

The Big Smear

The DNC Media's "You're a Racist" / "You're a Nazi" / "Free Markets Bad" Narratives Debunked

by Steven Mrozak

Why This Book Events alone don't change minds, unless some *new* facts rattle a person's meta-narratives. Intact meta-narratives can force-fit new events into existing mental frameworks, square-peg-round-hole, to blunt cognitive dissonance--or to allow bad actors to excuse bad behavior and justify double standards.

Most maddening modern media spin draws on three Meta-narratives; without these, the Left is *nothing* and will never win again.

First, *The "Race" Narrative*, including demagoguery about slavery, the Founding, most of US history, and *The Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory*. It also involves Socialism's phony claims of racial virtue, contradicted by its long record of ethnic and racial violence the world over.

Second, *The "Nazis" Narrative*, portraying all anti-establishment forces as Nazis or Alt-Right or adjacent to them--and violent too. This hoax links *The "Race" Narrative* and *The "Free Markets Bad" Narrative* by pretending capitalism is linked to Nazism and racism, and by claiming Nazis are "right-wing" to smear traditional conservatism and make "racism" claims stick, and by asserting National Socialists were arch-antisocialists to delegitimize opposition to socialism.

Third, *The "Free Markets Bad" Narrative*, which we demolish by proving free market capitalism all-but ended poverty. We crush counter-explanations like natural resources, technology, slavery or colonialism, and demolish the moral case for socialism (far more important than just showing it doesn't work). Then we smash Keynesianism and all its canards, first pointing out that Critical Race Theory logic ("lending disparities prove racism, so make bad loans now!") caused the 2008 Housing Crash, then shattering the New Deal Myth (it failed economically, and was actually just a political project to make a new Tammany on the Potomac). Adding insult to injury, I elaborate on how the working class has rejected socialism.

*

*

*

-->META-NARRATIVE #1: THE "RACE" NARRATIVE

>>> Institutional Racism Debunked: You Can't Be Morally Right If Your Facts Are Wrong

>>> Racism Is Not A Major Problem and Millennials Only Think It Is Because of the Nonstop Headlines About Racism Starting In 2011

>>> There's Gold In Them Hills: How the Southern Poverty Law Center and Anti-Defamation League Get Rich By Smearing People As Racist

- >>> The Southern Poverty Law Center
- >>> The Anti-Defamation League (ADL)
- >>> The Old Time Race-Hustlers: Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton
- >>> The New Time Race-Hustlers: Shaun King, Robin DiAngelo, Ibram X. Kendi
- >>> Institutional Racism Debunked: The Police
- >>> Institutional Racism Debunked: Crime and Imprisonment
- >>> Institutional Racism Debunked: There Is No Race-War Going On

>>> Foundational Distortions: The Fake History and Flawed Theoretical Frameworks That Make the Race Narrative Go

_____White Power Structure Claims

- >>> 1) Anyone Can Be Racist
- >>> 2) Mass Shootings and Race: Media Portrayals Versus Actual Data
- >>> 3) The "Angry White Male" Trope Was Invented in 1994 by Democrats to Downplay their Epic Midterm Thrashing
- >>> 4) A True History of Race and Racism

>>> Historical Distortions: The True History of Slavery, the American Revolution, and the American Constitutional System, all of Which Exonerates America

_____A True History of Slavery: America Did Not Invent Slavery, Nor Is it Uniquely Guilty

- >>> A True History of the American Revolution: The American Revolution Was a Fight For Freedom, and the 1619 Race-Hustlers Don't Have a Leg to Stand On
- >>> A True History of the American Founding: Liberals Malign the Founding Because It Blocks Them From Controlling Your Life

>>> The Democrats Own Slavery: A Refutation of The Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory. Prelude: Everything Pre-1960, and How Dan T. Carter, Earl and Merle Black, and Kevin M(ountebank) Kruse invented the Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory

- >>> 1) The Two-Guys-In-Congress Realignment
- >>> 2) The Segregationist Democrats weren't "conservatives."
- >>> 3) Southern Democrats Labelled "Conservative" Using Dubious Definitions
- >>> 4) The "Wings Narrative" Interlocks with the Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory, And Is Also FALSE!
- >>> 5) None of the Voting Data Fits the Narrative
- >>> 6) Misleading Phrasings and Framings, or My Deconstructive Delight!
- >>> 7) The "Southern Strategy" Debunked
- >>> 8) But the Quotes!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! But the Confessions!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- >>> 9) Dogwhistles: For When the Voting Data Doesn't Oblige Your Conspiracy Theory, Try Our "Dogwhistles" Canard!
- >>> 10) The Republican Position on Civil Rights Was Constant: There Was No Switch
- >>> 11) The Republican Position on the Role of Government and the Propriety of Free Markets Held Constant: There Was No Switch

>>> 12) No, GOP Election Integrity Measures Are Not The Continuation of Democrat Voter Suppression

>>> Identity Politics: Morally Defective, Dependent Upon Conspiracy Theories, Stoking Violence

>>> Identity Politics: Promising Wakanda, Delivering Rwanda, Since 1965, or, "Since the Democrats Ran Slavery and Jim Crow, There's No Justification For Scapegoating Either Republicans or White People in General"

>>> The Role of Conspiracy Theories In Promoting Identity Politics

>>> MAGA Is Not Identity Politics

>>> Stoking Victimhood, Stoking Violence

>>> Institutional Racism Debunked: Affirmative Action and Preferential Policies

>>> Incomes & Poverty & Wealth: Causes, Effects, Implications

_____Incomes By Race Disprove Claims of White Supremacy

>>> Median Household Incomes by Race & Ethnicity

>>> The Black/White Income Gap

>>> Sustained Poverty & the Elephant in the Room

>>> The Wealth Gap: Completing the Liberals' Incomplete Analysis

>>> No, the Suburbs Aren't Racist

_____The "White Flight" Conspiracy Theory

>>> But What About Redlining?

