two million dollars later, we've effected colossal change in American higher education, achieving more than two generations of conservatives and libertarians before us. And we're just getting started. My next tour, which might be underway already by the time you read this, will be called TROLL ACADEMY.

Every time they try to ban me, I get more powerful -- because I don't back down sheepishly and run away. I find another way to do what I wanted, often even more attention-seeking. You could say I'm only theatrical because they force me to be. Would there be a market for Milo if conservative and libertarian opinions were treated just as fairly as everyone else's?

³²⁸ <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/20/opinion/sunday/the-end-of-identity-liberalism.html>
<https://theamericanscholar.org/low-definition-in-higher-education/#.WGgP3VWLTIV>
<http://www.vox.com/2015/6/3/8706323/college-professor-afraid>
http://www.salon.com/2015/10/28/i_wanted_to_be_a_supporter_of_survivors_on_campus_and_a_good_teacher_i_didnt_realize_just_how_impossible_this_would_be/
<http://heatst.com/culture-wars/elite-college-professor-calls-academia-a-mad-house-and-safe-spaces-an-existential-error/>
<https://www.washingtonian.com/2016/09/15/jamie-raskin-american-university-political-correctness/>
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/12022041/How-political-correctness-rules-in-Americas-student-safe-spaces.html>

³²⁹ <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/03/12/university-of-minnesota-faculty-embraces-free-speech-following-milo-visit/>

³³⁰ <http://www.forbes.com/sites/maureensullivan/2016/12/30/provocateur-milo-yiannopoulos-was-the-speaker-most-likely-to-be-disinvited-to-colleges-in-2016/>

You'll know I've won when no one comes to my shows any more. In the meantime, as everyone knows, there are lines out the door everywhere I show up. That tells you all you need to know about the state of free thought on college campuses.

Administrators should have learned the lesson by now. If you think I'm crass and boorish and a cancer on your school's intellectual life, how about you start hiring more conservative academics? Because if you leave it just to the students, you're going to end up with people like me.

MILO'S COLLEGE RANKINGS: HEROES AND ZEROES

Want to know what college you should send your kids to, donate to, or apply to? Look no further. These are the colleges that have distinguished themselves – for better or worse.

ZEROES:

The University of Missouri: 2015's poster child for spinelessness saw its president resign over largely made-up racism complaints from privileged student activists. Do not enroll. Do not donate.

U.C. Berkeley: 2017's poster child for spinelessness. University police stood back and watched rioters set fires, loot buildings, and beat up anyone who looked vaguely pro-Trump.

U.C. Davis: Bullied College Republicans into cancelling my event minutes before it was scheduled to begin after violent protesters stormed the venue.

DePaul University: Administrators instructed campus police not to intervene when belligerent activists stormed the stage and swung their fists in my face.

The University of Maryland: Forced college organizers to cancel my event by hiking security fees at the last minute.

The University of Miami, Florida: Cancelled my event for vague, undefined "security concerns."

New York University: Ordered a professor, Michael Rectenwald, to go on leave after he publicly criticized political correctness and declared himself a "deplorable" on social media.

Villanova University: Caved in to activists who demanded the cancellation of my event.

Iowa State University: Forced the cancellation of my event with – you guessed it – levying a last-minute security fee hike on student organizers.

MILO'S COLLEGE RANKINGS: HEROES AND ZEROES

HEROES:

The University of Chicago: The Chicago Principles on Free Expression, outlining the colleges absolute commitment to free inquiry and free expression, are widely considered to be the gold standard in the fight against campus censorship. In 2016, the university greeted freshmen by warning them not to expect any “safe spaces” during their time at college.

California Polytechnic State University: Its president, Jeffrey Armstrong, refused to compromise with activist attempts to cancel my event, despite calls for his resignation.

The University of Minnesota: Minnesota's law faculty quickly moved to strengthen free speech protections on campus after protesters attempted to disrupt my lecture on campus.

Oklahoma Wesleyan University: Its president, Dr. Everett Piper, issued a letter to supporters of safe spaces in 2015, informing them that his college is not a “day care.”

Emory University: When activists demanded action against students chalking pro-Trump slogans on campus grounds, Emory's president, James W. Wagner, responded by chalking his own message: “Emory Stands for Free Expression.”

Ohio State University: Administrators ended a Missouri-style sit-in protest in 2016 with quiet efficiency, by threatening protesters with expulsion and arrest if they did not disperse.

Michigan State University: In contrast to the feeble response of campus security at U.C. Berkeley, police at Michigan State arrested no fewer than six unruly protesters and sent the rest running.

