

## CHAPTER TWO

---

# ANTI-BLACK RACISM & ANTI-SEMITISM

The Civil War was not only a breathtakingly bloody dispute between the North and the South, the Union and the Confederacy, and antislavery and proslavery forces, but a battle between the Republican Party and the Democrat Party—the latter conflict of which is rarely mentioned and certainly not emphasized. Indeed, for major elements of the Democrat Party, the Civil War did not end in 1865. It never ended. Despite the best efforts of its party apparatchiks, academic surrogates, and media propagandists to ignore, spin, or obscure the horrendous story of the Democrat Party's past—from the Ku Klux Klan and lynchings to segregation, Jim Crow laws, voter intimidation, etc.—the Democrat Party had a hand in all of it. In fact, Jefferson Davis, the president of the Confederacy, was a Democrat, as were virtually all the leaders and generals of the Confederacy. Confederate general Nathan Bedford Forrest, a Democrat, became the first grand wizard of the Ku Klux Klan after the Civil War, which he helped found to terrorize the newly freed slaves and gut Recon-

struction, and which Republican president Ulysses S. Grant sought to destroy by deploying the U.S. Army. Grant's efforts were stymied after the Democrat Party won a majority in the House of Representatives, which cut his support.

A few decades later, among the leading so-called progressive intellectuals (American Marxists) of the late 1800s and early 1900s was Woodrow Wilson, a prominent Democrat who was president of Princeton University and would become governor of New Jersey. Wilson was an accomplished racist activist. "In his academic work on American history, Wilson was friendly to the Ku Klux Klan's mission of suppressing blacks, and he was forgiving of its terror tactics," explains Williamson M. Evers in *Education Weekly*.<sup>1</sup> "When he was the president of Princeton, Wilson expressed his pride that no African-American students had been admitted during his tenure."<sup>2</sup> As governor, in 1911 Wilson signed into law a eugenics bill titled "An ACT to authorize and provide for the sterilization of feeble-minded (including idiots, imbeciles and morons), epileptics, rapists, certain criminals and other defectives," which was later struck down by the New Jersey Supreme Court.<sup>3</sup>

What is eugenics? As current Princeton University professor Thomas C. Leonard writes, "Eugenics describes a movement to improve human heredity by the social control of human breeding, based on the assumption that differences in human intelligence, character and temperament are largely due to differences in heredity."<sup>4</sup> It was also fundamentally and inherently a horrific racist and bigoted justification for literally thinning out minority populations.

Wilson's backing for eugenics was common among progressives. Indeed, progressivism and eugenics were interdependent. "Progressive Era eugenics was, in fact, the broadest of churches," states Leonard. "It was mainstream; it was popular to the point of faddishness; it was supported by leading figures in the newly emerging science of genetics; it appealed to an extraordinary

range of political ideologies, not just progressives; and it survived the Nazis. . . . Eugenic ideas were not new in the Progressive Era, but they acquired new impetus with the Progressive Era advent of a more expansive government. In effect, the expansion of state power meant that it became possible to have not only eugenic thought, but also eugenic practice.”<sup>5</sup> Why? By their lights, what better way to improve society than to improve human heredity and socially manage reproduction. In fact, tens of thousands of Americans were sterilized against their will.

It is little noted that the American eugenics movement “influenced Adolf Hitler and his policies and ultimately contributed to the Holocaust. . . .” as reported by no less than PBS.<sup>6</sup>

In its report, PBS spoke to historian Daniel Kevles, who explained: “People tend to think that eugenics was a doctrine that originated with the Nazis, that it was grounded in wild claims that were far outside the scientific mainstream. Both of those impressions are fundamentally not true.”<sup>7</sup>

Historian Jonathan Spiro added that “[t]he United States has the reputation of being on the forefront of scientific endeavor. When Adolf Hitler was in prison, he read Madison Grant’s *The Passing of the Great Race*, wrote Madison Grant a fan letter saying, ‘This book is my bible,’ and when he wrote *Mein Kampf*, his autobiography, he said, ‘We Germans must emulate what the Americans are doing.’”<sup>8</sup>

Grant, an American lawyer, wrote his book in 1916. It was the first book published by the Nazi regime. The book is a racist screed filled with pseudoscientific claims about the American superiority of the “Nordic race.”

To be clear, the eugenics movement, and the “scientific” application of eugenics as creating a superior governing system, was promoted by the so-called Progressives and the Democrat Party, and led to the idea of creating a superior race of people by culling

the population. Moreover, like most racists and racist theories, Grant insisted that historical and current events evolve around race rather than other social, economic, or cultural issues. The same emphasis on this dangerously perverse, racist ideological approach is the lens through which the American Marxist movements insist we view America today—but with a different set of victims. More on this in Chapter 3.

One of the most avid and influential advocates of eugenics was Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, which has had deep ties to the Democrat Party for a century and has been funded with billions of federal taxpayer dollars for decades. Indeed, any present-day attempts to reduce the group's tax subsidies is met with howls of objections from congressional Democrats.

Who was Margaret Sanger? Sanger has been celebrated as an early feminist and “birth control pioneer.” But she was much more than that. Sanger was an ardent racist. She spoke to the women's auxiliary of the Klan in New Jersey. She supported the forcible sterilization of “unfit” women. And Sanger made many documented racist declarations throughout her life. For example, she wrote: “Eugenics is . . . the most adequate and thorough avenue to the solution of racial, political and social problems.”<sup>9</sup> She argued that “[b]irth control is not contraception indiscriminately and thoughtlessly practiced. It means the release and cultivation of the better racial elements in our society, and gradual suppression, elimination and eventual expiration of defective stocks—those human weeds which threaten the blooming of the finest flowers of American civilization.”<sup>10</sup> Nonetheless, Planned Parenthood praised Sanger for decades, conferring its “highest award,” the Margaret Sanger Award, on a long list of recipients, including Hillary Clinton, who proudly accepted it. Not until 2000 did Planned Parenthood begin to distance itself finally and reluctantly from Sanger's racial eugenics, but only after a torrent of criticism.

Like Sanger, for the longest time Wilson's racism was mostly blue-penciled or softened by historians, the media, and the Democrat Party until more recently because he was a crucial "progressive reformer" and hyper-globalist. He was also the first Democrat since Andrew Jackson in 1832 to win two consecutive presidential terms (1913–1921). The Democrat Party and its surrogates could not politically afford to abandon him, let alone condemn him. They were invested in him. After all, Wilson reestablished the federal income tax, created the Federal Reserve and Federal Trade Commission, was generally antibusiness and pro-organized labor, and so forth. In other words, Wilson was the truly first president, and a Democrat at that, to widely institute the kind of administrative-state governance, supposedly relying on "scientific" and expert knowledge, that progressivism demands. Moreover, for Wilson and his ilk, the inferiority of blacks was a scientific fact about which the administrative state should take note in its reengineering of society. That is, if you are going to establish a society in which the best and brightest are to be in charge, from Wilson's perspective, inferior races must be taken into account and denied such top positions or significant influence.

Furthermore, Wilson, like so many Progressive Era Democrats and intellectuals, believing blacks to be an inferior race, opposed black suffrage and supported various insidious efforts in predominantly southern states to limit their influence at the ballot box and in politics and society overall for essentially the same reason they supported racial eugenics—that is, they believed it was impossible for government to more expertly and perfectly manage society given the influences of a supposedly inferior race. Thus, they believed they were justified and even compelled to use social and economic regulation to minimize black influence.

Consequently, as president, Wilson overturned decades of racial progress made under prior Republican administrations, set-

ting back race relations for half a century. For example, Wilson brought Jim Crow to the federal government and helped introduce it to areas of the North and spread it throughout the country by resegregating federal departments and agencies, including hiring practices, work areas, and even segregating restrooms and lunchrooms. Beginning in 1914, Wilson required applicants for federal civil service jobs to provide photographs for the first time to block the hiring of blacks. Wilson appointed racists and segregationists to his cabinet and throughout the highest levels of the federal government. Wilson fired black federal administrators, was openly sympathetic to the Klan, opposed black suffrage, and not only screened the racist movie *The Birth of a Nation* at the White House (the movie was adapted from the book *The Clansman*), but racist diatribes from his own book, *A History of the American People*, were prominently featured in title cards in the movie.<sup>11</sup>

“The policy of the congressional leaders wrought . . . a veritable overthrow of civilization in the South . . . in their determination to ‘put the white South under the heel of the black South.’”<sup>12</sup>

“The white men were roused by a mere instinct of self-preservation . . . until at last there had sprung into existence a great Ku Klux Klan, a veritable empire of the South, to protect the southern country.”<sup>13</sup>

“Adventurers swarmed out of the North, as much the enemies of one race as of the other, to cozen, beguile and use the negroes. . . . In the villages the negroes were the office holders, men who knew none of the uses of authority, except its insolences.”<sup>14</sup>

Progressive Era Democrats like Wilson rejected the Declaration of Independence’s references to individual unalienable rights,

transcendent natural law, eternal truths and values, and divine influence, which are the fundamental ideals undergirding American society and the establishment of our country. Why? Because the Declaration, properly understood, rejects both the progressive (Marxist) ideology and Democrat Party racism. In fact, the former explains, in part, why Barack Obama and Ketanji Brown Jackson shun the Declaration.

As Abraham Lincoln explained in his famous Lewistown, Illinois, speech on August 17, 1858: “‘We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.’ This was their [the founders’] majestic interpretation of the economy of the Universe. This was their lofty, and wise, and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to His creatures. Yes, gentlemen, to *all* His creatures, to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the Divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on, and degraded, and imbruted by its fellows. They grasped not only the whole race of man then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children and their children’s children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages. Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, or none but white men, were entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began—so that truth, and justice, and mercy, and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so

that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built.

“Now, my countrymen, if you have been taught doctrines conflicting with the great landmarks of the Declaration of Independence; if you have listened to suggestions which would take away from its grandeur, and mutilate the fair symmetry of its proportions; if you have been inclined to believe that all men are *not* created equal in those inalienable rights enumerated by our chart of liberty, let me entreat you to come back. Return to the fountain whose waters spring close by the blood of the Revolution. . . .”<sup>15</sup>

Wilson and the progressives saw America quite differently from Republican Lincoln, the “Great Emancipator,” and our country’s founders. In 1907, Wilson wrote:

So far as the Declaration of Independence was a theoretical document, that is its theory. Do we still hold it? Does the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence still live in our principles of action, in the things we do, in the purposes we applaud, in the measures we approve? It is not a question of piety. We are not bound to adhere to the doctrines held by the signers of the Declaration of Independence; we are as free as they were to make and unmake governments. We are not here to worship men or a document. But neither are we here to indulge in a mere rhetorical and uncritical eulogy. Every Fourth of July should be a time for examining our standards, our purposes, for determining afresh what principles, what forms of power we think most likely to effect our safety and happiness. That and that alone is the obligation the Declaration lays upon us. It is no fetish; its words lay no compulsion upon the thought of any free man; but it was drawn by men who thought, and it obliges those who receive its benefits to think likewise.<sup>16</sup>



And in a July 4, 1914, speech at Independence Hall, Wilson declared that “[t]here is nothing in [the Declaration] for us unless we can translate it into the terms of our own conditions and of our own lives. We must reduce it to what the lawyers call a bill of particulars. It contains a bill of particulars, but the bill of particulars of 1776. If we would keep it alive, we must fill it with a bill of particulars of the year 1914.”<sup>17</sup>

Wilson’s contempt for the principles undergirding the Declaration is embraced by leading Democrats today. For example, when asked if she believes in the Declaration’s proclamation about natural rights during her confirmation hearing, Associate Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson answered, “I do not hold a position on whether individuals possess natural rights.”<sup>18</sup> Jackson could not openly disavow the Declaration, lest she face a Republican filibuster in the Senate against her confirmation. Nonetheless, she, like Wilson and others, refused to endorse it.

The Declaration of Independence and the Democrat Party are fundamentally incompatible. For Wilson and progressives since, the supposed scientific ability of Marxist masterminds to manage and manipulate society, government, and economics necessarily requires controlling the individual and compelling his conformity and compliance with the “collective will” and the best interests of “the communal,” as determined and dictated by the self-anointed ruling-class elites. Thus, it is necessary to dehumanize the individual or at least deemphasize him, which fundamentally reverses the very purpose of America’s founding, and group individuals into various manageable categories based on economics, gender, religion, and, of course, race. Conformism and standardization replace free will, self-determination, and self-sufficiency. Traditions, customs, and institutions must be eradicated.

In 1913, Wilson wrote *The New Freedom*, in which he pro-

claimed: “We are in the presence of a new organization of society. Our life has broken away from the past. The life of America is not the life it was twenty years ago; it is not the life that it was ten years ago. We have changed our economic conditions, absolutely, from top to bottom; and, with our economic society, the organization of life. The old political formulas do not fit the present problems; they read now like documents taken from a forgotten age. The older cries sound as if they belonged to a past age which men have almost forgotten. . . .”<sup>19</sup> Obama, Sanders, Biden, et al. express these same sentiments as Wilson did.

As Associate Justice Neil Gorsuch pointed out in a recent Supreme Court decision, “Woodrow Wilson famously argued that ‘popular sovereignty’ ‘embarrasse[d]’ the Nation because it made it harder to achieve ‘executive expertness.’ In Wilson’s eyes, the mass of the people were ‘selfish, ignorant, timid, stubborn, or foolish.’ He expressed even greater disdain for particular groups, defending ‘[t]he white men of the South’ for ‘rid[ding] themselves, by fair means or foul, of the intolerable burden of governments sustained by the votes of ignorant [black Americans].’ He likewise denounced immigrants ‘from the south of Italy and men of the meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland,’ who possessed ‘neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of quick intelligence.’ To Wilson, our Republic ‘tr[ie]d] to do too much by vote.’”<sup>20</sup>

The modern Democrat Party remains an authoritarian political and societal enterprise, for which its conceit and self-righteousness know few limits, and its self-appointed experts seek to lord over their fellow man. The rejiggering of society and social engineering are unending and increasingly intrusive, the practice and legalization of abuses of power are more ambitious and pervasive in order to impose and enforce increasingly unpopular and unjust rule, and constant turmoil and tumult are used to confound the public and promote fissures among the citizenry. Tyranny is thus

planned and ultimately predictable. Again, in 2008, shortly before winning election to the presidency, Barack Obama declared that “we are five days away from fundamentally transforming the United States of America. . . .”<sup>21</sup> Transforming it into what? This sounds a lot like Wilson’s “new organization of society” writings.

In 2016, at the Democratic National Convention, and announcing his endorsement of Hillary Clinton for president, Bernie Sanders shouted: “Together, we have begun a political revolution to transform America, and that revolution continues. Together, we will continue to fight for a government which represents all of us and not just the one per cent.”<sup>22</sup> Exactly what kind of government does the “Democratic-Socialist” have in mind? In 2020, President Biden proclaimed that “we have an incredible opportunity to not just dig out of this crisis [COVID-19], but to fundamentally transform the country.”<sup>23</sup> Again, transform it into what? This has been the Democrat Party’s mantra for at least the past 130 years.