>>> Capitalism Is Anti-Racist, Socialism Is a Fraud, and Jim Crow Was Big Government in Action

_____The Democrats' Anti-Capitalist Opposition to Reconstruction

>>> Jim Crow Was Government Restriction of the Market, Not the Will of the Market

>>> Where Did Anyone Get the Idea Jim Crow Was Conservative or Capitalist?

>>> Where Did Anyone Get The Idea Capitalism Was Racist or that Socialism Was Anti-Racist? Part 1: Slavery and Capitalism are Opposites

>>> Where Did Anyone Get The Idea Capitalism Was Racist or that Socialism Was Anti-Racist? Part 2: How DuBois' Conspiracy Theories Tying Slavery to "America," All "White People" (Party Unspecified) and "Capitalism" Affected Black Voting Habits And Caused **THE BIG 1930s SELLOUT**

>>> Socialism's Long History of Racism and Genocide

_____Socialism's Racist History: The "Anti-Racism" of Socialism is a Scam

>>> The "Socialism is Anti-Racist" Scam: How the Very Very Very Racist Socialists Rebranded Themselves as Anti-Racism Crusaders

>>> "Anti-Zionism," or, "Hating the Jews, Soviet Style": How the Soviet Union Invented the Label Used by Jew-Haters and Israel's Enemies Today

--->**META-NARRATIVE #2: THE "NAZIS" NARRATIVE**

>>> Contemporary Frame-Ups & Hitjobs: Fascism is Not Right-Wing, and the Alt-Right Is Not Conservative---Part 1: The Original Fascists Were Not Right Wing
_____Fascism Is Left Wing in the Role of Government

>>> FDR, Democrats, Progressives, and their Great Love for Mussolini, or "IF IT'S THE END OF THE WORLD THAT DAVID DUKE PRAISED TRUMP, WHAT DO YOU CALL HITLER ENDORSING FDR AND THE NEW DEAL?"

>>> The Reason for the Affinity: Nazis, FDR, and Mussolini Had Similar Economic Policies

>>> Fascist Italy's Government-Run Economy

>>> Nazi Germany's Government-Run Economy

>>> The Nazi Welfare State

>>> Nazis Weren't Social Conservatives: They Hated Christianity and the Deathcamps Were Based on Eugenics Which is Based on [distortions of] Darwin

>>> The Nazis Hated Christianity and Planned to Exterminate It. The Marxists Leave This Part Out To Pretend Nazis Are Social Conservatives

>>> How the "Nazis Are Right-Wing" Hoax Was Begun, And What Rhetorical and Framing Tricks Does it Rest Upon?

>>> The Alt-Right Does Not Believe What Conservatives Do; The Neo National SOCIALISTS Are No Closer Than the Historical National SOCIALISTS

_____The Alt-Right Isn't Right, and there's no such thing as "White" Nationalism

>>> First the Matter of Abortion

>>> Then the Matter of Their Governmental Philosophy

>>> Dubious Citations of Irrelevant Endorsements

--->**META-NARRATIVE #3: THE "FREE MARKETS BAD" NARRATIVE**

Capitalism Cures Poverty: Poverty Reduction, Income Growth, Consumption Growth, Workweek Shortened

_____Capitalism Cures Poverty: More People Have Been Lifted Out of Poverty by Capitalism Than Any Other System

>>> The Raw Wage Numbers Have Not Recently Stalled

>>> The Counter Explanations All Fail: Not Technology, Not Natural Resources, Not Colonial Plunder, Not Slavery

_____Technology Fails As An Explanation, Free Market Capitalism Made Us Rich

>>> Natural Resources Fail As An Explanation, Free Market Capitalism Made Us Rich

>>> Colonial Plunder Fails As An Explanation, Free Market Capitalism Made Us Rich

>>> Slavery Fails As An Explanation, Free Market Capitalism Made Us Rich

>>> Government Investment Fails As An Explanation, Free Market Capitalism Made Us Rich

>>> GDP Is An Invalid, Phony Statistic That Includes Government Spending to Help Liberals Fudge the Numbers

>>> An Assortment of Leftist-Inspired Misconceptions About Capitalism and Government Policy Debunked, Along With Much Marxist-Style Class Warfare Rhetoric, and Sloppy Keynesian-Style Analysis, Debunked

_____The Rich Man's Riches Didn't Make the Poor Man Poor

>>> "Tax the Rich!" and the "Trickle-Down" Strawman Attack

>>> Quintiles Prove Little to Nothing Because Statistical Categories Are Not Flesh and Blood People

>>> Overarching Points About Inequality and Welfare In Theory

>>> Capitalism Is More Moral, Democratic, and Egalitarian Than Socialism, Which Has A Built-In Anti-Democratic and Elitist Temperament

_____The Morality of Laissez-Faire: It Opposed Classism, Promoted Meritocracy, and Generated Prosperity for the Masses

>>> Socialism Versus Democracy

>>> Socialism Failed Everywhere, Foreign and Domestic, and No One Said "That's Not Real Socialism" Before the Soviet Union Collapsed

>>> Scandinavia Is Not Socialist

>>> Counterclaims Against Capitalism

>>> The DSA, Millennials, and Socialism

>>> The Working Class Has Rejected Socialism, Because Socialism Is Elitist

>>> Democrat Vote-Getters: Creating and Exploiting Disinformation About Housing Crash and Great Depression

_____No, Capitalism Didn't Cause the Housing Crash and the Great Depression

>>> Deregulation Is Not Happening, Overregulation Is Happening

>>> Capitalism didn't cause the Financial crisis of 2008

>>> Great Depression Myths, New Deal Failures

_____Capitalism Didn't Cause The Depression

>>> Branch Banking: An Outlawed Solution

>>> Other Non-Causes: Buying Stocks on Margins, Concentration of Wealth

>>> The New Deal Failed

>>> FDR's Treasury Secretary Admitted the New Deal Failed

>>> 1937 Tax Hikes Killed the Recovery, Not Supposedly Tight Fiscal Policy

>>> How Liberals Pretend the New Deal Worked

>>> The Broken Window Fallacy That The New Deal's Fanclub Bases Their Whole Case On, Debunked. Spending to "Stimulate" the Economy is The Broken Window Fallacy