EPILOGUE

HOW TO BE A DANGEROUS FAGGOT

(EVEN IF YOU'RE NOT GAY)

You are fortunate, dear reader. You were born in time to witness the great fightback. Over the next decade, social justice warriors and busybodies are going to be beaten into submission by the forces of freedom and fun. We are going to win. And it's not thanks to a ferocious conservative press, or killer political candidates or great Republican authors and thinkers. It's you, buying this book, laughing at the idiots on Twitter and Facebook, finally throwing your hands up in disgust and saying, "Enough."

From college students sick of attending mandatory consent workshops and learning 42 new gender pronouns, to video game fans who just want to be left alone, the past couple of years have shown the power of ordinary people to defy elites and radically alter the cultural consensus. We're nowhere near sick of winning yet, and I am never short of excitement when I imagine what brilliant conquests our gang of deplorables will achieve next.

Even the BBC is starting to admit that conservatives are right about the state of college campuses.³³¹

The moon landing? Pfft. There is no more exciting time to be alive than now. We are living in an age of heroes, villains and revolution, and no one quite knows where the next uprising will come from.

³³¹ <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-38910648>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Like you, I'm sick of these odious blue-haired fucks on college campuses. I'd rather be at home watching Netflix, sucking off my boyfriend, or spending thousands of dollars in Louis Vuitton, or just being left alone. I do it because I have to, because no one else can or will right now. Until, perhaps, this book gets out there and inspires the next generation of culture warriors.

I have to go through the motions, day after day, absorbing the vitriol from the media and idiotic protesters, because every other conservative and libertarian figurehead has utterly failed

you. I'm like Cincinnatus, the Roman general who dropped his plough to lead an army to victory and secure the safety of his homeland, before immediately returning to the farm and his slave girls. In my case it would be a harem of Nubian catamites, but otherwise the picture is the same. In my heart of hearts I want to declare victory, or at least to pass the baton on, so I can go back to the *chaise longue* and indulge myself in silk and champagne.

But I know that will never happen in my lifetime, so I am resigned to the fight. I will wage war as long as there are dykes in gender studies departments telling lies about innocent young boys, as long as Black Lives Matter activists are attacking people for their skin color and as long as Britney has to withhold music videos because her managers are worried they aren't feminist enough. I will fight so long as free expression and creativity are at risk from thick-as-pigshit New York bloggers and social-justice activists.

I've always felt an acute sense of personal ordainment -- as though my life was meant for something greater. It's why I always related to *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Hopefully it's the achievement of the perfect blowjob or an imitable pompadour, rather than triggering campus feminists. But for so long as America needs me, I am yours.

At least for now, I am rejoicing. Because together, we have struck the first blow in what I know will be a decades-long fight to reclaim creative freedom and freedom of speech from the political Left. I'm talking, of course, about Daddy.

It was 1.40am on November 9, 2016, and I was in New York, giggling uncontrollably. I was giggling because the Associated Press had just called Pennsylvania for Donald Trump,

pushing him over 270 electoral votes and giving him the presidency. I was giggling because I could imagine the looks of bewilderment, despair and outrage on the faces of mainstream reporters covering the results just a few hallways away from me. I was giggling because the west was not doomed to die an ignominious death at the hands of open border-obsessed globalists. I was giggling because we had won.

The earthquake heralded by the election of Donald J. Trump had been a long time coming. It was the culmination of nearly thirty years of hectoring from both the mainstream left and the mainstream right; about how we should shut up if we knew what's good for us, about how we need to make up for a history of racism, sexism, and every "phobia" under the sun, about how entertaining this dangerous thought or making that dangerous joke would be the end of our careers.

Well, it turns out that the real danger lies in *not* daring to be dangerous. The Republicans didn't dare to be dangerous in 2012, and they lost. Donald Trump dared to be dangerous in 2016, and he won.

I dare to be dangerous every day, and, well, I can't *stop* winning.

My ascendancy has marked the overturning of an old order. GamerGate dealt a mortal blow to the leftist vigilante squads on social media and their friends in the press. Brexit put a stake through the heart of the bureaucratic, globalist European Union. And then Donald Trump came, to put an end to thirty years of politically correct consensus in the United States.

Leftists of course think 2016 was The Worst Year Ever, and not just because so many of their favorite celebrities died. Given the scale of their political defeats, they have some justification, but they are also pessimistic by nature. Some of these are the people, after all, who

believe that racism is worse than it's ever been, that rates of sexual assault on college campuses approximate the Congo, and that Brexit will herald World War III.