The Democrats of the earlier Progressive Era and the Democrats of the present day share contempt for the American experiment and the American people. In 2008, at a San Francisco fundraiser, Obama proclaimed that people in small-town America were “bitter, they cling to guns or religion or antipathy toward people who aren’t like them or anti-immigrant sentiment or anti-trade sentiment as a way to explain their frustrations.”<sup>24</sup>

The Declaration’s essential, founding principles, especially the emphasis on the individual, conflict with the Democrat Party’s political purposes and obsession with power, and always have. It naturally follows, therefore, that during much of American history, the Democrat Party has sought to pervert and dismember our governing document as well, the Constitution, and republicanism generally, inasmuch as the Constitution is a bulwark against the ideologies and motivations for which the Democrat Party

stands and has stood. Among other things, prominent Democrats have denounced or usurped, at various times, the Constitution's checks and balances, separation of powers, federalism, the Electoral College, the Commerce Clause, and the Bill of Rights—or have trashed the Constitution entirely as an old document written by slaveholders. Today, the Democrat Party's denunciation of America's founders, the Constitution's framers, and American history itself has been relentless. More on this later in the book.

The Democrat Party's greatest hero is Franklin Roosevelt, largely due to his New Deal agenda and its highly successful transformation of the United States away from constitutionalism and capitalism toward a centralized, socialist state. Indeed, the Great Depression provided Roosevelt, more than any president until his time, with the opportunity to fundamentally alter the prism through which national governance was and would be viewed. Even more than Wilson, Roosevelt altered the role of the American government. Roosevelt created a labyrinth of agencies, departments, programs, subsidies, etc. Henceforth, human improvement and progress would be measured not by actual outcomes and success, but by the extent to which government could be expanded, personal and economic freedom could be curbed through legislation, regulation, and taxation—and, significantly, altering the relationship between the individual and the government. Again, more on this later. But for this reason, Roosevelt's reputation has been mostly spared criticism more than virtually any other public figure, dead or alive, for the racist, bigoted, lawless, and unconstitutional aspects of his true legacy. Indeed, the number of books and documentaries celebrating Roosevelt, and distorting his record, seem infinite.

Let us add some truth to Roosevelt's record. For example, in 1942, after Imperial Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066, in which 120,000 Japanese Americans, including 70,000 United States citizens, were forcibly relo-

cated by the U.S. Army to internment camps in remote parts of the country. They lost their homes, property, and liberties.<sup>25</sup> In fact, well before Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, resulting in the United States entering World War II, the David S. Wyman Institute's Rafael Medoff explains that "[i]n a series of articles from 1923 to 1925, FDR railed against 'non-assimilable' immigrants from the Far East. 'Japanese immigrants are not capable of assimilation into the American population. . . . Anyone who has traveled in the Far East knows that the mingling of Asiatic blood with European or American blood produces, in nine cases out of ten, the most unfortunate results.'"<sup>26</sup>

In 1944, in *Korematsu v. United States*, the Supreme Court, the majority of whose members were appointed by Roosevelt, upheld the internment order in a 6–3 decision. Associate Justice Hugo Black, writing for the majority, said, in part: "Compulsory exclusion of large groups of citizens from their homes, except under circumstances of direst emergency and peril, is inconsistent with our basic governmental institutions. But when, under conditions of modern warfare, our shores are threatened by hostile forces, the power to protect must be commensurate with the threatened danger."<sup>27</sup> However, there was no threat that these Japanese Americans, including children and infants, posed any such danger.

In truth, Japanese Americans fought bravely during World War II. As the *Densho Encyclopedia* explains: "Much decorated for their valor and often cited as being part of the most decorated unit in World War II for its size and length of service, Japanese Americans served in the U.S. armed forces in disproportionate numbers, despite having their loyalties questioned after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Though they mostly served in the segregated 442nd Regimental Combat Team and its predecessor, the 100th Infantry Battalion, others served as translators and interpreters in the Military Intelligence Service."<sup>28</sup>

Who was Hugo Black, the justice who authored the *Korematsu* decision? Black rose through the Democrat Party ranks in Alabama, was a lawyer for the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s (from which he later resigned, but whose leaders he continued to work with), and was elected to the United States Senate in 1926. He opposed the 1934 Wagner-Costigan antilynching bill and was an intensely loyal supporter of Roosevelt and the New Deal.<sup>29</sup> In 1937, Black was rewarded by Roosevelt as his first nominee to the Supreme Court. His overall record as a justice is mixed and disputed, as he was an activist for Roosevelt's economic socialism, but he also insisted on a strict interpretation of the Bill of Rights, but with notable exceptions—like the *Korematsu* decision. That said, Hugo Black Jr., Black's son, recalling the appeal of the Klan to his father, stated that “[t]he Ku Klux Klan and Daddy, so far as I could tell, had one thing in common. He suspected the Catholic Church. . . . He thought the Pope and the bishops had too much power and property. . . .”<sup>30</sup>

A Republican president, Ronald Reagan, signed into law the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, which provided a restitution payment of \$20,000 to the 60,000 surviving Japanese Americans who had been unconstitutionally imprisoned in internment camps by Roosevelt. Reagan declared: “For throughout the war, Japanese-Americans in the tens of thousands remained utterly loyal to the United States. Indeed, scores of Japanese-Americans volunteered for our Armed Forces, many stepping forward in the internment camps themselves. The 442d Regimental Combat Team, made up entirely of Japanese-Americans, served with immense distinction to defend this nation, their nation. Yet back at home, the soldiers’ families were being denied the very freedom for which so many of the soldiers themselves were laying down their lives.”<sup>31</sup>

Importantly, these payments were made *directly* to those who were actually harmed by Roosevelt's racist directive, not to their

progeny or individuals several generations removed from their internment.

It is, therefore, shameful that even today the Democrat Party, and its surrogates at Harvard and the University of North Carolina, would stoop to using racially discriminatory admissions policies specifically targeting Asian Americans for exclusion. In the recent Supreme Court decision in *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College*, the Court by 6–2 (Justice Jackson recused herself respecting Harvard but voted with the minority by 6–3 respecting UNC), overturned their racist policies. Chief Justice John Roberts, writing for the majority, said in part:

. . . [t]he Harvard and UNC admissions programs cannot be reconciled with the guarantees of the Equal Protection Clause. Both programs lack sufficiently focused and measurable objectives warranting the use of race, unavoidably employ race in a negative manner, involve racial stereotyping, and lack meaningful end points. We have never permitted admissions programs to work in that way, and we will not do so today.<sup>32</sup>

Thus, but for the Republican-appointed conservatives on the Supreme Court, these racist higher education policies would remain today—and be sanctioned by the Court’s Democrats.

Indeed, in his concurring opinion, Clarence Thomas reminds us that Harvard, Yale, and Princeton instituted a similarly racist admissions policy in the 1920s against Jews. During this same period, Thomas notes that “Harvard played a prominent role in the eugenics movement. According to then president Abbott Lawrence Lowell, excluding Jews from Harvard would help maintain admissions opportunities for Gentiles and perpetuate the purity of the Brahmin race . . . ”<sup>33</sup>

The Supreme Court's decision was roundly condemned by Democrat Party officials, the Democrat Party media, and, of course, the universities. Biden proclaimed: "I strongly, strongly, disagree with the Court's decision . . . This is not a normal court."<sup>34</sup>

Looking back again, when Roosevelt's civil rights record toward blacks is scrutinized, it is not as generally described by historians and professors supportive of the New Deal and Roosevelt's socialist economic policies. In fact, it is deeply troubling. For example, Roosevelt established the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) in 1934. Its ostensible purpose was to insure mortgages, thereby promoting homeownership. However, it furthered racial segregation by specifically denying insurance in and around black neighborhoods. Incredibly, "the FHA was subsidizing builders who were mass-producing entire subdivisions for whites—with the requirement that none of the homes be sold to African-Americans. . . . The term 'redlining' . . . comes from the development by the New Deal, by the federal government of maps of every metropolitan area in the country. And those maps were color-coded by first the Home Owners Loan Corp. and then the Federal Housing Administration and then adopted by the Veterans Administration, and these color codes were designed to indicate where it was safe to insure mortgages. And anywhere where African-Americans lived, anywhere where African-Americans lived nearby were colored red to indicate to appraisers that these neighborhoods were too risky to insure mortgages."<sup>35</sup>

Roosevelt infamously and unceremoniously slighted the great black Olympian Jesse Owens. White athletes who had competed in the 1936 Berlin Olympics were later invited to meet the president at the White House. Owens, the star of those Olympics, was not. Owens complained that he was insulted. Asked if he



was snubbed by Hitler at the Olympics (whom he had not met), Owens replied: "Hitler didn't snub me, it was FDR who snubbed me. The President didn't even send me a telegram." Owens campaigned for Roosevelt's Republican opponent, Alf Landon, when he returned from Europe.<sup>36</sup>

Even when the issue was the horror of lynching, Roosevelt refused to support federal antilynching legislation. In 1940, black heavyweight boxing champion Joe Louis endorsed Roosevelt's Republican opponent, Wendell Wilkie, explaining: "If Mr. Willkie is elected . . . he has promised in writing to put over the anti-lynching bill. Roosevelt has been in office for eight years and done nothing about that. The people in the North don't know how long is eight years."<sup>37</sup> Roosevelt feared he would lose Democrat Party support, especially in the South, and would not gain an unprecedented third term if he backed the bill. Therefore, it died, never to be successfully resurrected during the rest of his presidency. In that same year, Roosevelt refused to reintegrate the armed forces, which Wilson had resegregated.<sup>38</sup> The fact is that Roosevelt did little for the black community. Author Bruce Bartlett notes that "Roosevelt never used his political capital to do anything meaningful to help blacks. . . . [He] never spoke to the NAACP or gave a single speech devoted to black concerns, and even banned black reporters from White House press conferences."<sup>39</sup>

Rafael Medoff goes further, explaining that Roosevelt's personal prejudices appeared to influence his decision-making as well. He explained that "Roosevelt enlisted government resources to advance his ideas on racial engineering. In 1942, he commissioned three prominent anthropologists to study 'problems arising out of racial admixtures.' A senior White House aide instructed them: 'The President wishes to be advised what will happen when various kinds of Europeans—Scandinavian, Germanic, French-Belgian, North Italian, etc.—are mixed with the South American

base stock.' Roosevelt also wanted to know, 'Is the South Italian stock—say Sicilian—as good as the North Italian stock—say Milanese—if given equal social and economic opportunity? . . . [If] 10,000 Italians were to be offered settlement facilities, what proportion of the 10,000 should be Northern Italians and what Southern Italians?'<sup>40</sup> Even given all that was on Roosevelt's plate in 1942, he was focused on this.

What of Roosevelt's relationship with the Jewish community, which is often believed to have been admirable? Roosevelt had some prominent Jews advising him as president, including in his cabinet. But his more complete record respecting Jews has been censored in significant ways, or worse, embellished—even today in books and documentary films.<sup>41</sup>

In his March 1933 inaugural address, Roosevelt declared, in part: "We are stricken by no plague of locusts. Compared with the perils which our forefathers conquered because they believed and were not afraid, we have still much to be thankful for. Nature still offers her bounty and human efforts have multiplied it. Plenty is at our doorstep, but a generous use of it languishes in the very sight of the supply. Primarily this is because the rulers of the exchange of mankind's goods have failed, through their own stubbornness and their own incompetence, have admitted their failure, and abdicated. Practices of the *unscrupulous money changers* stand indicted in the court of public opinion, rejected by the hearts and minds of men. True they have tried, but their efforts have been cast in the pattern of an outworn tradition. Faced by failure of credit they have proposed only the lending of more money. Stripped of the lure of profit by which to induce our people to follow their false leadership, they have resorted to exhortations, pleading tearfully for restored confidence. They know only the rules of a generation of self-seekers. They have no vision, and when there is no vision, the people perish. The *money changers* have fled from their high

seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social values more noble than mere monetary profit.”<sup>42</sup> (*Italics are mine.*)

The phrase “unscrupulous money changers” has been a damnable ethnic slur used against Jewish people since at least the twelfth century.<sup>43</sup> And given the significance of his first inaugural address, Roosevelt and his advisers knew this when they inserted the phrase twice in his speech.

Even more, Roosevelt’s purposeful inaction during the Holocaust, to assist Jews being slaughtered by the millions, was contemptible and unconscionable. Medoff explains: “Here is the president who was regarded as a humanitarian, who portrayed himself as the champion of the little man, who had the power to save many Jews from the Holocaust but who—to quote Fowler Harper, the Solicitor General for the Interior Department in the 1940s— ‘would not lift a finger’ to help them. His was the administration that kept the immigration quotas 90% under-filled—meaning it could have saved 190,000 Jews under the existing quotas, without changing the immigration laws. His was the administration that sent planes to bomb German oil factories less than five miles from the gas chambers of Auschwitz, but refused to instruct them to drop bombs on the gas chambers, or the railway lines, even after receiving maps and detailed information about what was happening in the camp. His was the administration that refused to pressure the British to open the gates of Palestine so Jews could find refuge there.”<sup>44</sup>

As I mentioned, Roosevelt had Jewish associates, however, notably the White House and particularly the State Department were populated with several infamous anti-Semites. At State, where the decisions about immigration and refugee issues were made, Roosevelt nearly always backed the bigots who blocked

the migration of Jewish refugees into the United States from Germany and the rest of Europe during the height of the Holocaust. In fact, “[T]he US immigration quota from Germany was filled for the first time in 1939, and almost filled in 1940. In all other years of Nazi rule (1933–1945) the quota was not filled.”<sup>45</sup> The person directly in charge of the visa process at State was Samuel Breckinridge Long, whom Roosevelt met and became good friends with when both served in the Woodrow Wilson administration. Long became a major donor to Roosevelt’s presidential campaign in 1932 and was previously rewarded with an ambassadorship to Italy. “Long’s dispatches to Washington from Rome praised the fascist Mussolini regime for its ‘well-paved’ streets, ‘dapper’ black-shirted stormtroopers, and ‘punctual trains.’”<sup>46</sup> In his private diary, Long “described Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* as ‘eloquent in opposition to Jewry and Jews as exponents of Communism and chaos.’”<sup>47</sup>

Moreover, “Long regularly briefed . . . Roosevelt on his efforts to suppress [Jewish] immigration below the level allowed by existing law. In one diary entry from October 1940, Long mentioned meeting with FDR to discuss ‘the whole subject of immigration, visas, safety of the United States, procedures to be followed,’ and ‘I found that he was 100% in accord with my ideas.’” Not until 1944, when Congress got wind of Long’s doings and began to publicly raise concerns, was Long finally demoted and, ultimately, left the State Department.<sup>48</sup>

Throughout his life Roosevelt made blatantly bigoted private remarks about Jews. Although he is not alone among presidents in this regard, Roosevelt, as Medoff writes, “allowed his prejudices to influence his policies regarding America’s response to the persecution of European Jewry.”<sup>49</sup> Among other things, Roosevelt “blamed Polish Jews for anti-Semitism in Poland; spoke of the ‘understandable complaints’ of the Germans about the prominence of Jews in some professions; boasted to a col-

league that '[w]e know we have no Jewish blood in our veins'; helped bring about a quota on Jewish students admitted to Harvard; and recommended that Jews be 'spread out thin' around the world so they would not dominate any particular economy or culture."<sup>50</sup>

Then there was Joseph P. Kennedy, the patriarch of the Kennedy clan and a powerful Democrat. He was a contemptible anti-Semite and pro-Third Reich, anti-Winston Churchill isolationist who undermined U.S. policy as ambassador to Britain. Eventually, Kennedy resigned as ambassador.