>>> "World War 2 Got Us Out of the Depression" = The Ultimate Broken Window Fallacy

>>> The New Deal Was a Political Project

_____The New Deal Was a Political Program, Not An Economic One: General Overview

>>> The New Deal, AKA, Tammany-on-the-Potomac

>>> FDR's Poor & Working Class Supporters Paid For the New Deal, Not the Rich: Propaganda &

Patronage, Just Like Modern Democrats

*
*
*

META-NARRATIVE #1: THE "RACE" NARRATIVE

Institutional Racism Debunked: You Can't Be Morally Right If Your Facts Are Wrong You can't be morally right if your facts are wrong. Wrong facts produce false accusations, and lead to doing bad things to good people for fake reasons. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor, and to avoid false witness, one must know the facts.

Avoid false witness by eschewing the *Continuing Oppression Narrative*, the CON, which endures despite lack of evidence, due to the *narrative-driven creative interpretation of ordinary life as "racism"*.

Discredited canards about the police, cultural appropriation, SAT tests being "biased," imprisonment rates, and incomes circulate endlessly, despite even though they fail to address alternative explanations.

Even worse, the Establishment press abuses public trust and academics abuse their credentials to terrify people and advance politically useful narratives, spreading false beliefs to build support for false solutions. They've been at this a long time. Back in the now-ancient 1990s, Barry Glassner's book *The Culture of Fear* busted many myths by asking "how common are these things we're all deathly afraid of?" From airplane crashes to child kidnapping to shark attacks, the Establishment media focused on demonstrably uncommon events. The same proves true of everything involving race, as the Democrat-controlled media uses hoaxes and willful misrepresentations to panic minority voters into election-season frenzies, despite the damage that widespread belief in ghosts does to the country at large.

Eric Kaufman documents the effects of the *Continuing Oppression Narrative* on Black opinion in his April 7, 2021 report for the Manhattan Institute (yes, they lean right) called *The Social Construction of Racism in the United States*. By page 5, a reader discovers that 8 in 10 Black respondents think police kill more young Black men than traffic accidents kill (Blacks who strongly agree Republicans are racist were *more likely to get it wrong*; 6 in 10 white liberals got it wrong too), that Black Biden voters are twice as likely as Black Trump voters to say they personally experienced racism (The *Continuing Oppression Narrative* drives interpretations of "lived experiences"), and that reading an excerpt by Ta-Nehisi Coates causes a 15 point drop in Black respondents' belief they have control over their own lives (so imagine the effect of a lifetime of "America is racist, and only Democrats can save you" propaganda).

Historical roots, most of them imaginary -- or worse, solely the fault of the Democrat party -- are misrepresented as 1) the fault of "America" and "white people," rather than the Democrat party, 2) treated as a feature of the American Founding, rather than as a bug, and 3) spun as still present in America today, via a campaign of narrative-pushing and statistical manipulation. We will unravel these in full below.

Racism Is Not A Major Problem and Millennials Only Think It Is Because of the Nonstop Headlines About Racism Starting In 2011

Racism is not on the rise. Headlines about racism are on

the rise. Just ask LexisNexis like GSU grad student Zach Goldberg did, and see for yourself.

Headlines containing any number of terms related to race or racism skyrocketed around the time of President Barack Obama's re-election campaign, shooting up so fast that the charts resemble the world-famous CLIMATECHANGEGRAPH (TM). Words like "diversity and inclusion," "whiteness," "critical race theory," "unconscious bias," "white privilege," "systemic racism," "diversity training," "privilege," "discrimination," "social justice," "police brutality," "marginalized," "people of color," "racism," "white supremacy," "intersectionality," etc loomed large in massive numbers of headlines.

This is why so many Millennials think there's massive amounts of racism everywhere, because "news" outlets write more articles about racism than ever before. *In fact, the percentage of articles about racism is higher now than during the Civil Rights era* (as is, consequently, the number of protest marches).

Most public accusations of racism in the last 20 years consisted of narrative-pushing. In 2008, an email listserv founded by Ezra Klein called "JournoList" was exposed: per Spencer Ackerman, *Washington Independent*: "If the right forces us all to either defend [Jeremiah] Wright or tear him down, no matter what we choose, we lose the game they've put upon us. Instead, take one of them -- Fred Barnes, Karl Rove, who cares -- and call them racists." First, notice the supposedly neutral press picked a side; second, take note that framing everyone who disagrees as "racist" is just a tactic.

More recently, in 2019, *New York Times* editor Dean Baquet discussed with his staff 1) the NYT's plan to pivot from Russian Collusion to racializing everything, and 2) the framing methods to be employed. Even more bizarre, Mr. Baquet's responses, per the transcripts, seem moderate by comparison to his rabid staff.

Regardless, this spike in race headlines *only attacks things the Establishment doesn't like*--the nonstop racism claims are an Establishment tactic. Only anti-establishment politicians and causes ever get called "racist." Funny how that works. Only websites the establishment doesn't control are "crawling with Nazis." Funny how that works. (Only stories that threaten the establishment's credibility are ever "Russian disinformation" or "promoted by Russian bots." Funny how that works). Whatever its original meaning, "racist" (along with "white supremacist" or "white nationalist") now serves as an anti-dissident sledgehammer for the establishment.