Steven Pinker, a sensible liberal, reminds us that this is not the case. The world is getting better, and has been for some time. As he ceaselessly reminds a pessimistic public, "Extreme poverty, child mortality, illiteracy, and global inequality are at historic lows; vaccinations, basic education, including girls, and democracy are at all-time highs." Rates of murder, violence, sexual assault and other crimes in the west also continue, by and large, to fall.³³² Socially, the millennial generation is the most tolerant ever³³³ and the incoming president is also likely to be the most gay-friendly Republican ever elected to the Presidency.

And now that leftists are out of power, America is on track to be less divided, safer, and more stable than ever before. By the time the next election rolls around, I predict Democrats will struggle to downplay the nation's success.

Never Apologize

The left delights in extracting apologies from the victims of public shaming. From Jack "The Southern Avenger" Hunter to Justine Sacco, one of the first signs of leftist victory is the sight of someone verbally flogging themselves in public. Like prisoners emerging from Big Brother's torture chamber in room 101, you can expect to see the phrases that mark a broken spirit: "I'm sorry." "I'll try to do better." "I'm learning to be a better person every day." "Thank you, mob of faceless Internet vigilantes, for educating me."

If you want to win, the first step is not to admit defeat.

Never apologize.

³³² <http://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2016/12/22/14042506/steven-pinker-optimistic-future-2016>

³³³ <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/02/24/millennials-confident-connected-open-to-change/>

Be Twice As Funny As You Are Outrageous

Does anyone remember how the alt-right died? Many reading this book will, but here's a refresher: an idiot called Richard Spencer took control of the movement. Spencer is offensive and hateful without being funny. He does his best to emulate the wittier elements of the movement, cringingly referencing Pepe and "meme magic" in his speeches, but it doesn't convince anyone. In the early days of the alt-right, tweeters were having fun with forbidden ideas. Spencer was having forbidden ideas (and bad ones, of course) and trying to transplant the fun in afterwards.

The fact that he had barmy ideas about "peaceful ethnic cleansing" (his quote) didn't really matter, at least not as much as the people giving Nazi salutes at his meetings. He later called them "Roman salutes" and claimed they were just trolling, but the damage was done. Spencer's little post-election stunt, a meeting of less than 200 people in which just a few engaged in the "Roman salute" spread all across the media, and the next day Donald Trump disavowed the entire alt-right.

I want people to be allowed to make jokes about, and discuss, anything that they want. I don't think people should be ostracized for doing so. I don't fear the ideas of people like Spencer, nor do I feel a need to hide them from view, because I have enough trust in ordinary people to examine and reject bad ideas on their own. Sunlight is the best disinfectant.

I will always defend the right of people to make jokes about whatever they choose, and mercilessly attack people who want to destroy the lives of 20-somethings over alt-right memes and 4chan trolling campaigns.

Be twice as funny as you are outrageous, because no one can resist the truth wrapped in a good joke,

“Not an Argument”

This one doesn't come from me, but from Canadian philosopher Stefan Molyneux. Molyneux, who frequently dabbles in dangerous topics like race, intelligence, anarchism and religion, has said this so often on his YouTube channel that it has become a meme.

Simply put, when someone calls you names, as the left is so fond of doing, there is no need to be upset, ruffled, or apologetic. These are just outbursts of moral rage, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. If you make a point, or reveal a fact, and someone responds with cries of “Racist!,” “Sexist!” “Homophobe!” or any other ways that the left now spells “heretic,” just coolly respond with that now-immortal phrase:

“Not an argument!”³³⁴³³⁵

Facts Over Feelings

In this book, you will have encountered several excellent examples of what I like to call “hate facts.” You now know, for instance, that black gang violence eclipses police violence as a threat to black lives. You will now know that the fabled “rape culture” on college campuses doesn't exist, and that the “gender pay gap” is a myth. You will know that being fat isn't healthy, although quite frankly, I think most of you are smart enough to figure that last one out on your own.

³³⁴ I call people a lot of names too, of course, but mostly to illustrate to my critics how frustrating it is when people don't address your arguments and instead fixate on irrelevant details, such as the fact that you're a straight white male

³³⁵ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qBM7qvw_kXk

You should never miss an opportunity to spread these facts around, especially if you're at college. Your peers are currently living in one of the most brainwashed eras of our history. The media, academia, and pop culture are all working overtime to get them to believe things that simply are not true. They are naturally offended when this fragile worldview is faced with reality, which is one of the reasons why so many of the younger generation retreat into safe spaces. However, you cannot spare their feelings.

The only way to beat propaganda is to spread the truth faster than the machine spreads lies.

Facts over feelings.