In the left-wing *Daily Beast*, Jacob Heilbrunn explains, with the help of David Nasaw's Kennedy biography, *The Patriarch*, that "[i]t was in Hollywood that Kennedy's mounting paranoia about Jews . . . manifested itself. Kennedy saw everything in terms of ethnic groups, partly as a result of his own upbringing in Boston. Nasaw explains that Kennedy suggested he would be 'Hollywood's white, or non-Jewish knight and rescue it from the suspicion that its pictures were not to be trusted because they were produced by men who through breeding and background were morally untrustworthy.' All his life Kennedy would remain convinced that Jews acted as a cabal to serve their common interests—a mind-set that would manifest itself most vividly in the run-up to World War II, when he blamed Jews for allegedly suborning . . . Roosevelt from pursuing the nation's best interests abroad."<sup>51</sup> There is a great deal more, but this is not a biography about Joe Kennedy.

About twenty years after Roosevelt's death, and less than sixty years ago, the 1964 Civil Rights Act—which essentially outlawed Jim Crow segregation and discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin—was opposed by 69 percent of Senate Democrats (and supported by 82 percent of Senate Republicans) and opposed by 61 percent of House Democrats (and supported by 80 percent of House Republicans). Of those who voted

no in the House, 74 percent were Democrats, and of those who voted no in the Senate 78 percent were Democrats.

The civil rights movement, and the federal government's actions in eventually supporting it—including the overwhelming majority of congressional Republicans—was compelled by the racist, segregationist practices and policies in the Democrat Party, which had continued one hundred years after the end of the Civil War. Among those who filibustered the legislation for some seventy days was West Virginia's Democrat senator Robert Byrd. Byrd spoke for over fourteen hours in a desperate, last-ditch effort to kill the bill. Yet Byrd would go on to serve as the Senate's Democrat leader from 1977 to 1989, including majority leader from 1977 to 1981 and 1987 to 1989, and minority leader from 1981 to 1987. He was chosen to serve in these powerful posts by his fellow Democrat senators. Byrd had come a long way. As a young man, he was a recruiter and organizer for the Klan in West Virginia.<sup>52</sup> When Byrd died, he was praised in glowing terms by the leading lights of the Democrat Party ruling class, including Joe Biden, Barack Obama, Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, and many other Democrat bigwigs. Several called him a “mentor,” including Biden.

President Lyndon Johnson is credited for his support of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Yet Johnson was notoriously and personally racist in many ways, including his constant use of the “N-word” throughout his lifetime, according to a long list of associates and staffers as well as audio recordings.<sup>53</sup> For example, in 1967, Johnson nominated Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court as its first black justice. Even so, Johnson biographer Robert Dallek writes that Johnson said he appointed Marshall rather than a less well-known black judge because “when I appoint a [N-word] to the bench, I want everybody to know he's a [N-word].”<sup>54</sup>

Moreover, up until 1957, Johnson biographer Robert A. Caro

notes that “[d]uring . . . twenty years [in Congress], [Johnson] had never supported civil rights legislation—any civil rights legislation. . . . [H]is record was an unbroken one of votes against every civil rights bill that had ever come to a vote: against voting rights bills; against bills that would have struck at job discrimination and at segregation in other areas of American life; even against bills that would have protected blacks from lynching.”<sup>55</sup>

Although as Senate majority leader Johnson helped President Dwight Eisenhower pass the 1957 Civil Rights Act, he spent most of the year equivocating. Ultimately, Johnson succeeded in pressuring the Eisenhower administration to weaken the bill at the behest of his southern colleagues and by threatening to kill it altogether. He also needed to change his position on civil rights because he was seriously eyeing a run for the presidency in 1960.<sup>56</sup> Johnson was able to diminish the bill’s enforcement strength and subsequently supported the bill, allowing him to have it both ways politically.

Conversely, in 1957, Republican Eisenhower, in an unprecedented presidential act, ordered federal troops to enforce the integration of Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, and upheld the Supreme Court’s 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, which Democrat governor Orval Faubus had blocked. Eisenhower also signed into law his second civil rights bill, the 1960 Civil Rights Act.

The opposition among elected Republicans to the 1964 Civil Rights Act was small and insignificant. And those Republicans who opposed it, including Sen. Barry Goldwater, mostly did so not for racist beliefs, but reasons related to federalism—that is, the sorting out of which level of government had the authority to act. Obviously, they were wrong. That said, Goldwater supported the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts.

Even Wikipedia, whose co-founder says is now “propaganda

for the left-leaning establishment,”<sup>57</sup> acknowledges the following about Goldwater: “Barry Goldwater was fundamentally a staunch supporter of racial equality. Goldwater integrated his family’s business upon taking over control in the 1930s. A lifetime member of the NAACP, Goldwater helped found the group’s Arizona chapter. Goldwater saw to it that the Arizona Air National Guard was racially integrated from its inception in 1946, two years before President Truman ordered the military as a whole be integrated (a process that was not completed until 1954). Goldwater worked with Phoenix civil rights leaders to successfully integrate public schools a year prior to *Brown v. Board of Education*.”<sup>58</sup>

Wikipedia continues its praise of Goldwater: “Goldwater was an early member and largely unrecognized supporter of the National Urban League Phoenix chapter, going so far as to cover the group’s early operating deficits with his personal funds. Though the NAACP denounced Goldwater in the harshest of terms when he ran for president, the Urban League conferred on Goldwater the 1991 Humanitarian Award ‘for 50 years of loyal service to the Phoenix Urban League.’ In response to League members who objected, citing Goldwater’s vote on the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the League president pointed out that Goldwater had saved the League more than once, saying he preferred to judge a person ‘on the basis of his daily actions rather than on his voting record.’”<sup>59</sup>

Moreover, it is noteworthy that the Civil Rights Acts of 1875, 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1965 were overwhelmingly supported by Republicans. Moreover, in 1982, President Reagan signed a twenty-five-year extension of the Voting Rights Act (the longest extension by far up to that time). In 1983, Reagan also signed into law the designation of Martin Luther King Jr.’s birthday as a national holiday.

As for Johnson, the truth is that he had less of an epiphany



than a slap of political reality, realizing that most of the nation had already rejected the southern Democrat segregationists and it was in his political interests to do so as well.

People are imperfect, political parties are imperfect, and institutions are imperfect. This has been understood since Biblical times. Looking back at history through present lenses of moral and ethical understandings has its shortcomings. But the Democrat Party's problem is not about imperfection. Clearly, it has been among the most organized, systemic, and malignant political institutions behind racism, bigotry, and segregation throughout much of American history.

Indeed, the Democrat Party's institutional racism extended well into the 1970s. President Joe Biden, in the early to mid-1970s, as a senator, had a close relationship with several of the Senate's most notorious racists and segregationists, about which he brags to this day, including Mississippi senator James Eastland, who fought hard against the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Biden worked closely with Eastland, among others, to thwart public school integration.<sup>60</sup> In 1977, Biden declared, unless there is "orderly integration . . . [m]y children are going to grow up in a jungle, the jungle being a racial jungle."<sup>61</sup>

When campaigning in the South for the Democrat Party's presidential nomination several decades ago, Biden often touted the praise he received from Alabama Democrat governor George Wallace, another leading racist and segregationist, as "one of the outstanding young politicians of America."<sup>62</sup> Biden knew who and what he was dealing with, yet he was comfortable embracing it. Moreover, Biden has a long history of racist and stereotypical remarks about blacks and other minorities, which he has openly and repeatedly voiced to this day.<sup>63</sup>

In his 2022 choice of Ketanji Brown Jackson for the Supreme Court, Biden said, in part: "For too long, our government, our

courts haven't looked like America. And I believe it's time that we have a Court that reflects the full talents and greatness of our nation with a nominee of extraordinary qualifications and that we inspire all young people to believe that they can one day serve their country at the highest level."<sup>64</sup>

But Biden did not feel that way in 2003, when President George W. Bush nominated Judge Janice Rogers Brown, a black woman, to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. As Marc A. Thiessen wrote in the *Washington Post*: ". . . Biden wants credit for nominating the first black woman to the Supreme Court. But here is the shameful irony: As a senator, Biden warned President Bush that if he nominated the first black woman to serve on the Supreme Court, he would filibuster and kill her nomination."<sup>65</sup>

Judge Brown is the "granddaughter of sharecroppers, and grew up in rural Alabama during the dark days of segregation, when her family refused to enter restaurants or theaters with separate entrances for Black customers. She rose from poverty and put herself through college and UCLA law school as a working single mother. She was a self-made African American legal star. But she was an outspoken conservative—so Biden set out to destroy her."<sup>66</sup> Thiessen points out that "[w]hat Biden threatened was unprecedented. There has never been a successful filibuster of a nominee for associate justice in the history of the republic. Biden wanted to make a black woman the first in history to have her nomination killed by filibuster."<sup>67</sup>

Biden fought like a rabid dog to block Brown's nomination—though she was confirmed later—because he knew Brown would be in line to become the first black woman on the Supreme Court. Biden did not want such a historic appointment conferred on a Republican and he did not want the Republican Party to receive credit for making it.

Race and racism have always been central to the Democrat Party's existence. Given the atrocious history of the Democrat Party on race, described in abridged form here (it is actually much worse), how did the Democrat Party turn the tables on the Republican Party and successfully self-define as the party of civil rights, and define the Republican Party as racist, or at least convince blacks to align with and vote overwhelmingly for the Democrat Party?

There are several reasons for this. For starters, debunking the frequent and preposterous claim that the Democrat Party and Republican Party switched places in the 1960s and during the election of Richard Nixon as president requires attention. *National Review's* Kevin D. Williamson made hash of this Democrat Party propaganda, calling it an "outright lie, the utter fabrication with malice aforethought." He summarized it this way: "The Democrats have been allowed to rhetorically bury their Bull Connors, their longstanding affiliation with the Ku Klux Klan, and their pitiless opposition to practically every major piece of civil-rights legislation for a century. . . . Even if the Republicans' rise in the South had happened suddenly in the 1960s (it didn't) and even if there were no competing explanation (there is), racism—or, more precisely, white southern resentment over the political successes of the civil-rights movement—would be an implausible explanation for the dissolution of the Democratic bloc in the old Confederacy and the emergence of a Republican stronghold there. That is because those southerners who defected from the Democratic Party in the 1960s and thereafter did so to join a Republican Party that was far more enlightened on racial issues than were the Democrats of the era, and had been for a century. There is no radical break in the Republicans' civil-rights history: From the abolition of slavery to Reconstruction to the anti-lynching laws, from the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Civil Rights Act of 1875 to the Civil Rights Acts

of 1957, 1960, and 1964, there exists a line that is by no means perfectly straight or unwavering but that nonetheless connects the politics of Lincoln with those of Eisenhower. And from slavery and secession to remorseless opposition to everything from Reconstruction to the anti-lynching laws, the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, the Civil Rights Act of 1875, and the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, there exists a similarly identifiable line connecting John Calhoun and Lyndon Baines Johnson. Supporting civil-rights reform was not a radical turnaround for congressional Republicans in 1964, but it was a radical turnaround for Johnson and the Democrats.”<sup>68</sup>

So, what did happen? Among other things, as older black Americans passed on, so did their memories and generational ties to the Party of Lincoln. Moreover, the Great Depression was devastating for most Americans, especially poorer Americans, including black Americans. And the terrible recession that would lead to the Depression started in 1929–30, when Republican Herbert Hoover was president. Therefore, the Republicans shouldered much of the blame, and the Democrat Party succeeded spectacularly in politically exploiting the citizenry’s economic misery.

In addition, there was a mass migration of blacks from the South to the North, where Democrat Party political machines existed in many of the large inner cities, which encouraged blacks to register as Democrats. If you wanted, say, a patronage job, you had to be a registered Democrat.

Furthermore, although the New Deal was rife with racism, both in certain structural aspects and implementation, blacks were able to participate in some educational, public works, and food programs. Roosevelt was also the consummate glad-hander who paid attention to outreach, albeit to only certain key black leaders. Consequently, in 1936, for the first time, more black Americans began voting for Democrats over Republicans. Democrat Roo-

sevelt received more black votes than Republican Alf Landon for president.

Most significantly, as the early progressive (Marxist) intellectuals had urged, the Democrat Party began laying the foundation for economic socialism and, more broadly, cultural Marxism, redefining civil rights and human rights as economic issues and in economic terms. They also began the process of breaching constitutional firewalls, which served as barriers to their designs. Although Wilson and especially Roosevelt poured the foundation for this political and economic upheaval, the tipping point was reached in the 1960s with Lyndon Johnson's Great Society. As civil rights activist Joyce Ladner, writing for the Brookings Institution, stated: "[T]he [civil rights] victories of the movement, however decisive they seemed at the time, did not bring the long-term parity that activists and policymakers hoped for. Bread-and-butter issues such as unemployment, substandard housing, inferior education, unsafe streets, escalating child poverty, and homelessness supplanted the right to vote, eat at a lunch counter, and attend desegregated schools. As new issues arose, appearing and intensifying in ways that fell beyond the scope of the legislative and social reforms, the old civil rights model—one that relied mostly on judicial and protest remedies—seemed less and less effective in dealing with them."<sup>69</sup> Thus, having mostly achieved legal equality, the focus shifted to economic equality, which in turn has now moved to "equity"—that is, economic socialism and cultural Marxism.

In fact, in 1944, Roosevelt argued for what he titled "The Second Bill of Rights." Professor Cass Sunstein, who has made his rounds among Ivy League schools and served in the Obama administration, argued that "the second bill attempts to protect both opportunity and security, by creating rights to employment, adequate food and clothing, decent shelter, education, recre-

ation, and medical care. The presidency of America's greatest leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, culminated in the idea of a second bill. It represented Roosevelt's belief that the American Revolution was radically incomplete and that a new set of rights was necessary."<sup>70</sup>

Roosevelt proclaimed that every American is entitled to:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

The right to a good education.<sup>71</sup>

Roosevelt had to be aware of Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin's 1936 Constitution when developing his second bill of rights, as there is an obvious overlap between the two documents. For example, Stalin's Constitution provided, in part:

ARTICLE 118. Citizens of the USSR have the right to work, that is, are guaranteed the right to employment and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality. . . .

ARTICLE 119. Citizens of the USSR have the right to rest and leisure. . . .