There's Gold In Them Hills: How the Southern Poverty Law Center and Anti-Defamation League Get Rich By Smearing People As Racist

To give their fake narrative of skyrocketing racism some street cred, the 90% Democrat media (so say polls of journalists) pairs with fake civil rights organizations with a financial stake in you believing there's racism everywhere: The Grievance-Industrial Complex

The Southern Poverty Law Center

The Southern Poverty Law Center has \$400 million in the bank and a ritzy Montgomery, Alabama headquarters the locals call "Poverty Palace," as they drum up donations from *suckers* who think racism surrounds us. Absent actionable racism, they pretend anyone who owns a gun and is to the right of Chairman Mao will be the next Timothy McVeigh. The SPLC, mentally stuck in the early 1990s, pulls in \$51,800,000 a year and has an endowment of \$432,000,000. (The Southern Poverty Law Center, "Financial Information: The Southern Poverty Law Center's latest financial information and annual report,"

<https://www.splcenter.org/about/financial-information>)

The SPLC made its name on the much-touted United Klans of America case in 1987. Yet of the hyped \$7M judgement, the SPLC recovered only \$50,000. Other targets easily folded. Hate had become a barely-funded niche problem by the late 80s. Nevertheless, the SPLC cashed in, making a pivot from an actual civil rights organization to a partisan attack dog by the early 1990s at the latest. Investigative journalists soon noticed. By the year 2000, both *Harper's Magazine's* Ken Silverstein and the *Montgomery Advertiser* exposed the SPLC's grifting, the *Advertiser's* series won an award.

Those inside the Center noticed even earlier. In 1986, the entire SPLC legal staff quit in protest of Morris Dees' obsessive focus on fundraiser-favorite issues like the last remnants of the Klan. The resigning lawyers believed Dees should focus on homelessness, voter registration, and affirmative action. They likely went unmissed, as the SPLC does precious little litigation anyway. Stephen Bright, director of the Southern Center for Human Rights (litigates death penalty appeals cases on a shoestring budget), denounced Dees in an open letter: "You are a fraud and a con man. You spend so much, accomplish so little, and promote yourself so shamelessly."

The SPLC makes good fundraising appeals; Morris Dees is in the Direct Marketing Association's Hall of Fame for a reason. Thus in the wake of the Charlottesville incident, including the murder of Heather Heyer by a Neo-Nazi, Apple pledged \$1 million, JP Morgan Chase pledged \$500K, and Amal & George Clooney pledged \$1M.

A hefty price for shaky credibility: The libelous SPLC had to settle with Majid Nawaz for \$3.375 million after defaming him as "Islamophobic." The SPLC published a ridiculous article by a Portland State University hack named Alexander Reid Ross called "The multipolar spin: how fascists operationalize left-wing resentment," claiming non-establishment Leftists were somehow pawns of the alt-right and Russia. They soon had to retract this in *embarrassment and disgrace!* Yet the 90% Democrat media treats the SPLC as credible, and YouTube takes their advice on policing content.

Other sleazy funders include the Tides Foundation, the Open Society Foundation, and the J.M. Kaplan Fund, who want the SPLC to smear right-wingers as haters, regardless of veracity. The obliging SPLC uses the "worst possible interpretation" model to cover its targets, also promoting several outright hoaxes the same way.

For example, the 1990s "burning Black churches" hoax; church arsons barely exceeded their normal low levels. The SPLC promoted the idea white racists ran wild, burning Black churches at will. This concern spurred passage of the Church Arson Prevention Act, allocating funds to investigate the burnings. Such queries revealed most burned churches were white ones, and non-racial motives drove nearly all Black church burnings; the DOJ found just three of the 70 fires to be racially motivated. Yet the SPLC fundraised extensively from fears of 1960s *deja vu*.

The Y2K militia scare followed. The SPLC took militia *predictions* that computerized technology failure at the dawn of the year 2000 *would cause* widespread violence as proof the militias themselves plotted such violence. But nothing happened. The SPLC's trash take collapsed, yet they still insist militias not only intended such things, but remain lethal--and just one standard deviation from mainstream conservatism.

Beliefs incidental to militias (suspicion of central government and central banking and internationalism) get spun as instrumental, to smear everyone to the right of Chairman Mao, and create the impression that mainstream small government, anti-international-organizations conservatism is a

"gateway drug" to joining a militia, or that militias serve as a virtual paramilitary to political conservatives.

Inflated hate group counts propel the SPLC's fundraising power and political influence. The SPLC "inflates the hate" with its "hate map," which is fake analysis; there is no legal definition for a hate group. It's also unclear how many of these groups even exist. Of the 1,002 alleged hate groups in 2010's report, for example, 262 weren't associated with any known location. In many cases, the SPLC can't prove the "hate group" is more than three bigots with a web domain who take no concrete offline action. Their reports don't tell us how many members each group has. Double-counting predominates, counting different chapters of the same organizations in different towns (or states) as different organizations. Groups that split (as factious extremists often do) count as an "increase," which is then cited to fuel further hysteria.

Meaningless definitions of "hate group" overstate the problem, as the term lacks a legal definition. The FBI keeps no tally of its own, and does little until and unless hate manifests itself in prosecutable criminal activity. Hence the SPLC's corny list goes unquestioned by the very media whose job it is to ask questions. (Some *non-corporate* left-leaning media does ask questions, <https://www.currentaffairs.org/2019/03/the-southern-poverty-law-center-is-everything-thats-wrong-with-liberalism> is excellent)

SPLC defines "hate group" in terms of ideology, no criminal activity required. "Hate group activities can include criminal acts, marches, rallies, speeches, meetings, leafleting or publishing." Yet minus "criminal acts," this entire list is perfectly legal, and thus overcounts the problem to sustain the grift.