And that brings me to my favorite rule of all ...

Seek Attention

People often accuse me of being an attention-seeker. They're right, of course.

Or at least mostly right.

You see, I may be a flamboyant egotistical attention whoring diva faggot, but all my flouncing, Valley-girl craving for attention also serves a noble purpose -- it draws attention to my arguments, my values, and the causes I champion *as well as* my impeccable sense of style and Adonis-like good looks.

One of the mistakes that libertarians make endlessly is that they assume people actually *read* their brilliant essays on why roads should be privatized. I mean, they're probably flawless -- but that doesn't mean anything if *no-one's paying attention*.

I've galvanised a movement because I know how to put on a good show. I don't turn up on stage and reel off a list of paid talking points. I turn up on stage dressed as Marilyn Monroe,

have my deputy slap me in the face with whipped cream, throw up a slideshow of the hottest and spiciest memes of the moment... and *then* I reel off a list of talking points, but only after I've got everyone's attention, and ensured no one at the back is falling asleep.

We live in age where the competition for attention is getting tougher and tougher. Half a century ago, everyone watched same channels on TV because, well, there wasn't much else. Now there are thousands of channels, shows, YouTube feeds, and websites competing for the public's eyeballs. If what you have to say is important, you have to know how to get people listening.

Be Hot

This sounds difficult, but it's very important. You have *got* to be hotter than your opponents. We live in an age of "fat acceptance" and the celebration of the mediocre. A high school sports day where everyone gets a prize. No! Don't settle for second-best. Hit the gym, go on a diet, go to a tanning salon. Don't waste money on McDonald's--waste it on Gucci.

Keep in mind that it's not hard to be hotter than many of your opponents, so you don't even have a good excuse. Be Ann Coulter, not Lena Dunham.

And always keep women worried you might steal their boyfriends when they're not looking.

Be hot.

Have Fun

This is one of the most important requirements of being a Dangerous Faggot, and probably the most important reason I win.

What do leftists do when they get together? Well, if college safe spaces are any guide, they sit in a circle and share their feelings with each other. They'll talk about how unsafe they feel, and gently pat each other on the shoulders. In public, they'll get angry, yell slogans, and whine about how offended they are by our side's words.

They don't look like they're having much fun, do they?

Establishment conservatives do a little better on the "sense of humor" scale, but you can never escape the feeling that they'd rather be at a college debate club meet, or at a Heritage Foundation speaker event. Like the leftists, they can be dreadfully serious sometimes.

My followers win because they know that politics isn't everything. That's why they mistrust overly-serious establishment conservatives, and that's why they're so at odds with the left, who wish to politicize everything from video games to pop songs.

No-one wants to hang out with squares. They want to go to the party with blackjack and hookers, not the one with Scrabble and Diet Coke.

And right now, I'm throwing the best party in town.

Have fun.

Be Dangerous

We live in an age where one side of the political spectrum would like all debate, all challenge to their viewpoints, all diversity of thought to be snuffed out. Why? Because they're scared. Scared that their political, social and cultural consensus, carefully constructed and

nurtured over the past few years, with its secular religions of feminism, enforced diversity, multiculturalism, and casual hatred for straight white males, is built on a foundation of sand.

They have watched as the threats to their order, and the worldview it represents, multiply. They have watched the dream of multiculturalism die at the hands of Islam, despite all their attempts to downplay and cover up the atrocities.

They have watched as the idea of “socially constructed” genders and races, once dogma in the academy, slowly fades into irrelevance, swept away by a new wave of research on the innate roots of our identities, despite all attempts to suppress it.

They have seen their stranglehold on culture, once so steely and strong, slip away. Comedians grow tired of language codes. Movie directors and video game designers grow tired of the demands for diversity quotas, of attacks over the representation of women and minorities, and long to taste creative freedom once more. Artists, ever longing to provoke and challenge, slowly wake up and realize that to be left-wing today is to be the establishment.

It’s a scary time to be a leftist. So it’s little wonder that even I’m considered to be dangerous, with my mild demands for free speech on campuses, my fact-based objections to feminism and black lives matter, and my wariness of the sexism and homophobia that drifts slowly westward from the swamp of modern Islam.

Those who are frightened of free speech, whether it’s ideas and facts that challenge their side, or jokes that prod at their carefully-constructed social taboos, are almost always frightened of something else. It’s not the speech, or even the so-called “hurt feelings” that bother them. It’s that nagging concern, that plagues all defenders of fact-free dogma, that they might be wrong or they might be unpersuasive. And they just can’t handle that.