ARTICLE 120. Citizens of the USSR have the right to maintenance in old age and also in case of sickness or loss of capacity to work. This right is ensured by the extensive development of social insurance of workers and employees at state expense, free medical service for the working people and the provision of a wide network of health resorts for the use of the working people.

ARTICLE 121. Citizens of the USSR have the right to education. This right is ensured by universal, compulsory elementary education; by education, including higher education, being free of charge; by the system of state stipends for the overwhelming majority of students in the universities and colleges. . . .

ARTICLE 126. In conformity with the interests of the working people, and in order to develop the organizational initiative and political activity of the masses of the people, citizens of the USSR are ensured the right to unite in public organizations—trade unions. . . .<sup>72</sup>

Keep in mind that the early progressive intellectuals, including John Dewey, who was probably the most influential among them, were infatuated with the 1917 Russian Revolution and Stalin in the 1920s and 1930s.<sup>73</sup> Indeed, Dewey, who had an enormous influence on the direction of public education in America, wrote admiringly of Stalin's educational system—that is, Stalin's use of brainwashing.

Of course, in Karl Marx's 1848 *Communist Manifesto*, Marx famously published his "10 Planks" of policy, which included "a heavy progressive or graduated income tax; abolition of all rights to inheritance; centralization of credit in the hands of the state,

by means of a national bank . . . ; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equable distribution of the population over the country; free education for all children in public schools. . . ." Much of this has been and is being advanced by the Democrat Party.

As I have said many times and explained in *American Marxism*, progressivism is a form of Marxism. It is customized and tailored in a way to devour the American system and society by abusing liberty to promote tyranny and hijack the Constitution to enshrine its policy agenda. The overarching fundamentals enlist the ideas and goals of Marxism.<sup>74</sup> Indeed, in promoting Roosevelt's Second Bill of Rights, Sunstein declares: "Why does the American Constitution lack Roosevelt's second bill? Why hasn't it become a part of our constitutional understandings? . . . If [Richard] Nixon had not been elected, significant parts of the second bill would probably be part of our constitutional understandings today. In the 1960s, the nation was rapidly moving toward accepting a second bill, not through constitutional amendment but through the Supreme Court's interpretations of the existing Constitution. An appreciation of this point will drive home . . . the extent to which the meaning of America's Constitution depends on the commitments of its judges. Even more important, it will show that a belief in the second bill lies beneath the surface of our current constitutional understandings. With a little work of recovery, we can easily uncover it there. Parts of it are widely accepted already."<sup>75</sup>

Sunstein is well aware that Woodrow Wilson believed and argued that the judiciary was the most potent tool by which to transform America into the kind of society the American Marxists envision. Moreover, this provides some context for the Democrat Party's hatred of Nixon and obsession with forcing him from the presidency, with the active participation of its media surrogates.

In truth, Marxism permeates American society due to the



efforts of the Democrat Party and its proxies throughout the culture and society, including the media and academia. It is devouring America from within, as Italian communist Antonio Gramsci, German communist Herbert Marcuse, and Saul Alinsky had all advocated. And the propaganda in support of American Marxism and the Democrat Party is similar to this woeful PhD student's harangue: "Capitalism nurtures the continuation of racism, sexism, discrimination, and oppression, as they offer those among the privileged an advantage over subordinate groups. Race is a catalogue of descriptive differences—an ideology which construes populations as groups—sorting them into hierarchies of capacity, civic worth, based on perceived 'natural' characteristics attributed to them. 'Whiteness' is a descriptive quality that ensures the bearer of it is privileged over blacks, Latinos, or any race which is not white."<sup>76</sup> And, unfortunately, like this PhD student, an awful lot of young people are falling for it.

## CHAPTER THREE

---

# ANTI-WHITE RACISM & ANTI-SEMITISM

It is an empirical fact that anti-white racism now pervades our culture and society. It is not only fully embraced by the Democrat Party, it is responsible for promoting it. So are its surrogates in academia and the media. It is necessary to spend some time digging into the arguments of certain American Marxists behind this movement and the grave threat it poses to our country.

Although Karl Marx did not emphasize race when defining class struggles (in fact, he never defined what he meant by class despite incessantly referencing it), his American progeny did, in fact, link the two. Indeed, a little-noticed subterranean movement had been afoot since the early days of the Progressive Movement—the late 1800s and early 1900s—which promoted cultural Marxism and economic socialism. Among the most prominent among the movement's advocates were several black Marxist intellectuals, such as W. E. B. Du Bois. They argued that America's capitalist system was built on slavery and the exploitation of slaves by the white race. It should be noted, as Phillip

W. Magness, senior research faculty and director of research and education at the American Institute for Economic Research, writes in *National Review*, that Du Bois, who is celebrated in school textbooks and during Black History Month, as well as modern-day Marxist authors, “split from the avowedly anti-communist leadership of the NAACP. . . . He spent his final years gallivanting with Mao Zedong and touting the alleged credentials of Joseph Stalin as a leading anti-racist.”<sup>1</sup>

Were Du Bois and his circle of Marxists right? Did capitalism promote slavery, and was America built on the exploitation of slaves? This is a frequently repeated narrative of modern-day Marxists as well. First, of course slavery is an undeniable fact of American history. However, so are the numerous efforts to abolish it.

Every northern state passed laws to abolish slavery in the first two decades after the Revolutionary War, either immediately or soon thereafter.<sup>2</sup> In 1800, Congress passed the Act Prohibiting the Importation of Slaves, which took effect in 1808.<sup>3</sup> Of course, slavery within parts of the United States persisted. By the time of the Civil War, the overwhelming number of slaves were held in the agrarian South. However, most white southern families did not own slaves. Less than 25 percent of the South was wealthy enough to own slaves.<sup>4</sup>

Second, the North did not rely on slavery to build its industrial capacity. Indeed, “[w]hile factories were built all over the North and South, the vast majority of industrial manufacturing was taking place in the North. The South had almost 25% of the country’s free population, but only 10% of the country’s capital in 1860. The North had five times the number of factories as the South, and over ten times the number of factory workers. In addition, 90% of the nation’s skilled workers were in the North.”<sup>5</sup>

Consequently, by “1860 the North had over 110,000 manufacturing establishments, the South just 18,000. The North produced

94 percent of the country's iron, 97 percent of its coal and—not incidentally—97 percent of its firearms. It contained 22,000 miles of railroad to the South's 8,500. The North outperformed the South agriculturally as well. Northerners held 75 percent of the country's farm acreage, produced 60 percent of its livestock, 67 percent of its corn, and 81 percent of its wheat. All in all, they held 75 percent of the nation's total wealth."<sup>6</sup>

Hence, the lesson is the exact opposite of what the American Marxists and Democrat Party preach—that is, capitalism and a free people create wealth, prosperity, opportunity, and, yes, colorblindness. Indeed, Nobel Prize laureate and economist, the renowned Milton Friedman, profoundly declared: "The great virtue of a free market system is that it does not care what color people are; it does not care what their religion is; it only cares whether they can produce something you want to buy. It is the most effective system we have discovered to enable people who hate one another to deal with one another and help one another."<sup>7</sup>

Of course, slavery is unconscionable. There is no excusing it. But capitalism did not drive slavery. Slavery has existed, and exists today, throughout the world and in noncapitalist societies. As Peter W. Wood, president of the National Association of Scholars, explains: "Slavery . . . was not an American invention, or a European one. It has existed in human societies for thousands of years. In north and east Africa, slave capture and trading were pursued on an enormous scale by Arabs. When Europeans encountered native kingdoms on Africa's Atlantic coast in the fifteenth century, they discovered slavery as a deeply embedded practice. That the Portuguese and the Spanish fostered this practice by creating a market for African slaves in the New World is among the great tragedies of human history. Other European powers eventually joined in perpetuating that tragedy."<sup>8</sup>

In his review of Nikole Hannah-Jones's 1619 docuseries, Mag-

ness points out that “[e]quating capitalism with the exploitation of workers certainly serves the purpose of designating chattel slavery as a capitalistic institution, but it is simply not an accurate—or even functional—definition of the concept. Ancient Roman slavery, medieval feudalism, Soviet-era gulags, and North Korean prison camps today would also qualify as ‘capitalism’ if we reduce the concept to exploitive worker conditions. . . .” Magness also explains that “Canada, Japan, several European states [were] of economies that underwent massive industrialization in the 19th century without the alleged benefits of slavery.” He adds that “Brazil, which maintained a large slave economy for several decades longer than the United States did so without industrializing.”<sup>9</sup> Indeed, Hannah-Jones, writes Magness, contends that “almost every economic fallacy and pejorative denigration imaginable describe economic development under market-based capitalism.”<sup>10</sup> By this, she insists that slavery and capitalism are inextricably linked, and she proceeds from there to cheerlead for Marxism.

Perhaps someone should inform Hannah-Jones and other American Marxists that the greatest slave states that exist today do so under the banner of Marxism.

And what of post-Civil War America? Again, the accusation is that capitalism and American economic growth had been nurtured by racial discrimination and racial inequality—that is, capitalism “intersected” with slavery and racism. This theory has now been given a name—“racial capitalism.” It is argued that racial capitalism is based on the theft, exclusion, and exploitation of people of color for the economic benefit of white people. In short, white supremacy is what undergirds America’s economic system and its history.

More recently, the late professor Cedric J. Robinson, influential in radical circles but mostly unknown by the body politic, took Du Bois’s views a step further in his book *Black Marxism: The*

*Making of Black Radical Tradition*. He argued that “[t]he development, organization, and expansion of capitalist society pursued essential racial directions, so too did social ideology. As a material force, then, it could be expected that racialism would inevitably permeate the social structures emergent from capitalism.”<sup>11</sup>

UCLA professor Robin D. G. Kelley explains that for Robinson “capitalism emerged *within the feudal order* [rather than replacing it, as Marx wrote] and flowered in the cultural soil of a Western civilization already thoroughly infused with racialism. Capitalism and racism, in other words, did not break from the old order but rather evolved from it to produce a modern world system of ‘racial capitalism’ dependent on slavery, violence, imperialism, and genocide. Capitalism was ‘racial’ not because of some conspiracy to divide workers or justify slavery and dispossession, but because racialism had already permeated Western feudal society.”<sup>12</sup> (Italics are mine.) In other words, anti-black racism is in the nation’s DNA thanks in large part to capitalism.

Moreover, Robinson insisted, racial capitalism was not limited to the South. The claim is that the Industrial Revolution, which reached deeply into the North and was in many ways a product of the North, was built on the backs of blacks and their unequal and abusive treatment. Thus, whether from slavery in the South or industrial capitalism in the North, racism was and is endemic in capitalism and, therefore, throughout all corners of the country. Capitalism is, therefore, the economic tool by which the white-dominant society lords over and exploits blacks and other minorities to this day.

The attraction of Marxism, even in its altered forms, to Du Bois and Robinson, and numerous other self-proclaimed radicals and revolutionaries past and present, is now routinely taught in our public schools, colleges, and universities and enforced through Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion or DEI administrators, seminars, and training; advocated by elected Democrats and the

Biden administration; imposed through government regulations, grants, and executive orders; and, propagated in the media. It is even a growing ideology in major corporations and financial institutions—disguised and customized as the Environmental, Social, and Governance or ESG corporate movement.

Of course, identifying slavery and racism as essential elements of early and present-day capitalism gets it backwards. Capitalism is not to blame for mankind's evils or the institution of slavery generally, or its early institutionalization in parts of America. Indeed, it requires a rewriting of American history and a perverse view of the *free-market* system to blame capitalism for slavery. It was the Progressive Era—that is, the early American Marxists—that advocated the fundamentals of Marx, in which the “science” of eugenics and widespread racism thrived post-Civil War. As described in Chapter 2, it was a thoroughly anti-black racist movement that claimed to apply science to the ranking of a human hierarchy and Darwin's selection of the fittest, in which blacks consistently ranked at the bottom. Professor Thomas C. Leonard explains that “[i]n defining race, American race science was as protean as was evolutionary thought. Eugenics and race theorists used ‘race’ to refer to the human race as well as to the conventional division of humanity into ‘white, black, yellow, brown, and red faces.’”<sup>13</sup>

Furthermore, in no rational understanding of capitalism, the foundational blocks of which emphasize individualism, liberty, and free will, does government-sanctioned enslavement or racial discrimination of fellow human beings for the forcible use or abuse of their labor coexist with the core principles of capitalism. And what goes unsaid is that the most egregious political and governing institution that embraced, promoted, and defended slavery, and post-Civil War racism, segregation, and inequality, was the Democrat Party, not some perverse concept of capitalism. Yet most of American Marxism identifies with the Democrat

Party, and vice versa. Why? Among other reasons, the Democrat Party fundamentally rejects capitalism as well.

Robert Reich, President Bill Clinton's radical secretary of labor and currently a professor at UC Berkeley, credits Biden with revitalizing what he calls "democratic capitalism." Of course, democratic capitalism is just another phrase for what Bernie Sanders calls "democratic socialism," with a few twists and turns. Reich's point, however, is that Biden has jettisoned market capitalism for Roosevelt's government-directed socialism.<sup>14</sup> In this, he is correct.

Let us briefly examine what Biden and the Democrat Party disparagingly refer to as "Reaganomics." In 1990, Martin Anderson, a Hoover Institution senior fellow and former Reagan adviser, explained in a *New York Times* opinion piece that "[w]e don't know whether historians will call it the Great Expansion of the 1980's or Reagan's Great Expansion, but we do know from official economic statistics that the seven-year period from 1982 to 1989 was the greatest, consistent burst of economic activity ever seen in the U.S. In fact, it was the greatest economic expansion the world has ever seen—in any country, at any time."<sup>15</sup> Anderson added that "[o]ne thing the Marxists got right: Economics is a powerful determining factor of history. But Marxists never dreamed it would be the economics of Ronald Reagan and all those capitalists that would prevail in the end."<sup>16</sup>

Did economic conditions for black Americans improve during Reagan's enormous economic boom? Unequivocally, yes. In 2004, American Enterprise Institute scholar Michael Novak observed: "In constant dollars, 1988 dollars, the total annual income earned by all 30 million U.S. blacks together rose from \$191 billion at the end of 1980, to \$259 billion by the end of 1988. That sum was larger than the GDP of all but ten nations in the world. The number of black families earning more than \$50,000 per year much more than doubled, from 392,000 in



1982 to 936,000 in 1988. The median salary/wage of black males increased from \$9,678 in 1980 to \$14,537 in 1988 (in current dollars). Median means half earned more than that, half less, so more than half of all black males improved their income by more than 50 percent.”<sup>17</sup>

And without instituting Democrat Party/Marxist punitive redistributive tax policies but, to the contrary, slashing taxes across the board, “Reagan . . . shift[ed] the burden of income tax upward from the poor and lower middle class—indeed from the whole bottom half of income earners. By 1988, Reagan had the lower half paying less than 6 percent of income taxes. The top-five percent, which before Reagan had been paying under 38 percent of all income taxes, by 1988 were paying nearly 46 percent. He had the top-ten percent of income earners paying a whopping 57 percent of all income taxes.”<sup>18</sup>

Much more can be said about the Reagan years and their remarkable successes, but that is not the object of this book. Nonetheless, even an abbreviated look at the record exposes the lies obsessively and repeatedly disgorged by Biden, the Democrat Party, and its Marxist ideologues against Reagan and the capitalist system.