The Anti-Defamation League (ADL)

The ironically-named Anti-Defamation League--headed by former Obama staffer Jonathan Greenblatt--instigates moral panics for political purposes by defaming every anti-establishment person or organization as Nazi or at least Nazi-influenced. It's "Stop Hate for Profit" campaign calls for internet censorship through histrionics about the last 300 Nazis on the internet. Any meme mocking the powers that be is proclaimed -- without evidence -- the work of literal Nazis, and accompanied by calls for internet censorship. Ginning up moral panics pays well, and the ADL possesses \$144,158,994 in assets, \$81,187,088 in post liability assets in 2018. (KPMG LLP, "Anti-Defamation League and Anti-Defamation League Foundation Consolidated Financial Statements and Schedules," December 31, 2016 and 2015, <https://www.adl.org/media/10267/download>) Their most recent moral panic attacks Gab, because how dare any alternative venue for discussion even exist! They hide their Establishment goals of Nazi-style speech controls behind the veneer of "fighting Nazis" (who, by the way were LEFT WING and SOCIALISTS who did central planning, price controls, wage controls, and accused the Jews of inventing capitalism---more on that in the #2 NAZIS NARRATIVE section).

Led by Greenblatt, who also previously served in Bill Clinton's White House, the ADL serves as the DNC's attack dog, taking stands on issues with only tenuous connections to fighting anti-Semitism, like Obamacare's contraception mandate, Trump's travel ban, and advocacy for border cheaters via support for sanctuary cities and amnesty, even going so far as reverse its stance on Ukraine's Nazi-infused Azov Battalion to help Democrat Joe Biden play "tough guy" against Russia. The ADL is a Democrat Party front group: understand them and their pronouncements accordingly!

The Old Time Race-Hustlers: Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton

Al Sharpton and Jesse

Jackson are rich. How about you? Probably not, right? That's because race-hustling exists to enrich race-hustlers, not to improve others' lives. Thus, no one can name one community that is better off today for either Jesse Jackson or Al Sharpton having been there. The two race-hustlers, who both fell for the Jussie Smollett hoax, have no legislative accomplishments to their names either. Contrast this with Martin Luther King Jr., whose net worth peaked at \$250K (mostly from book sales), whose influence directly produced (or at least led to) the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, and the Fair Housing Act. MLK: Real results, braved actual danger, and assassinated for his trouble; a hero. Meanwhile, Jackson and Sharpton endured no danger, promoted numerous defamatory accusations against Republicans and conservatives, and cashed in relentlessly; two scoundrels. That, and no organic Black groundswell made Sharpton or Jackson "Black leaders" in the first place; Democrats boosted their stature to serve the Party's own purposes.

Kenneth R. Timmerman's book *Shakedown* describes the history and methods of Jackson's operations. Many wised up to him early, though little was done. Even in the liberal Jimmy Carter administration, the newly-created Department of Education amassed a huge file on Operation PUSH, as the civil servants at the Department of Education believed Operation PUSH had defrauded the government of millions in federal grants. Reagan's administration terminated the grants but didn't prosecute anyone. Deprived of the Federal grants cash cow, Jackson turned to shaking down big business, threatening them with terrible press for racism, real or imagined, present in their policies. But they need not suffer this terrible coverage depressing their stocks and earnings, if only they'd hire consultants to teach them about diversity...consultants tied to Jesse Jackson, of course. Jackson's machine hit a snag when then-FOX News host Bill O'Reilly raised the inconvenient question of how exactly Jackson funded his operation. Suddenly, companies discovered a spine and told him "no," and it all collapsed. But Jesse had a good run. His net worth is either \$9 million, \$10 million, or \$15 million, depending on who on the internet you believe.

Al Sharpton pulled similar capers with the National Action Network, in between getting famous pushing the Tawana Brawley Hoax, getting successfully sued for defamation for his role in promoting the Tawana Brawley hoax, as well as inciting the Crown Heights race riot and the Freddie's Fashion Mart race riot. Al Sharpton's net worth is between \$500,000 and \$1 million, lower than Jesse Jackson, likely the result of his tax debts to various state and federal authorities. (The combined unpaid taxes once approached \$1.5 million, much since repaid. Yet the IRS jailed many a man owing less than Mr. Sharpton, ergo, he has friends in high places. Also note his tax delinquency never stopped Reverend Al from calling for tax hikes on others).

The New Time Race-Hustlers: Shaun King, Robin DiAngelo, Ibram X. Kendi

Race-hustling is now so lucrative that a white woman named Robin DiAngelo and a white guy named Shaun King wanted in. Ibram X. Kendi, though hardly white, is another more recent addition. Recent trends in race-hustling include a rise in the importance of academics (Quackademics?) as opposed to organizations tied to particular charismatic individuals like Jackson or Sharpton. After all, why settle for a few heroes when one can, at taxpayer expense, train a veritable army of race-hustlers?

Shaun King, dubbed "Talcum X" by the amazing internet, has a long pattern of

fundraising-and-oh-gosh-where-did-the-money-go stunts to his name. For many years, he set up GoFundMe or equivalent fundraisers on behalf of people who never asked him to; what became of that money is anyone's guess. Most notably (to me anyway), he announced he'd make a reboot of the original Frederick Douglass newspaper, *The North Star*. Fourteen months later, with nothing to show for it and much of the staff laid off, King faulted his tendency to bite off more than he could chew, raising many eyebrows, even from sympathetic sectors. The *Daily Beast* blasted him, noting King had used the "I took on more than I could handle, silly me" line before.

More darkly, Shaun King promoted the case of Jazmine Barnes, a tragically murdered 7-year old Black girl, in what first appeared a noble quest to find her killers. But, before anyone knew anything concrete, he declared a white man named Robert Paul Cantrell the culprit. King's followers harassed and threatened Cantrell and his family, driving him to suicide. (The actual killers happened to be Black, at which point King & company lost interest). But, then again, with a white guy willing to lie his way into an Oprah Scholarship for Black men, should anything surprise us?

Then there's Robin DiCringelo, I mean Robin DiAngelo, the Lady of Circular Reasoning: denying you have white privilege means you have "white fragility," says she, in a bestselling 2018 book by the same name. She and High Priest Ibram X. Kendi get five-figures per speech, not a bad salary for browbeating people. Naturally, they fear Americans will realize they don't live in a racist country, as this halts their money and influence, their racket and their clout. Nor is it excessive virtue in service of a good cause, for, as we shall see, their facts are wrong!