Well, no matter. You don't need to convince them. You're responsible for your own minds, after all, not theirs. And your minds are clearly in a good state, because you're reading this book.

So use them. Be dangerous. Read all the books that your college is too afraid to stock in their library. Find the thinkers and the writers and the artists who have been shamed out of the mainstream, and find out why. Get together with your friends and pledge to be as dangerous as possible.

You're already reading a book you're not supposed to. Go watch a movie you're not supposed to.

Or better yet, go *make* a movie you're not supposed to.

Or write a song you're not supposed to.

Or design a video game you're not supposed to.

Start a blog you're not supposed to.

Discuss ideas you're not supposed to.

Get on social media and tell a joke you're not supposed to.

Share a meme you're not supposed to. Find some facts you're not supposed to.

Be dangerous.

Like that hot guy on the cover.

The Yiannopoulos Privilege Grant

Thanks to the overzealous efforts of diversity activists, a new disadvantaged social group has appeared: young white men, who are increasingly the losers of the education system, the least preferred candidates in a system that falls over itself to accommodate women and minorities.

Men are rapidly falling behind women in education, making up just 43 percent of America's 20.5 million college students³³⁶. Furthermore, between 1976 and 2012, the percentage of white non-Hispanic students fell from 84 percent to 60 percent, below proportional numbers³³⁷. In the UK, white working-class males are now considered the group least likely to go to university³³⁸.

This presents long term problems, as higher education pays dividends. Young adults who only have a high school diploma end up earning 62 percent less than those with a bachelor's degree. The exclusion of white men from the education system has ramifications that will lead to wider economic inequality.

So I've decided to do something about it. I've created the Yiannopoulos Privilege Grant, a scholarship for white men who wish to pursue their post-secondary education on equal footing with their female, queer and ethnic minority classmates. Every year, it will award \$2,500 to support one white male student's college education. There are a myriad of scholarships available to women (already over-represented) and minorities, so why not?

If you want to donate, apply for, or just find out more about the Yiannopoulos Privilege Grant, you can find it at <http://privilegegrant.com>.

³³⁶ <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372>

³³⁷ <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=98>

³³⁸ http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2016/01/06/poor-boys-attend-university_n_8921854.html

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

If you're looking for someone to blame for the whole Milo thing, here are a few people who ought to be in your crosshairs. My editor at Breitbart, Alex Marlow, has perhaps the best news judgment of any journalist working today and has saved me from plenty of near-misses. I wouldn't be where I am without him. My deputy, Allum Bokhari, without whom this book would never have got off the ground, is a major journalistic talent and will, I'm sure, eclipse me when I finally collapse unconscious onto a pile of Nigerian rent boys.

My chief of staff Colin Madine executes the most difficult job in media -- keeping Milo Yiannopoulos on the straight and narrow -- flawlessly. My assistants Marc and Marc make sure I show up within an hour or two of the advertised time. My lawyer Brian and his team do a lot of heavy lifting and never complain when I demand ridiculous things. Thanks to the squad for keeping the travelling Dangerous Faggot circus fed, watered and looking fabulous -- Mike, Hayden, Hunter, Seabass, Blake and of course Jeff the wildman Johnson and my long-suffering tour manager Andrew Greider. Thanks Gabe, for keeping the lights on. Will Ross -- we miss you.

A few friends gave me a leg up. Thank you to my dark angel Lexica for helping me to produce the best pop album of 2017. You shaped my thinking and I am forever grateful. One day we will be free at a Snctm party in the hills. James Cook: as always, wise counsel. Scott Walter and Rachel Fulton Brown provided constant intellectual nourishment. Based Mom, Christina

Hoff Sommers, kept me kind. Drake Bell kept a smile on my face. Thanks to Pizza Party Ben for keeping the meme tank full. I could have been a better friend while on tour and while writing this book to Alicia and to Colette and Sascha for the past three years. But I know they will forgive me eventually.

And of course I couldn't have done it without my agent Tom Flannery, who was indulgent when able and strict when necessary, and my publisher Mitchell Ivers, who lightened the mood with welcome camp classic pop quizzes.

THANK YOU TO ALL THE HATERS -- WITHOUT YOU I'D BE NOWHERE. TO ALL THE HUNGRY TIGERS WHO TRIED IT - STAY MAD! TO EVERYONE WHO SAID I COULDN'T MAKE IT, LOOK AT ME NOW! IN PARTICULAR: Anita Sarkeesian! Couldn't have done it without you, babe. Leslie Jones, for making me even more famous. And Jack Dorsey, who did so much to get Daddy elected.

Finally, of course, thanks to Steve Bannon -- for everything else.