In addition, there are a host of socioeconomic reasons individuals succeed or fail as well as individual weaknesses and strengths, having absolutely nothing to do with race or racism, and yet determine outcomes. In fact, given the uniqueness of each person, equal outcomes or “equity,” even in societies that are racially, ethnically, or otherwise largely homogenous and never experienced slavery, and even within the same families, are impossible. Indeed, the pursuit of such lofty egalitarian yet totalitarian objectives by governing institutions breeds tyranny, and is used to justify horrendous forms of persecution. You would think that over one hundred years of experience with Marxism’s inhumanity has

demonstrated even to the Democrat Party the genocidal nature of the ideology in its various applications and impositions.

Whether a person is a slave to a plantation or to a government, he is a slave. Ask the people who escaped, say, North Korea if they had lived as slaves. Yet the Democrat Party finds Marx's ideology more appealing than the vision of America's founders, whom they continuously revile. Moreover, unlike capitalism, slavery is baked into Marxism.

Writing in the *City Journal*, Coleman Hughes points out that there are "several historical examples in which capitalism inspired antiracism. The most famous is the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* Supreme Court case, when a profit-hungry railroad company—upset that legally mandated segregation meant adding costly train cars—teamed up with a civil rights group to challenge racial segregation. Nor was that case unique. Privately owned bus and trolley companies in the Jim Crow South 'frequently resisted segregation' because 'separate cars and sections' were 'too expensive,' according to [research published in the *Journal of Economic History*.]"<sup>19</sup>

Again, the American Marxist has succeeded today in establishing the idea that a societal, cultural, and political intersection of racism and capitalism exists. There are at least two important conclusions resulting from this distortion: 1. Capitalism must be destroyed and replaced if racism is to be eliminated; and, 2. The white race is said to be responsible for the capitalist system and is the beneficiary of the system, and the society created around it, which is intended to sustain and perpetuate white domination and privilege. Therefore, it follows that the white race is the ultimate oppressor. Consequently, in order to end anti-black racism and white supremacy, inasmuch as the entire society is said to be irredeemably racist and white-race dominated, the society must be overhauled and ultimately overturned if justice and equity are to prevail. Therefore, the goal is no longer to end individual cases of

racism or illegal discrimination, which are said to be distractive or irrelevant to a comprehensive solution to a systemic problem, but to terminate the country.

Furthermore, it is said that the white-dominant society imposes racial capitalism on blacks and other minorities to maintain its privileged and oppressor status in society, thereby institutionally creating unequal outcomes—*inequitable* outcomes—and is, therefore, to blame for any real or perceived disparate economic and social results. This is the essence of Critical Race Theory (CRT), which pervades the ivory towers of academia, public school classrooms, newsrooms, corporate boardrooms, religious institutions, and beyond. It has assimilated into nearly all aspects of the culture. I call this *civil rights Marxism*, which has co-opted the old civil rights movement. Justice per se has been replaced with so-called economic justice—that is, economic socialism and cultural Marxism.

On May 10, 2023, the vice president, Kamala Harris, spoke at the swearing-in of commissioners to the White House Initiative on Advancing Educational Equity, Excellence, and Economic Opportunity for Hispanics. She said, in part: “[S]o many of us have come from movements that were about the fight for equality. We also understand there’s a difference between equality and equity. Equity is everyone deserves to have rights and be treated equally. But equity understands that not everybody starts out on the same base. So, if you’re giving everybody an equal amount, but they’re starting out on different bases, are they really going to have the opportunity to compete and achieve? That’s why we purposefully as an administration, the president, myself, the secretary, and everyone in our administration are so dedicated to a specific principle which is that of equity.”<sup>20</sup> This also explains, in part, the Democrat Party’s rejection of a color-blind society and capitalism.

Marx, like Harris and the rest of the Biden administration and Democrat Party, was not particularly a fan of “equality.”

He believed it was a tool of the bourgeoisie to retain the status quo in society—where the proletariat were under the thumb of the bourgeoisie. Hence, he insisted on ultimately abolishing all “classes” and the existing society—that is, starting with a blank slate, thereby making way for the communist paradise.

This ideology has cost tens of millions of human beings their lives. For example, for Vladimir Lenin, Joseph Stalin, Mao Zedong, Pol Pot, Fidel Castro, et al., this meant annihilating entire “categories” of people—teachers, professors, lawyers, and mostly all professionals. It meant forcibly marching city dwellers into rural areas, where they would be compelled to farm, pick fruit, gather rice, etc. It meant nationalizing private property, seizing bank accounts, etc. In other words, as Kamala Harris explained, “not everybody starts out on the same base,” and the Biden administration is “dedicated to a specific principle which is that of equity”—meaning, the government will use the law and its considerable resources to redistribute wealth, discriminate against certain individuals and groups, abolish merit, and ultimately control human behavior. When linked to race, as it is today, it means racial discrimination and quotas in school admissions, the hiring and firing of employees, segregating college dorm rooms and graduation ceremonies, dumbing down school curricula, sabotaging merit scholarship programs, and issuing presidential executive orders that, for instance, exclude white farmers and other “privileged” racial groups. Again, as Harris declared, “everyone in our administration are [*sic*] dedicated” to the promotion and institution of equity.<sup>21</sup>

Although the Supreme Court and other courts have struck down some of these hideous and unconstitutional policies, many of the Democrat-controlled institutions that have used them have announced their intention to circumvent the Court—at the Biden administration’s urging.

Because of the emphasis on race as the basis for all behaviors

and outcomes, and allegations of irreversible white racism based on skin color at birth, CRT and civil rights Marxism dehumanize the individual and groups of individuals. Ironically, the scholars and activists promoting this point of view use dehumanizing stereotypes not only to label white people but to describe black individuals and the black community. After all, in the end, Marxism of any kind is built on the false foundation of oppressor and oppressed class identification, which is said to exist in all non-Marxist societies.

Ibram X. Kendi, director of the Center for Antiracist Research at Boston University and a leading advocate for CRT, has written that “[t]o say that there is widespread racial inequity caused by widespread racism, which makes the United States racist, isn’t an opinion, isn’t a partisan position, isn’t a doctrine, isn’t a left-wing construct, isn’t anti-white, and isn’t anti-American. It is a fact.”<sup>22</sup>

In fact, CRT scholars and activists dismiss all the societal efforts, economic programs, laws, court rulings, even the Civil War and the presidencies of Abraham Lincoln and Ulysses S. Grant, as well as Martin Luther King Jr.’s courageous activism and speeches, as little more than transparent and self-serving attempts by the white-dominant society, or those who go along with and help perpetuate white privilege (knowingly or otherwise), to paste over the incurably flawed American founding, the tentacles of which reach into all aspects of modern life now and into the future.

The civil rights Marxists also reject both the idea and pursuit of a color-blind society. Lest we forget, Peter C. Myers, visiting fellow at the Heritage Foundation, reminds us that “[f]or Frederick Douglass, the 19th century’s greatest abolitionist and civil rights advocate, an abiding faith ‘in reason, in truth and justice’ sustained an expectation that ‘the color line . . . will cease to have any civil, political, or moral significance’ in America. In the most famous dissenting opinion in U.S. Supreme Court history,

Justice John Marshall Harlan provided a more focused expression of that sentiment, thus explaining his vote in *Plessy v. Ferguson* to invalidate a law mandating racial segregation on train cars: ‘Our constitution is color-blind. . . . The law regards man as man, and takes no account . . . of his color when his civil rights as guaranteed by the supreme law of the land are involved.’ . . .

In his brief for the plaintiffs in the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* case, Thurgood Marshall argued, ‘distinctions . . . based upon race or color alone . . . [are] the epitome of that arbitrariness and capriciousness constitutionally impermissible under our system of government.’ Three score and seven years after *Plessy* came the most resounding statement of all, when the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., stood under the shadow of Abraham Lincoln and immortalized the moral vision of the civil rights movement by declaring, ‘I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.’”<sup>23</sup>

Today, civil rights Marxism preaches and demands the opposite. For example, Kendi has declared: “The only remedy to racist discrimination is antiracist discrimination. The only remedy to past discrimination is present discrimination. The only remedy to present discrimination is future discrimination.”<sup>24</sup> Thus, the demand for “equity.” Indeed, the movement has come up with a new term for condemning colorblindness: *color-blind racism*. A column by radical Dani Bostick, an educator and contributor to the Democrat Party–supporting *Huffington Post*, further illustrates the point. She asserts that:

Colorblindness foists whiteness on everyone. It is another way of saying, “I view everyone as if they were white.” Your default color for sameness is white.

Colorblindness strips non-white people of their unique-

ness. Your default culture for sameness is white culture. When you encourage your child to be colorblind and view everyone as “the same,” you are projecting white on people of [sic] who aren’t white, negating their experiences, traditions, and uniqueness.

Colorblindness suppresses critically important narratives of oppression. Once you view everyone through a colorblind, white lens, you deny the reality that non-white people face. . . .

Colorblindness assumes everyone has the same experience here in America. When you fail to see color, you fail to recognize injustice and oppression. . . .

Colorblindness promotes the idea that non-white races are inferior. When you teach your child to be colorblind, you are essentially telling them, “If someone isn’t white, pretend they look like you so you can be friends.” Stripping people of a fundamental aspect of their identity by claiming not to see color is dehumanizing.<sup>25</sup>

Consequently, Myers explains, “[i]f racism is conceived in practical terms as a maldistribution of socioeconomic goods and ills, then its remedy must be conceived in terms of redistribution, not only of opportunities but also of outcomes. The proper function of preferential race-classifications would then be to effect the desired redistributions. . . . The minimum condition of a just society, in this view, is that no historically disfavored racial group would suffer *any* aggregate disadvantage in the incidences of the main goods and ills whereby we measure socioeconomic well-being. The ultimate expectation is that those goods and ills would be distributed among racial groups in rough proportion to their percentages of the societal population.”<sup>26</sup> Thus, racism, equity, Marxism.

As the recent propaganda and intolerance of the Democrat

Party and American Marxists spread, which is intended to empower the former and enshrine the latter, and is aggressively promoted by the media, academia, and revolutionary activists, the truth is that the American people are nothing like how they are portrayed and stereotyped by the Democrat Party and their surrogates.

For example, looking at interracial marriage, in 2021 Gallup reports that 94 percent of Americans approve of interracial marriage, between white and black people, up from 4 percent in 1954. . . . “Americans in all age groups today are more supportive of black-white marriages than adults in the same age group were in the past, particularly among older adults. In 1991, 27 percent of U.S. adults aged 50 and older approved of interracial marriage, compared with 91 percent today.”<sup>27</sup>

In addition, there has been a steady and significant rise in interracial marriages. In 2021, Pew Research reported: “In 2019, 11% of all married U.S. adults had a spouse who was a different race or ethnicity from them, up from 3% in 1967. Among newlyweds in 2019, roughly one-in-five (19%) were intermarried.”<sup>28</sup>

Moreover, the number of Americans who identify as coming from multiple races has jumped. Pew Research notes: “According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Americans who identify as two or more races are one of the fastest growing racial or ethnic groups in the country, along with Asians. Roughly 6.3 million American adults—2.5% of the adult population—identified as being more than one race in 2019. The number has grown significantly since the census first allowed people to choose more than one racial category to describe themselves in 2000. Among adults who identify as more than one race, relatively few (2.1%) are Black and Asian.”<sup>29</sup>

You would think that the evidence of Americans as an accepting, tolerant, and “live and let live” people would complicate things for the Democrat Party and American Marxists. You would be wrong. In fact, it encourages them to intensify and escalate their



revolutionary campaign. Remember, for them this is about power: the party comes before country, and the revolution is top down.

DePaul University professor Jason D. Hill, who happens to be black, explains in his book *What Do White Americans Owe Black People: Racial Justice in the Age of Post-Oppression* that this ideology is “a vicious anti-reason and, therefore, anti-life phenomenon that robs human beings of a particular method of cognition. It deprives them of integrating fundamental principles to clear and lucid thinking that leads to intelligible and reasonable actions. It cuts away at the idea of objective reality and replaces it with an unbridled and amorphous, necrotic lump of feelings that are treated as tools of cognition . . . a convenient cover for any subjective and personal quest for power, violation of rights, and basic human lawlessness. Even the concept of law is regarded as an oppressive construct designed by those who wish to exercise dominion over the marginalized. . . . Today, in the form of not just these but in manifestations of cancel culture, cultural appropriation, and successful efforts to suppress offending speech, we are witnessing the wholesale death of our civilization. . . . Because this philosophy is an attack against individualism, reason, progress, and the notion of truth itself, its deadliest consequence is a form of moral inversion of human beings.”<sup>30</sup>

Of course, this is totalitarian in mind-set and practice. It is an undeniably racist application of Marxism, pure and simple. And it is extremely dangerous. If it continues to take hold throughout America’s culture and society, and the federal government uses its lawmaking power to enforce it, and the private sector uses its hiring, wealth creation, and distribution decision-making to impose it, this cancerous ideology will destroy the norms, traditions, and comity that form the bases of a civilized society. Indeed, it will all come crashing down, perhaps violently. After all, this is the true yet often unstated intention of its advocates.

Incredibly, despite untold numbers of books, essays, seminars, training manuals, classes, etc., insisting that there exists a white-dominant society, white privilege, white oppression, and so forth, many proponents of civil rights Marxism insist that this perverse and hateful ideology is not built on anti-white racism. Of course, this an utterly preposterous attempt at deception. In fact, if the ideology and its toxicity are disputed, denounced, or opposed, the criticism itself is said to reinforce the evidence of white supremacy and privilege. The circuitry and irrationality of the ideology are inescapable. It is a delusion. But delusions can be powerful attractions, and their quest a disastrous journey.

Professor Lynn Uzzell, visiting assistant professor of politics at Washington and Lee University, explains that “[t]he definition of racism has undergone a radical change in a short time. [For example], [a]ccording to the new eighth-grade curriculum for the Albemarle County (Va.) School District, racism now means: ‘The marginalization and/or oppression of people of color based on a socially constructed racial hierarchy that privileges white people.’ Perhaps the most jarring aspect of this new definition is that it is no longer race-neutral. It is now impossible, by definition, for white people to be the victims of racism. The definition itself constructs a ‘racial hierarchy’ whereby only people of color may be victimized, and only ‘white people’ may marginalize or oppress. . . . Since the ‘marginalization and/or oppression of people of color’ is no longer committed by word, thought, or deed, but is based instead on an inescapable ‘socially constructed racial hierarchy’ that *always* ‘privileges white people’—it means that white people are engaging in racism simply by being white (and hence privileged) within this impersonal system of marginalization and oppression. A person of color is a victim of racism, by definition. A person identified as white is a racist, by definition. . . .”<sup>31</sup>

Uzzell notes that Hannah-Jones, the lead author of the roundly

criticized 1619 Project, which is primarily a collection of “anti-white screeds” and historical distortions, has a long background in vile anti-white racist tantrums. “In a letter to her college paper, [Hannah-Jones] alleged: ‘The white race is the biggest murderer, rapist, pillager, and thief of the modern world.’ Not only were white people in America’s past ‘barbaric devils,’ but the ‘descendants of these savage people’ continue to harm ‘the Black community’ to this day. . . .”<sup>32</sup> This sounds a lot like racists Louis Farrakhan and Leonard Jeffries.