Institutional Racism Debunked: The Police How many unarmed Black men were killed by police last year? Does anyone know? 100? 500? 1,000? 3,000? 10,000?

Eighteen. Not "thousands." Eighteen. Not "they're hunting us" (we see you, LeBron!) Eighteen. Not "an open season," not a "legalized genocide" (Ben Crump, you dummy, looking at you!) Eighteen. Not "it's been 400 years of oppression and this is just the latest example." Eighteen. That's why the "say their names" brigade can remember all their names: so few names to remember!

As the press says *ad nauseum*: Blacks comprise 13% of the population and 22% of those killed by police. But another way to say the same thing is over 75% of those killed by police *were not Black*. The situation occurring three-fourths of the time gets *less than ten percent of the police-shootings media coverage*. The 90% Democrat media advances a politically useful narrative, as even an elementary use of a search engine exposes.

Police killings aren't rampant; while American cases surpass those of many other nations, it comprises a miniscule percent of total interactions. Every year from 2010 onward features 8 to 10 million arrests, whereas police kill about 1,000 suspects total, of all races, in any given recent year as attested to by 1) the *Washington Post* police shootings database and 2) the dataset of the now-defunct killedbypolice.net, preserved here <https://robarguns.com/crime-and-police-shootings> and <https://robarguns.com/kbp2019/> (Said databases filled the gap in police self-reporting of such data.)

The total number of Black suspects killed by police, armed or not, justified or not, is about 250 to 300 in any given recent year.

The number shot isn't disproportionate, controlling for other relevant factors, as Harvard

professor Roland G. Fryer discovered. (Roland G. Fryer, "An Empirical Analysis of Racial Differences in Police Use of Force," OpenScholar@Harvard, July 2017, https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/fryer/files/empirical_analysis_tables_figures.pdf and, Roland G. Fryer, "Reconciling Results on Racial Differences in Police Shootings," *Papers and Proceedings* 2 (May 2018), https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/fryer/files/fryer_police_aer.pdf) In addition, Black officers were more likely than white officers to shoot Black suspects. (David J. Johnson, Trever Tress, Nicole Burkel, Carley Taylor, and Joseph Cesario, "Officer characteristics and racial disparities in fatal officer-involved shootings," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, July 22, 2019) After Heather MacDonald cited them, they were *woketimidated* into retracting their study. Despite later assertions that right-wingers misquoted them, they said otherwise in 2019. Look at <https://phys.org/news/2019-07-white-police-officers-minorities.html> and control+F search for "We found that the race of the officer," or take <https://www.npr.org/2019/07/26/745731839/new-study-says-white-police-officers-are-not-more-likely-to-shoot-minority-suspect> and search "The race of a police officer" and see for yourself. *Woketimidation* at work!

And even in high-profile cases, *who* does the killing? The white-cops-wantonly-kill-Black-suspects trope collapsed in recent years. Several non-white officers accompanied George Floyd's killer. Jeronimo Yanez, Philando Castile's shooter, wasn't white either, depending on how one counts Hispanics--who seem to count as white, or not, depending on what fits leftist narratives. Preset narratives ran most wild when portraying Freddie Gray's unfortunate and suspicious* death. Three of the six officers charged in Freddie Gray's death were Black (Sergeant White, Officers Goodson and Porter).

The mayor was Black, the top two officials in the Baltimore Police Department were Black, the City Council was mostly Black, the prosecutor was Black, the judge was Black, in a country with a Black Attorney General and a Black President. Yet, allegedly serious people with national platforms blamed a "white power structure" for Gray's death. (Yes, really, put "Freddie Gray white power structure" into any search engine). White supremacy, no whites required? Or perhaps, some people mentally stuck in a 1960s paradigm (that no longer explains the world) attempted to push a square-peg-explanation into the round-hole-facts of today?

Per CDC stats, police killings of Blacks declined almost 80% from the late 1960s through the 2010s. (Mike Males, "Who Are Police Killing?" Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, Aug. 26, 2014, citing Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. Compressed Mortality File 1968-2011) *Translation: We're hearing more about something that's never been rarer; a narrative promoted for political purposes.* Cops kill mostly young, male, poor and Protestant people, yet the press ignores age, sex, income, religion--even a libertarian angle over abuse of official power--and obsesses about race to further an agenda.

Those wronged by police--which in many cases** is the case--should get justice. We must correctly identify the problem--abusive government officials--and eschew racialized attempts to dismantle America itself. Some officers murdered suspects, yet evidence of racial motivation--BLM's central claim--doesn't exist. For nearly every iconic case, a white victim died the same way. Narrative pushers bury this. For example, compare George Floyd's death with Tony Timpa's, and it becomes clear we need more data and less drama, more facts and fewer narratives.

*Police excuses for Freddie Gray's death in custody seem unconvincing. He got into the van alive, and came out dead. It resembles the Ray Race/elevator situation--coincidentally also from Baltimore--there's only one way it could have happened.

**Including, but not necessarily limited to, Alton Sterling, LaQuon MacDonald, Eric Garner, Walter Scott, Freddie Gray and George Floyd. Michael Brown, not so much, as the forensic evidence, according to a report from Obama's DOJ, supports Darren Wilson.

Institutional Racism Debunked: Crime and Imprisonment

According to the victims,

Black crime rates are higher. Since 1972, the Bureau of Justice Statistics has conducted the National Crime Victimization Survey, which samples 150,000 representative randomly selected households. Black crime victims, *with no reason to falsely claim a Black perpetrator*, give answers that basically match the arrest rates. (This also means most who call cops on Black suspects are themselves Black, proving that "Karens" are *not a thing*; but merely a subset presented as the whole story.)