What does this have to do with the Democrat Party? Everything.

As described earlier, race and racism have been core characteristics and hideous weapons of the Democrat Party’s pursuit and maintenance of power from its earliest days. Capitalism and constitutionalism, with their emphasis on the individual and freedom, as well as limitations on central planning and social engineering, have been inconvenient obstacles to the Democrat Party’s objectives for its entire existence. Democrat Party intellectuals, leaders, and activists have told us this since at least the Progressive Era. Therefore, abandoning the old civil rights movement for civil rights Marxism, and abandoning anti-black racism for anti-white racism, was not as difficult a transition as one might otherwise imagine. In essence, the Democrat Party has and does reject *Americanism*, meaning the fundamental principles upon which our nation was founded—and not only capitalism, but the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. This is the common thread that ties the old anti-black Democrat Party of Woodrow Wilson to the current anti-white Democrat Party of Joe Biden.

Indeed, Biden is a clear example of the Democrat Party’s transition from anti-black racism to anti-white racism, and its abandonment of capitalism for economic socialism. Today, Biden repeatedly uses anti-white racism as a self-righteous cudgel with

which to attack his political opponents and the Republican Party, promote his radical domestic agenda, and curry favor with the numerous and growing Marxist elements that make up the Democrat Party base and activists. In fact, Biden positions himself as some kind of savior of American democracy, the nation's soul, and civil rights icon who stands bravely against white supremacy.

When running for president in 2020 and speaking at a National Action Network event hosted by Al Sharpton—whose own background is littered with racist and anti-Semitic episodes<sup>33</sup>—the same Biden whose legacy includes significant relationships with segregationists, infinite bigoted statements, and years of fighting racial integration, declared: “The bottom line is we have a lot to root out, but most of all the systematic racism that most of us whites don’t like to acknowledge even exists. We don’t even consciously acknowledge it. But it’s been built into every aspect of our system.” He continued, “[b]ecause when your schools are substandard, when your houses are undervalued, when your car insurance costs more for no apparent reason, when poverty rates for black Americans is still twice that of white Americans, . . . there’s something we have to admit. Not you—we—white America has to admit there’s still a systematic racism. And it goes almost unnoticed by so many of us.”<sup>34</sup>

Of course, the unmentioned irony of Sharpton’s past history of anti-Semitism and white racism, Biden’s anti-black racism and support for segregation, and the loathsome story of the Democrat Party went without comment.

In 2021, when signing an “Executive Order on Racial Equity,” Biden said that “[o]ne of the reasons I’m so optimistic about this nation is that today’s generation of young Americans is the most progressive, thoughtful, inclusive generation that America has ever seen. And they are pulling us toward justice in so many ways, forcing us to confront the huge gap in economic . . . inequity between

those at the top and everyone else, forcing us to confront . . . systemic racism and white supremacy.”<sup>35</sup> In 2022, Biden tweeted that “[w]hite supremacy is a poison running through our body politic. We need to say as clearly and forcefully as we can that the ideology of white supremacy has no place in America.”<sup>36</sup>

Biden has spent decades fine-tuning his skills as a poisonous demagogue and political opportunist—and exploiting race since his earliest days in the Senate. When Biden speaks repeatedly of white supremacy, he does not mean such horrendous organizations as the Ku Klux Klan or neo-Nazis. He is speaking of systemic white-on-black discrimination and society-wide enshrined white privilege, which he claims exists in America today. By his own words, Biden hates America.

Biden proves the point that in order to be a politically successful Democrat, especially if you want the Democrat Party nomination for president, you must despise our country. You must lie about it. You must denounce it. You must smear it. And if you want to be reelected and create an FDR-like legacy for yourself, you must attack the nation’s long-standing institutions, its history, its founders, its economic system, its sovereignty, and multillions of its people—first black and now white. Being the consummate political chameleon, having spent half a century as a Washington, D.C., politician, Biden, even in his feeble state, is more than up to the task. However, he is hardly alone, as a long line of equally unconscionable and unscrupulous Democrat Party apparatchiks, also egomaniacal in ambition and the pursuit of power, stand ready to pounce.

Here Biden is again, this time at the unveiling of a heart-wrenching documentary about the torture and murder of Emmett Till: “It was one of the great honors of my career, the Emmett Till Anti-Lynching Act, making lynching a federal hate crime. You know, folks, lynching is pure terror, enforcing the lie that not

everyone belongs in America and not everyone is created equal. Pure terror to systematically undermine hard-fought civil rights. Innocent men, women, children hung by a noose from trees. Bodies burned, drowned, castrated. Their crimes? Trying to vote. Trying to go to school. Trying to own a business. Trying to re-preach the gospel. False accusations of murder, arson, robbery. Lynched for simply being Black, nothing more. With white crowds, white families gathered to celebrate the spectacle, taking pictures of the bodies and mailing them as postcards. Hard to believe, but that's what was done. *And some people still want to do that.*"<sup>37</sup> (Italics are mine.)

Biden's "some people" without identifying who he means is deranged and dangerous rhetoric. Way over the top. Yet this kind of hate speech is regular fare on Democrat Party-supporting media platforms and in academic institutions, as it was during the days of segregation. This is similar to his his unhinged attack on then Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney in December 2015, when he said to a racially mixed crowd: "[Romney] said in the first 100 days, he's going to let the big banks once again write their own rules. Unchain Wall Street! They're gonna put y'all back in chains."<sup>38</sup>

As Fox News reported, on May 15, 2023, during a commencement speech at Howard University, a historically black college, Biden began by talking about "America's battle with racism from the time of its inception, saying, 'We know American history has not always been a fairy tale. From the start, it's been a constant push and pull for more than 240 years, between the best of us—the American ideal that we're all created equal—and the worst of us, a harsh reality that racism has long torn us apart. It's a battle that's never really over,' he said, adding, 'But on the best days, enough of us have the guts and hearts to stand up for the best in us, to choose love over hate, unity over disunity, progress over retreat.' Biden then zeroed in on white supremacy, saying,

‘To stand against the poison of white supremacy as I did in my Inaugural Address.’ He then called it ‘the most dangerous terrorist threat to our homeland.’ The audience erupted in applause.”<sup>39</sup>

Biden has never acknowledged or apologized for his racism or support for segregation. And the Democrat Party–supporting media provide cover for him.

Biden and the Democrat Party have adopted the ideology, language, and agenda of anti-white racists and racism, the intersection of racism with capitalism, CRT, and outright Marxism. As president, Biden is using the tools of government and the presidency to spread and impose this ideology throughout the federal bureaucracy, the culture, and society.

In fact, as the *Washington Examiner*’s Paul Bedard explained, in the Democrat Party’s 2020 eighty-page draft platform, in which it lays out its mission and beliefs as a political organization, “whites are mentioned 15 times, all critical, including three references to white supremacy or supremacists and one to white nationalists. The document doesn’t capitalize white as it does Black, Latinos, Asian Americans, and Native Americans. . . . Typical in it is the reference to the wage gap between whites and minorities, which the party document said ‘is hurting our working class and holding our country back.’ The theme in much of the document is that America is divided between whites and minorities, the situation is unfair and needs to be remedied, and that most issues, even military court-martials, are in a racial crisis.”<sup>40</sup>

Here are the fifteen references to whites:

1. We will never amplify or legitimize the voices of bigotry, racism, misogyny, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, or white supremacy.
2. Median incomes are lower and poverty rates are higher for black Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, and

some Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, compared to median white households.

3. And there is a persistent, pernicious racial wealth gap that holds millions of Americans back, with the typical white household holding six times more wealth than the typical Latino family and 10 times more wealth than the typical black family.

4. The wage gap between black workers and white workers is higher today than it was 20 years ago.

5. It takes a typical black woman 19 months to earn what a typical white man earns in 12 months—and for typical Latinas and Native American women, it takes almost two years.

6. Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, the uninsured rate was nearly three times higher for Latinos and nearly twice as high for black Americans as it was for whites.

7. Black children are far more likely than white children to suffer from asthma.

8. Latinos, Native Americans, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and black Americans are diagnosed with diabetes at higher rates than whites.

9. Black women are more than three times as likely to die from complications of pregnancy and childbirth compared to white women.

10. President Trump's words and actions have given safe harbor and encouragement to bigots, anti-Semites, Islamophobes, and white supremacists.



11. The extreme gap in household wealth and income between people of color—especially black Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans—and white families is hurting our working class and holding our country back.

12. We will confront white nationalist terrorism and combat hate crimes perpetrated against religious minorities.

13. Each year, the United States spends \$23 billion more on schools in predominantly white districts than in non-white districts.

14. We will root out systemic racism from our military justice system, where black service members are twice as likely as white ones to face court-martial.

15. Our counterterrorism priorities, footprint, and tools should shift accordingly, including to respond to the growing threat from white supremacist and other right-wing terrorist groups.<sup>41</sup>

Of course, it is impossible to know how the cherry-picked information and allegations were amassed. Nonetheless, we know that the stated purpose is to tear down the country, attack capitalism, and spread anti-white racism.

Coleman Hughes caught Ibram Kendi in several questionable assertions and even big whoppers, when Kendi made similar claims about “white privilege” and capitalism. Hughes explained: “[Kendi] correctly notes that blacks are more likely than whites to die of prostate cancer and breast cancer, but does not include the fact that blacks are *less* likely than whites to die of esophageal cancer, lung cancer, skin cancer, ovarian cancer, bladder cancer, brain cancer, non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma, and leukemia. Of course,

it should not be a competition over which race is more likely to die of which disease—but that’s precisely my point. By selectively citing data that show blacks suffering more than whites, Kendi turns what should be a unifying, race-neutral battle ground—namely, humanity’s fight against deadly diseases—into another proxy battle in the War on Racism.”<sup>42</sup>

Hughes further notes that when Kendi asserts that the “‘black unemployment rate has been at least twice as high as the white unemployment rate for the last fifty years’ because of the ‘conjoined twins’ of racism and capitalism . . . why limit the analysis to the past 50 years?” Hughes cites a Pew Research article that shows “the black-white unemployment gap was ‘small or nonexistent before 1940,’ when America was arguably more capitalist—and certainly more racist.”<sup>43</sup>

Moreover, Alan Berube of the liberal Brookings Institution examined recent Census information and found that although there is an income gap between whites and blacks, “[F]rom 2013 to 2018 most major metropolitan areas registered estimated increases in black median household income that exceeded those for white households. In Phoenix, for instance, the typical black household’s income rose 29% (from just under \$40,000 to more than \$51,000), compared to a 12% increase for the typical white household (from \$63,000 to \$71,000). Across the 20 metro areas with the largest black populations (where sample sizes are larger), 15 registered a larger estimated rise in median black income than median white income.”<sup>44</sup>

And there is more. Although “the Bureau of the Census on household income inequality show that in 2017 the bottom 20 percent of households had an average income of \$13,258, other . . . data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) show that these same households spent \$26,091 on consumption—two times more than their income. Households in the second

20 percent income group spent 11 percent more than their Census income. The Census also reports that the top 20 percent of households had average income of \$221,846, but BLS reports they consumed . . . \$116,998.”<sup>45</sup>

“The bottom quintile can consume more than twice its Census income only because the Census does not count two-thirds of transfer payment as income for those who receive them. The Census reports that the top 20 percent of households averaged 16.7 times as much income as the bottom 20 percent can be reconciled with the BLS report that they only consumed 4.5 times as much by adding the value of the transfer payments received to the income of the bottom 20 percent and subtracting the taxes paid by the top 20 percent.” In fact, “[i]n 2017, federal, state, and local governments redistributed \$2.8 trillion, 22 percent of the nation’s earned household income, with 68 percent of those transfer payments going to households earning in the bottom 40 percent.”<sup>46</sup>

Keep in mind, the level of government spending since 2017, and especially during Biden’s ascendancy to the White House, has exploded, making the amount of government redistribution of household income, and the extent to which it is transferred to the bottom 40 percent, much larger.

Looked at another way, a comprehensive study conducted by Just Facts concluded that “after accounting for all income, charity, and non-cash welfare benefits like subsidized housing and food stamps—the poorest 20 percent of Americans consume more goods and services than the national averages for *all people* in most affluent countries. This includes the majority of countries in the prestigious Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), including its European members. In other words, if the United States poor were a nation, it would be one of the world’s richest.”<sup>47</sup>

For the civil rights Marxists, however, it is ideologically

critical that all fingers point to race, and by that they mean the “white-dominant society,” “racial capitalism,” etc., as the culprit for “inequity” and injustice. Racial and economic progress are measured against the impossibility of their ideological radicalism. For them, injustice and inequity abound, and there is always some event, some statistic, some outcome that serves as conclusive evidence of their righteousness and society’s derangement. Yet what of the home environment, family structure, education, geography, immigration, and so forth? Do they not have an impact on an individual’s life and personal outcomes? And, of course, the endless promise and pursuit of “equity” or equal outcomes is a fantasy by which all Marxist societies deceive, entice, and ultimately control their populations, eventually through a brutal police state.

Indeed, the situation has become so depraved that the “white-dominant culture” is blamed for black-on-black acts of violence. For example, here is Van Jones, CNN commentator and former Obama administration official, insisting that the murder of Tyre Nichols, who was black, by five black police officers is due to the training the black officers received, which is based on white societal racism toward black people. Jones declared that “[f]rom the [Rodney] King beating to the murder . . . of George Floyd, American society has often focused on the race of the officers—so often white—as a factor in their deplorable acts of violence. But the narrative ‘White cop kills unarmed black man’ should never have been the sole lens through which we attempted to understand police abuse and misconduct. It’s time to move to a more nuanced discussion of the way police violence endangers black lives. Black cops are often socialized in police departments that view certain neighborhoods as war zones. In those departments, few officers get disciplined for dishing out ‘street justice’ in certain precincts—often populated by black, brown or low-income people—where there is a tacit understanding that the ‘rulebook’ simply doesn’t

apply. Cops of all colors, including black police officers, internalize those messages—and sometimes act on them. In fact, in black neighborhoods, the phenomenon of brutal black cops singling out young black men for abuse is nothing new. At the end of the day, it is the race of the *victim* who is brutalized—not the race of the violent cop—that is most relevant in determining whether racial bias is a factor in police violence. It's hard to imagine five cops of any color beating a white person to death under similar circumstances. And it is almost impossible to imagine five *black* cops giving a white arrestee the kind of beat-down that Nichols allegedly received.”<sup>48</sup>

Therefore, the Nichols murder is due to the psychological indoctrination of police officers by a white system of justice, which influenced the lawless behavior of the five black police officers toward the black victim. Of course, this is imbecilic psychobabble.