Adjusting for fatherlessness explains the Black-white crime difference. (Lauren J. Krivo and Ruth D. Peterson, "The Structural Context of Homicide: Accounting for Racial Differences in Progress," *American Sociological Review* 65, no. 4 (August 2000): 547-59). According to the social scientists Chris Knoester and Dana Hayne, there is a direct and statistically significant relationship between father absence and gang violence, as well as other youth violence: "If the number of fathers is low in a neighborhood, then there is an increase in acts of teen violence...a 1 percent increase in the proportion of single-parent families in a neighborhood is associated with a 3 percent increase in an adolescent's level of violence." ("The Consequences of Fatherlessness," National Center for Fathering, <http://fathers.com/statistics-and-research/the-consequences-of-fatherlessness/2/>)

Contra the "mass incarceration/New Jim Crow" narrative, *mass crime causes mass incarceration*. No one made criminals commit crimes, and for all the Left's legendary compassion, they have none for crime victims. And "The New Jim Crow?" Are you kidding me? Putting criminals in jail for victimizing others is just like Jim Crow? Somehow, this passes for serious thought on the Left.

Leftists assert anti-Black animus motivated tough-on-crime legislation, omitting "minor details" like *the actual crime rates!* Both violent and property crime exploded in the 1960s. The year 1960 saw 9,110 murders, that number climbing to 16,000 by 1970, reaching a new high of 23,040 murders by 1980. Seven years in the 1980s witnessed 20,000 or more murders. Rapes mirrored murders, from 17,190 in 1960, to 37,990 in 1970, to 82,990 in 1980. 1960 saw 107,840 robberies, jumping to 349,860 in 1970 and 565,840 in 1980. Other crimes, from assault to burglary to vehicle theft saw similar jumps. "*Law and Order*" was no dogwhistle, but a sane response to a crime wave everyone knew was there.

Skyrocketing crime 1960-1980 drove exasperated voters to elect officials who did something about it, and crime was lower ever since. Some overly broad 1990s laws warrant revision, but remember, legitimately ridiculous crime levels led to such laws to begin with. Liberal-omitted facts are still facts.

Some claim that racial animus motivated drug sentencing laws, citing the crack/cocaine sentencing disparity--yet trafficking meth (a "white" drug) earns the exact same penalty. Additionally, the Congressional Black Caucus supported these hardline anti-crime laws at the time they were made. They think differently now. They're entitled to change their minds, but they're not

entitled to claim white racial backlash produced such laws, because that's a vicious lie.

Red states enacted more criminal justice reforms than Blue states, by avoiding CBC-style racial hyperbole, and focusing instead on the justice system's big government overreach, as explained in an article The Marshall Project produced in conjunction with *Politico*. The article (Alysia Santo, "How Conservatives Learned to Love Free Lawyers for the Poor," at <https://www.themarshallproject.org/2017/09/24/how-conservative-learned-to-love-free-lawyers-for-the-poor>) elaborates:

"The criminal justice system's disproportionate impact on people of color has become more recognized in recent years, driving the Black Lives Matter movement and scholarship in books such as *The New Jim Crow*. But for the growing coalition of conservatives working to reform public defense, race isn't the central issue. *Poor white defendants are being failed by the public defenders system just as nonwhite ones are, they contend. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, which last conducted a survey on this subject in 1997, 69 percent of white inmates in state prison said they had court-appointed lawyers, while 77 percent of black and 73 percent of Hispanic inmates did. Many conservatives believe that pointing out racial disparities in this context is polarizing and counterproductive.*" (emphasis mine) For Federal prisons, the percentage of prisoners with public defenders was 65% for Blacks, 56% for Hispanics, and 56% for Whites. (both sets of numbers come from BJS, Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 1997)

Controlling for class, comparing apples (poor whites) to apples (poor Blacks) leaves us with a 8-9% difference, a far cry from BLM's narrative, or talk of a "New Jim Crow."

Our justice system has real problems, like sovereign immunity for prosecutors, making it hard to punish malicious prosecutions. These problems need real solutions, not racializing rhetoric to divide and conquer We The People ourselves on behalf of the powers-that-be.

Institutional Racism Debunked: There Is No Race-War Going On

Some good news!

There's no race war, or any epidemic of interracial conflict at the moment, and hasn't been for some time.

Only about 5% of crime is interracial and 1) this is a small subset of total crime, and 2) different perpetrator/victim races (most of which happens to be Black-on-white) doesn't *ipso facto* prove racial motivation. Boring motives like greed motivate most crimes, and most victims suffer simply for being handy targets.

Even for hate crimes, the "War-of-Whites-on-POC" story fails. Examining hate crime perpetrators by race, for 2013: Blacks are 24.3% of hate crime offenders and 13% of the population, Whites are 52.4% of offenders and non-Hispanic Whites comprise 63.7% of population, Native Americans are 1% of offenders, and 1% of the population, Samoans/Pacific Islanders are 0.1 of offenders and 0.2% of the population, and Asians are 0.7% of hate criminals and 4.8% of the population. (Brian Anerston, "New FBI Stats: Blacks More Likely to Commit Hate Crimes Than Any Other Race," Downtrend, December 11, 2014; see also <https://www.westernjournal.com/real-stats-say-black-white-crime-woke-crowd-will-hate-every-one/>)

A typical year sees about 7,000 hate crimes. The FBI's 2019 crime statistics report 7,314 criminal incidents and 8,559 "related offenses" (offenders by race roughly match 2013's data). Hard data collapses the hysteria about "White Supremacy" and "Nazis" under every rock and behind every

tree.

Exaggerators cite Bureau of Justice Statistics data claiming 200,000+ hate crimes in a year, but self-reported data includes claims never investigated by the police, and thus not definitively proven to be all real. Further, unless investigated by a third party, much of this could be those who believe the CON (Continuing Oppression Narrative) interpreting their experience in light of already believing that narrative.