Moreover, if you are not white and your views do not conform to the Marxist ideology and anti-white racist narrative, then you may be of black or brown pigmentation, but you are of a racist white outlook. Wajahat Ali, an author, playwright, contributor to the *New York Times*, and regular guest on MSNBC, said as much about former governor Nikki Haley when she announced her run for the presidency. He said, “To quote Zora Neale Hurston, not all skin folk are kinfolk. Nikki Haley instead is the Dinesh D'Souza of Candace Owens. She's the alpha Karen with brown skin. For white supremacists and racists, she is a perfect Manchurian candidate. Instead of applauding her, I'm just disgusted by people like Nikki Haley who know better, whose parents were the beneficiaries . . . of the 1965 Nationality Act, which passed thanks to those original BLM protesters and the Civil Rights Act. Her father came here because he was a professor, he taught at a historically black college in South Carolina. That's how she became the proud American that she is. And yet, what does she

do, like all these model minorities, which, by the way, is a strategy of white supremacy, to use Asians in particular as a cudgel against black folks? Instead of pulling us up from the bootstraps and pulling others from the bootstraps, we're thought to take your boot and put it on the neck of poor browns, immigrants, refugees and black folks. That's what she did in her ad. So, I see her and I feel sad . . . because she uses her brown skin as a weapon against poor black folks and poor brown folks, and she uses her brown skin to launder white supremacist talking points. The reason why I feel sad, because no matter what she does . . . it will never be enough. They will never love her."<sup>49</sup>

Amazing how much hate, racism, and bigotry is spewed by deranged Democrats and their surrogates in the name of anti-racism.

The fact is that systemic white racism, the supposed evil at the core of American society, therefore, must be eradicated. Biden and the Democrat Party are doing all they can to exploit this hateful ideology and use the instrumentalities of government and political propaganda to advance it, under the guise of a new civil rights movement. Indeed, they are as blatant in promoting racism and resegregation as Woodrow Wilson and the Democrat Party were during much of the last century in promoting anti-black racism and segregation.

Biden and the Democrat Party were ready to impose their ideological will on the public immediately after Biden's inauguration. And no longer do they bother going through Congress and the legislative process. Biden signed an executive order hours after his swearing-in that stated, in part: "Affirmatively advancing equity, civil rights, racial justice, and equal opportunity is the responsibility of the whole of our government. Because advancing equity requires a systematic approach to embedding fairness in decision-making processes, executive departments and agencies

must recognize and work to redress inequities in their policies and programs that serve as barriers to equal opportunity.”<sup>50</sup>

What Biden intended by this presidential fiat would become crystal clear. Remember, CRT demands that new racial discrimination is necessary to address past racial discrimination. Loyola Marymount University professor Evan Gerstmann, writing in *Forbes*, has noted that there is “a recent trend toward the [Biden administration] excluding white people, and sometimes Asian Americans, from access to government relief funds and other benefits. These exclusions go well beyond traditional affirmative action plans. . . . [T]he Biden Administration has pursued this new approach most doggedly, across a broad array of relief funds, with billions of dollars being marked as off-limits to white business owners and farmers regardless of need.”<sup>51</sup>

Rav Arora in the *City Journal* put it this way: “According to this framework, race, rather than individual circumstance, is the definitive marker for economic need. The effects of historical discrimination are presumed to be so immense that any black American, regardless of economic position, is eligible to jump ahead of the line for governmental assistance. Neither wealth nor education nor skills can attenuate a black individual’s ancestral connection to the horrors of slavery, Jim Crow, or other forms of past institutionalized racism. In this paradigm, blacks are hostages to history. What could be a more dehumanizing view? . . . [T]he Biden administration has extended racial preferences . . . to virtually any individual not born into the inflexibly oppressive ‘white’ caste. Thus, farmers or restaurant owners of Indian, Taiwanese, and Filipino extraction—among the highest-earning groups in America—qualify for government assistance, but not poor white farmers in Appalachia.”<sup>52</sup>

For example, the Small Business Administration (SBA) processed and distributed nearly \$29 billion in funds allocated

under the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021. The SBA distributed funds on a supposedly first-come, first-served basis. But during the first twenty-one days the agency gave grants to priority applicants only. Priority applicants were restaurants that are at least 51 percent owned and controlled by women, veterans, or the “socially and economically disadvantaged.” “Socially disadvantaged” means someone who has been “subjected to racial or ethnic prejudice” or “cultural bias” based on his immutable characteristics. Indeed, Biden’s SBA injected explicitly racial and ethnic preferences into the priority process, asserting certain applicants are socially disadvantaged based solely on their race or ethnicity—that is, to the exclusion of white-owned businesses. Not surprisingly, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the federal government cannot allocate limited COVID-19 relief funds based on the race and sex of the applicants.

Moreover, under the same law passed by congressional Democrats and signed by Biden, “the Secretary [of Agriculture] shall provide a payment in the amount of up to 120 percent of the outstanding indebtedness of each socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher. . . .” The Department of Agriculture interprets “socially disadvantaged” to include farmers or ranchers “who are one or more of the following: Black/African American, American Indian, Alaskan native, Hispanic/Latino, Asian or Pacific Islander.” As the court describes it: “the loan forgiveness program is based entirely on the race of the farmer or rancher.”<sup>53</sup> The court struck down the racist part of this law as well.

Furthermore, as Betsy McCaughey, a former Republican lieutenant governor of New York, explains in the *New York Post*, Biden’s student loan cancellation, recently overturned by the Supreme Court in *Biden v. Nebraska*, in addition to being unconstitutional, was defended by the administration “as a way to close the ‘wealth gap’ between races, citing data showing that 20 years



after starting college, the average black borrower still owes 95% of the loan, while the average white borrower has paid off all but 6%. . . . [O]lder people who are white will find it harder to get an appointment with a doctor who takes Medicare. Biden is forcing physicians to categorize their patients by race and demonstrate they have an ‘anti-racism’ plan to combat health disparities. To meet that test, black patients will be in demand; white ones not so much. Doctors who insist on treating patients as individuals rather than by race will be punished with lower payments. . . . Fannie Mae’s new Equitable Housing Finance Plan will help with appraisals and closing costs—but only if you’re black. If you’re a white company owner who sells to the federal government, get ready to lose business to a competitor who identifies as ‘underserved,’ ‘marginalized’ or ‘disadvantaged’—all euphemisms for identity groups. The Biden bureaucracy gives preference to minorities in federal procurement.”<sup>54</sup>

On February 16, 2023, with virtually no fanfare, Biden doubled down on his government-wide racist policies by signing another executive order—a second massive equity dictate—described as an “Executive Order on Further Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities through the Federal Government.” Among other things, it declares that the federal government will “establish equity-focused leadership across the federal government; deliver equitable outcomes through government policies, programs, and activities; deliver equitable outcomes in partnership with underserved communities; create economic opportunity in rural America and advance urban equitable development; advance equitable procurement; further advance equitable data practices.”<sup>55</sup>

The order also defines, among other things, “equity” to include “Black, Latino, Indigenous and Native American, Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander persons and other per-

sons of color; members of religious minorities; women and girls; LGBTQI+ persons; persons with disabilities; persons who live in rural areas; persons who live in United States Territories; persons otherwise adversely affected by persistent poverty or inequality; and individuals who belong to multiple such communities.”<sup>56</sup> Specifically excluded from the list of favored Americans are most heterosexual, white males.

Beyond the racist federal regulations, rules, and mandates, Biden and the Democrat Party seek permanent changes to the electoral process to ensure the Democrat Party holds power for extensive periods of time without interruption. Thus, Biden and other Democrats use deceit and racial propaganda to try to both rally support for and camouflage their true electoral schemes. For example, in July 2021, in a speech intended to promote the Democrat Party’s effort to nationalize election laws and enshrine its power over the federal government for generations, Biden gave one of his many demagogic speeches, in which he proclaimed, in part, that America has a long history as a racist hellhole. “From denying enslaved people full citizenship until the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments after the Civil War; to denying women the right to vote until the 19th Amendment 100 years ago; to poll taxes and literacy tests, and the Ku Klux Klan campaigns of violence and terror that lasted into the ’50s and ’60s . . .”<sup>57</sup>

Of course, the American people have confronted and do confront, and the American system is built to adjust and reform, what Biden described. But what is always missing from Biden’s tirades is, again, the role the Democrat Party played in so much of this. The Democrat Party supported slavery and segregation and opposed the Emancipation Proclamation, the 13th Amendment (abolishing slavery), the 14th Amendment (due process and equal protections for blacks), and the 15th Amendment (giving blacks the right to vote). The Democrat Party was reluctant to

give women the right to vote; created poll taxes, literacy tests, and other forms of intimidation to prevent blacks from voting; was tied closely to race-based eugenics and the Ku Klux Klan; and for decades refused to support a federal law outlawing lynching. This is the Democrat Party's obscene history.

More from Biden: "The 21st century Jim Crow assault is real. It's unrelenting, and we're going to challenge it vigorously. While this broad assault against voting rights is not unprecedented, it's taking on new and, literally, pernicious forms. It's no longer just about who gets to vote or making it easier for eligible voters to vote. It's about who gets to count the vote—who gets to count whether or not your vote counted at all. It's about moving from independent election administrators who work for the people to polarized state legislatures and partisan actors who work for political parties."<sup>58</sup>

"To me, this is simple," Biden declared. "This is election subversion. It's the most dangerous threat to voting and the integrity of free and fair elections in our history. Never before have they decided who gets to count . . . what votes count. . . . So, hear me clearly: There is an unfolding assault taking place in America today—an attempt to suppress and subvert the right to vote in fair and free elections, an assault on democracy, an assault on liberty, an assault on who we are—who we are as Americans."<sup>59</sup>

Despite Biden's constant and reckless race-baiting and pathological lying, nobody who is qualified to vote is prevented from voting. More on this later in the book.

In addition to demanding that Congress pass the power-grabbing Democrat Party voting bill, Biden was taking aim at states that were reforming their own election laws after the 2020 election and ensuring election integrity, such as Georgia, with no intention of suppressing any American's vote. Biden and the Democrats rallied the media, corporations, and others to promote a boycott of the state. Major League Baseball even moved its all-

star game out of black-majority Atlanta. The Republican Georgia legislature was condemned as taking steps to suppress the black vote. Of course, this was another flat-out lie.

Writing in the *Daily Signal*, Heritage Foundation voting rights expert Hans von Spakovsky looked back at the 2022 midterm election in Georgia. Here is what he found: “In a propaganda campaign over the past two years that would impress Russian President Vladimir Putin, Biden and [Stacey] Abrams [Democrat candidate for governor of Georgia] falsely claimed that new Georgia election reforms such as an ID requirement for absentee ballots were ‘Jim Crow 2.0’ and deliberately intended to ‘suppress’ minority voters. . . . [A] survey from the Survey Research Center of the School of Public & International Affairs at the University of Georgia found that precisely 0% of black respondents said that they had a ‘poor’ experience voting in 2022, compared to 0.9% of white voters. . . . In fact, 96.2% of black voters said their voting experience was ‘excellent’ or ‘good,’ compared to 96% of whites, a statistically insignificant difference. Georgia voters were asked to compare their voting experience in the 2022 midterm congressional elections to the 2020 presidential election. State legislators passed the election reform bill, SB 202, in 2021 and its new provisions were in effect for the 2022 elections. Biden claimed the new law was ‘Jim Crow 2.0.’ Over 19% of black voters said their voting experience was ‘easier’ and 72.5% said there was ‘no difference,’ for a total of 91.6%. That compares to 13.3% of white voters who said they had an ‘easier’ experience in 2022 and 80.1% who said they saw ‘no difference,’ for a total of 93.4%. . . . 68.7% of black voters reported that they had no wait time at all, or had to wait less than 10 minutes. Another 27.3% said they waited only 10 to 30 minutes. That means that 96% of black voters voted within 30 minutes of getting to a polling place. The comparable number for white voters was 95.2%.”<sup>60</sup>

The point is that Biden and the Democrat Party, helped by their media surrogates and corporatists, spent months pushing a malicious ruse against the Republican Party and Republican-controlled Georgia legislature, for the purpose of preventing legitimate election reforms aimed at averting voter fraud. More on the Democrat Party's voting scheme later in the book.

Biden is not alone among Democrats in his inflammatory and exploitive advocacy of civil rights Marxism and anti-white racism. I cannot think of a single national Democrat who has denounced any aspect of this un-American and hateful ideology. It now runs through the political veins of the Democrat Party, as anti-black racism did in the last century. Its surrogates in the teachers' unions, professoriate, media, Hollywood, corporate boards, etc., are all in. It is enforced throughout the economy by corporatists, activist shareholders, and government oversight and regulatory agencies (such as the Securities and Exchange Commission) and through Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) rules and policies; it is imposed on the rest of society through Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) personnel employed by the thousands as enforcers and propagandists in human resource departments, in public and private workplaces, educational institutions, government departments, etc.

Although the Democrat Party has recalibrated its modern racist targets, like Democrats of old, it remains the party of anti-Semitism. In fact, as the Democrat Party's Marxist core continues to metastasize, so does its anti-Semitism. For example, the current leader of the House Democrats, and Speaker-in-waiting, Hakeem Jeffries, strongly defended his bigoted, anti-Semitic uncle Leonard Jeffries, when Hakeem Jeffries was a leading activist in college. CNN reports that Leonard Jeffries "faced widespread backlash in the early 1990s after comments he made about the involvement of 'rich Jews' in the African slave trade and 'a conspiracy, planned

and plotted and programmed out of Hollywood' of Jewish executives who he said were responsible for denigrating Black Americans in films. 'Dr. Leonard Jeffries and Minister Louis Farrakhan have come under intense fire,' wrote Hakeem Jeffries in February 1992. 'Where do you think their interests lie? Dr. Jeffries has challenged the existing white supremacist educational system and long-standing distortion of history. His reward has been a media lynching complete with character assassinations and inflammatory erroneous accusations.'"<sup>61</sup> Hakeem Jeffries also smeared black critics of his uncle: "The House Negro of the slavery era and the black conservative of today are both opportunists interested in securing some measure of happiness for themselves within the existing social order. In both cases, the social order has blacks occupying the lowest societal echelon."<sup>62</sup> For years, Hakeem Jeffries has flatly lied about his past support for his uncle's vile anti-Semitism. But all is forgiven and forgotten, as Democrats have lined up in his defense.<sup>63</sup> After all, power is their aphrodisiac, and absolute power is their aim.

Scholar and author Victor Davis Hanson explains in *National Review* that "[t]he new anti-Semitism that grew up in the 1960s was certainly in part legitimized by the rise of overt African-American bigotry against Jews (and coupled by a romantic affinity for Islam). It was further nursed on old stereotypes of cold and callous Jewish ghetto storeowners (e.g., 'The Pawnbroker' character), and expressed boldly in the assumption that black Americans were exempt from charges of bias and hatred. . . . By the late 1970s, Israelis and often by extension Jews in general were demagogued by the Left as Western white oppressors. Israel's supposed victims were romanticized abroad as exploited Middle Easterners. And by extension, Jews were similarly exploiting minorities at home. . . . Soon it became common for self-described black leaders to explain, to amplify, to contextualize, or to be unapologetic

about their anti-Semitism, in both highbrow and lowbrow modes: James Baldwin (“Negroes are anti-Semitic because they’re anti-white”), Louis Farrakhan (“When they talk about Farrakhan, call me a hater, you know what they do, call me an anti-Semite. Stop it. I am anti-termite. The Jews don’t like Farrakhan, so they call me Hitler. Well, that’s a great name. Hitler was a very great man”), Jesse Jackson (“Hymietown”), Al Sharpton (“If the Jews want to get it on, tell them to pin their yarmulkes back and come over to my house”), and the Reverend Jeremiah Wright (“The Jews ain’t gonna let him [Obama] talk to me”). Note that Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton both ran as Democrat candidates for president. Sharpton officially visited the Obama White House more than one hundred times, and Wright was the Obamas’ longtime personal pastor, officiated at the couple’s wedding and the baptism of their daughters, and inspired the title of Obama’s second book.”<sup>64</sup>

Hanson notes that “marquee black leaders—from Keith Ellison to Barack Obama to the grandees of the Congressional Black Caucus—have all had smiling photo-ops with the anti-Semite Louis Farrakhan, a contemporary black version of Richard Spencer or the 1980s David Duke. Appearing with Farrakhan, however, never became toxic, even after he once publicly warned Jews, ‘And don’t you forget, when it’s God who puts you in the ovens, it’s forever!’ . . . In that vein, Michigan’s new congresswoman, Rashida Tlaib, assumed she’d face little pushback from her party when she tweeted out the old slur that Jewish supporters of Israel have dual loyalties: Opponents of the Boycott, Divest, and Sanctions movement, which targets Israel, ‘forgot what country they represent,’ she said. Ironically, Tlaib is not shy about her own spirited support of the Palestinians: She earlier had won some attention for an eliminationist map in her office that had the label ‘Palestine’ pasted onto the Middle East, with an arrow pointing to Israel. Similarly, Ilhan Omar—like Tlaib, a new

female Muslim representative in the House—used to be candid in her views of Israel as an ‘apartheid regime’: ‘Israel has hypnotized the world, may Allah awaken the people and help them see the evil doings of Israel.’ On matters of apartheid, one wonders whether Omar would prefer to be an Arab citizen inside ‘evil’ Israel or an Israeli currently living in Saudi Arabia or Egypt.”<sup>65</sup>

And, of course, many present-day Democrat Party anti-Semites view the Jewish people as part of the white-dominant, white-privileged, oppressor white race. Hanson points out: “The new, new anti-Semites do not see themselves as giving new life to an ancient pathological hatred; they’re only voicing claims of the victims themselves against their supposed oppressors. The new, new anti-Semites’ venom is contextualized as an ‘intersectional’ defense from the hip, the young, and the woke against a Jewish component of privileged white establishmentarians—which explains why the bigoted are so surprised that anyone would be offended by their slurs.”<sup>66</sup>

In early September 2016, writes Rabbi Yaakov Menken, managing director of the Coalition for Jewish Values, in the *Observer*, “[T]he Obama administration reacted angrily to a video in which Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu pointed out that the Palestinian Authority intended to be *Judenrein*, ethnically cleansed of Jews. The State Department willfully distorted Netanyahu’s remarks, asserting he was promoting Israeli settlements, and reiterating its false claim that those settlements are illegal. In other words, the Obama administration twisted a statement about Arab bigotry against Jews into a perceived injustice against Arabs. Later that same month, Obama delivered his final address to the United Nations General Assembly. ‘And surely, Israelis and Palestinians will be better off if Palestinians reject incitement and recognize the legitimacy of Israel,’ he said, ‘but Israel recognizes that it cannot permanently occupy and settle



Palestinian land.' While his words may sound to the untrained ear as if Obama were striving for balance, these two phrases could not be further apart."<sup>67</sup>

Apparently, the Jewish people are the only indigenous people Obama, the Democrat Party ruling class, and their ilk do not recognize. "Jews lived in the area Jordan labeled the 'West Bank' continuously for the past 3,000 years," writes Menken, "save for brief periods when they were massacred, and the survivors were forced from their homes—most recently by the Jordanian Army in 1948. To now call the Tomb of the Patriarchs and the Temple Mount 'Arab land' tacitly endorses Arab ethnic cleansing of Jews."<sup>68</sup>

In fact, Obama was disastrous for the state of Israel, as he was for the United States. He denied Israel arms for a period when it was under attack; he signed an agreement with the terrorist Iranian regime that ensured its acquisition of nuclear weapons and threatened Israel's existence; he directed his secretary of state, John Kerry, to abstain rather than vote "no" on another anti-Semitic UN resolution against Israel; he attempted to unseat Israel's elected prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, and treated him disrespectfully when he visited the White House; and, much more.

Biden has picked up where Obama left off, reversing President Trump's pro-Israel policies. He negotiates with the Iranian regime in secret, reportedly promising tens of billions in financial relief and acceptance of Iran's substantial advances in developing nuclear weapons; he bypassed the Taylor Force Act, which prevented United States' funding of the Palestinians unless they stopped using the money to reward the families of Palestinian terrorists for murdering Jews (Taylor Force was a former U.S. Army officer who was part of a Vanderbilt University tour group who was stabbed to death in a terror attack that left ten others wounded in an old section of Tel Aviv); he delivered hundreds of millions of dollars to the Palestinian Authority; and much more.<sup>69</sup>

And Biden has done next to nothing to address the growing anti-Semitism in the Democrat Party or on Democrat Party-supporting college and university campuses.

In *Newsweek*, Kenneth Marcus, chairman of the Louis D. Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law, recently wrote: “The Biden White House had announced last spring (and even before that), that the Education Department’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) would deliver an important proposed regulation in December 2022. The regulation is supposed to implement the Executive Order on Combating Antisemitism, which former President Donald Trump had signed in 2019. This order had been a major milestone, codifying important rules under which Jewish students receive civil rights protections in American colleges and schools. . . . [T]he Biden administration announced that the proposed regulation would be delayed another 12 months, until December 2023.”<sup>70</sup>

The Biden administration decided to move up its announcement, Marcus explained in the *Jewish Press*. However, the move was “deeply troubling,” because “the administration appears to be retreating from a longstanding commitment to issue regulations on combating antisemitism. Instead of issuing a new regulation that strengthens protections for Jewish students, the administration is promising only to issue informal guidance to remind institutions of their existing commitments.”<sup>71</sup> In other words, Biden appeased the anti-Semitic elements in his party and like-minded Democrat Party surrogates and groups. Like Lyndon Johnson, who succeeded in watering down the 1957 Civil Rights Act, Biden has done the same with anti-Semitism in colleges and schools.

The editors at *National Review*, in an editorial titled “Time for Democrats to Address Their Anti-Semitism Problem,” explained that “[a]nti-Jewish attacks did not spring forth in a vacuum. Increasingly, the American Left has gone beyond mere criticism of the Jewish State (of the sort that is made against other nations)

and adopted the kind of virulent strain of anti-Israel rhetoric that was once mercifully relegated to far-left college campuses. In this environment, Squad members Ilhan Omar, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, and Rashida Tlaib can falsely accuse Israel of being an ‘apartheid state’ and of employing U.S. military aid to target civilians and children—a new spin on an old blood libel—and experience almost no rebuke from their own party.”<sup>72</sup>

The editors continued: “The intense opprobrium saved for Israel, and spared authoritarian nations such as China and Iran, betrays the progressive left’s moral corruption. And rather than react in dismay, *New York Times* progressive columnist Michelle Goldberg lamented that attacks on Jews might undermine the Palestinian political cause. Rather than distance themselves from violence conducted by their allies, former Bernie Sanders surrogate Amer Zahr implored progressives in a video and tweet to ‘stop condemning anti-Semitism.’ He said, ‘You are not helping. You are playing their games. It’s a distraction.’ Instead, he urged followers to say ‘Free Palestine—and nothing else!’ Zahr needn’t worry. Most progressive politicians who did bother denouncing the recent wave of violence against Jews diluted their rebukes by also condemning rising Islamophobia, creating the impression that advocates of both sides of the Israeli–Palestinian debate were engaging in violence—which is, needless to say, a myth.”<sup>73</sup>

Indeed, for American Marxists and the Democrat Party, anti-Semitism fits neatly into their political and ideological narrative. “There is little political upside for Democrats to call out the Squad. Polls show a party that has lurched leftward and become increasingly antagonistic towards the Jewish State,” write the *National Review* editors. “As Ayaan Hirsi Ali recently noted, the Israeli–Palestinian conflict feeds into many of the progressive left’s ideological biases: ‘the narrative of the oppressor versus the

oppressed, of the colonizer versus the colonized, of the genocide perpetrator and system of supremacy.’”<sup>74</sup>

And do Democrat Party leaders condemn what is taking place among their ranks? “When it comes to Ilhan Omar and Co., where is Nancy Pelosi? Where is Chuck Schumer or Dick Durbin? To this point, nowhere to be found. It is, of course, true that neither Left nor Right has a monopoly on anti-Semitism. These days, however, one party is increasingly under the sway of a noxious, all-encompassing hostility to the Jewish State.”<sup>75</sup> The Democrat Party is not only tolerating anti-Semitism, it is promoting it.<sup>76</sup> Not so with the Republican Party.

Nonetheless, the Democrat Party, once again, attempts to project upon the Republican Party and others the bigotry and hatred that have always defined it, in one form or another. This is typical of arrogant autocratic parties and regimes, which use propaganda to distract and manipulate events. Jonathan S. Tobin, editor in chief of the *Jewish News Service*, responded to an effort by a Democrat-aligned writer to paint former president Donald Trump and the Republican Party as the real home of anti-Semitism. “To the contrary,” writes Tobin, “[Trump] was not only the most pro-Israel president ever but surpassed his predecessors in opposing antisemitism on college campuses and had closer ties to Jews than any other previous president via his family and close associates. The claims that he never condemned right-wing extremism or had endorsed the neo-Nazis who marched in Charlottesville, Va., in August 2017, which continue to be voiced on the left, were simply untrue. The argument that Trump somehow encouraged antisemites on the far-right with his trolling of his critics and foes on Twitter, as well as in speeches, was pure partisanship. It’s also hypocritical since it’s the sort of charge that is never applied to liberals, like Biden, who are also prone to hyperbolic and dishonest attacks on their opponents.”<sup>77</sup>

Tobin declares: “The reality of contemporary politics is the GOP is a lockstep pro-Israel party where philo-Semitism is the norm. The opposite is true of the Democratic Party, whose intersectional left-wing’s embrace of critical race theory has driven growing hostility to Israel and support for ideologues in the Black Lives Matter movement that embrace the idea that Jews are ‘white’ oppressors. And rather than isolating their extremists, the party’s progressive wing and pop-culture and media cheering sections have embraced them.”<sup>78</sup> Tobin explains that for many on the left, “their goal is to redefine antisemitism in a way so as to label the demonization of Israel and the Jews as legitimate discourse rather than hate speech.”<sup>79</sup>

Indeed, Biden has a history of treating the State of Israel, the only Jewish state in the world, and established after World War II and the Holocaust, as a second-class country. He speaks down to its elected leaders, when those leaders are members of the Likud Party—Israel’s largest political party for the last quarter century. It is also Israel’s most prominent conservative party.

On June 22, 1982, Sen. Biden confronted then Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin during his Senate Foreign Relations committee testimony, threatening to cut off aid to Israel when Begin refused to accept Biden’s demands on how to run his country. Begin looked directly at Biden and said: “Don’t threaten us with cutting off your aid. It will not work. I am not a Jew with trembling knees. I am a proud Jew with 3,700 years of civilized history. Nobody came to our aid when we were dying in the gas chambers and ovens. Nobody came to our aid when we were striving to create our country. We paid for it. We fought for it. We died for it. We will stand by our principles. We will defend them. And, when necessary, we will die for them again, with or without your aid.”<sup>80</sup>

Today, Biden is at it again. Like his former boss, Obama, Biden is actively undermining Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netan-

yahu, his coalition government, and the State of Israel, as it faces down the Iranian terror state and its nuclear weapons development and Palestinian terrorists. The *Wall Street Journal* editorial board recently asked: “Why does President Biden go out of his way to snub, criticize and give marching orders to the government of Israel? At least rhetorically, the President and his Administration treat Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and his governing coalition worse than they do the ruling mullahs in Iran.... Tom Nides, Mr. Biden’s departing Ambassador to Israel, chimes in that the U.S. must speak up to stop Israel from ‘going off the rails.’”<sup>81</sup>

The *Journal* notes that Biden’s “Israel policy has been counterproductive. U.S. aid to anti-Israel international bodies has resumed, and all of [Judaea and Samaria] and East Jerusalem is treated as ‘occupied territory.’ This is now a liberal article of faith, but how does it advance peace to indulge Palestinians in the belief that Jews are interlopers in Judea and at the Western Wall?”<sup>82</sup>

Biden is selling out Israel in pursuit of another treacherous nuclear deal with Iran that allows Iran to complete its nuclear arms program, and in which Biden and the Obama holdovers surrounding him, arrogantly claim and stupidly believe they can diplomatically manage the region. Hence, Netanyahu, who insists that Iran must never produce a single nuclear weapon—and is prepared to go to war to stop that genocidal terrorist regime—is viewed by Biden as the problem.

Biden has not and never will treat another country, especially an ally, with the kind of condescension and disdain he singularly saves for Israel and its democratically elected government. And despite his self-aggrandizing lies, in which he claims a decades-long record of supporting the Jewish state, his motives are sinister and his contempt is obvious. In this, his record may well exceed Franklin Roosevelt’s legacy toward the Jewish people.



As the Democrat Party's want for ever more control intensifies, and its hate for America becomes even more pronounced, it will look increasingly like autocratic parties, past and present, around the world. The Marxist model best fits its aims because Marxist rhetoric is more easily made appealing to "the masses," as is the promise of a paradisiacal society supposedly replacing the irredeemably amoral society inherited by present-day Americans. Moreover, their progress is never measured by promises kept, but by more promises made.

The Democrat Party will also continue to aggressively denounce and degrade capitalism, which rewards individual accomplishments, merit, and freethinking and is, thereby, a huge impediment to their effort to centralize power and decision-making. It will further extol CRT's oppressor-oppressed Marxist-based racism, which breeds jealousy, anger, and hate toward the existing "white-dominant society;" and, anti-Semitism within the Democrat Party will further fester and become increasingly belligerent and bellicose, which is a sign of the evil nature of such parties and, ultimately, regimes throughout the centuries.

This is the unmistakable path the Democrat Party is on. And it is the path down which it is driving the rest of the country.