Circling back to the earlier point, "Hate Crimes" are a subset of a tiny group of "Interracial Crimes," in other words, a "fraction of a fraction" of total crime. Cable news and clickbait promote vivid but rare phenomena for money and ratings. More broadly, even potential interracial violence does not impress. For example, today's Klan is pathetic, barely above defunct, and hasn't existed as a unified organization in decades. Its fragmented, factious membership totals perhaps 6,000 sorry individuals; even the SPLC and ADL say 5,000-8,000 at most, as of this (2021-22) writing.

Viral incidents from Pool Patrol Paula to Permit Patty to Barbeque Becky contain *zero non-circumstantial evidence of racial motivation*. On-camera complainers likely are whiners in general; *no proof exists they whine exclusively about Blacks*. Even assuming the worst, a few dozen videos don't prove an epidemic in a nation of 330 million.

Yet the good news must end with a warning: If race-hustlers run the media and schools for another generation or two, today's rarities will become the rule, a minimal problem resurrected to the menace status it once held.

*
*
*

Foundational Distortions: The Fake History and Flawed Theoretical Frameworks That Make the Race Narrative Go Present distortions rest upon historical distortions, combined with twisting logic to fit theories. From pretending that slavery in America was uniquely large, uniquely malign, and integral to our Founding, to claiming only certain races can be racist (itself a racist claim), to half-baked assertions that a "white power structure" persists into the present: these debunked ideas undergird numerous Democrat talking points.

White Power Structure Claims No "white" power structure exists, as shown by widespread white poverty, white opioid deaths, white suicides, and constant media and academic vilification of whites--the latter hardly a signifier of power. Indeed, *to learn who REALLY holds power, ask who you're forbidden to criticize*. White Americans have the lowest racial consciousness of any group (https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/psdt_03-25-19_race_update-01/), and as such, exhibit the *least monolithic* voting patterns; no unified "white political interest" exists to build a "racial contract" around!)

Starting with opioids, these take 27,000 lives annually, 90% of them white. (Dan Nolan and Chris Amico, "How Bad Is the Opioid Epidemic, *PBS Frontline*, February 23, 2016, <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/how-bad-is-the-opioid-epidemic/>) White poverty in rural Appalachia rivals or exceeds anything seen in urban minority neighborhoods. ("Appalachian Poverty," Fahe, <https://fahe.org/appalachian-poverty>)

White suicide rates--especially for males (privilege?)--far surpass that of Blacks, Hispanics or

Asians, their rates only exceeded by Native Americans. Suicides end far more lives annually than murders, police shootings, and terrorism combined (a typical recent year features roughly 40-50K suicides versus 15-20K murders + police killings + terrorist casualties). But suicide is not a shiny object that fuels ad buys, so it largely slips under the corporate media's radar.

White vilification has reached truly ridiculous levels (an entire site could be devoted to that alone), so let's just cover four regular canards: 1) "only white people can be racist," 2) "mass shooters are all angry white men," 3) "any electoral rejection of Democrats is angry white men at work," and 4) "white people invented race and/or racism." Such vilification injures the United States at large, though it does boost Democrat turnout, and move the public to back policies once seen as too radical.

1) Anyone Can Be Racist Racism is a belief, not a power structure. The first clue? It's rac-ISM, the word ends in "ism," as beliefs do. Power structures have names ending in -archy or -ocracy: oligarchy, monarchy, anarchy, democracy, aristocracy, theocracy. If racism is about a power structure, it would be called "racearchy" or "raceocracy." The very word itself proves this claim is fraudulent. It's also historically false: if it takes institutional power to be racist, then National *Socialists* haven't been racist since the 1940s and the Ku Klux Klan hasn't been racist since the 1960s.

Modern white supremacists have no influence; Black and Brown supremacists do. Coca-Cola didn't tell employees to "be less Black," and Democrat politicians beg Louis Farrakhan and La Raza ("the RACE") for their support. The Nation of Islam is an indisputably Black supremacist organization. La Raza (since renamed UnidosUS because people noticed they were called "the RACE"), insists they're entitled to an "Aztlán," a reconstituted neo-Aztec Empire spanning the American Southwest. Contrast with David Duke or Richard Spencer: endorsements not sought, and disowned if given.

2) Mass Shootings and Race: Media Portrayals Versus Actual Data Media narratives aside, whites remain underrepresented among mass shooters. According to the Crime Prevention Research Center's data for 1998-January 2021:

Whites (excluding Middle Easterners) were 64.4% of the population (all figures 2010 census) and 57% of mass shooters. ---Blacks were 12.8% of the population and 15.2% of mass shooters. ---Asians were 4.8% of the population and 7.6% of mass shooters. ---Middle Easterners were 0.4% of the population and 7.6% of mass shooters. ---Hispanics were 16.6% of the population and 8.9% of mass shooters. ---American Indians were 1.0% of the population and 3.8% of mass shooters. (Statista.com arrives at similar conclusions, <https://www.statista.com/476456/mass-shootings-in-the-us-by-shooter-s-race/>)

Race-hustlers also hype niche, fringe, and generally irrelevant issues, such as trivial "militias," with, at most, 20K to 60K membership (Chip Berlet & Matthew Lyons, *Right-Wing Populism in America: Too Close for Comfort*, 2000). Hustlers hype white supremacist terror, when lightning strikes kill more annually than all flavors of terrorism combined, much less the skinheads or Klan specifically. Tiny actual attack counts and death tolls reveal the SPLC and ADL use fear to get both donations and control of internet speech. Are the last 400 neo-Nazis talking in an obscure chatroom? Quick! Censor everything the Establishment calls "Nazis" -- aka "everything opposing the Establishment!" "Nazis" is the pretext. Control of you is the goal.

3) The "Angry White Male" Trope Was Invented in 1994 by Democrats to Downplay their Epic Midterm Thrashing

Bill Clinton's administration pioneered a wound-collecting trend, the mass appointment of women and minorities to insulate his radical agenda from criticism. Most recall Bill as a moderate, but this resulted from the 1994 shellacking; the 1992-1994 timespan before Dick Morris and "triangulation" saw radicalism galore. Republicans won the House for the first time in 40 years, and it strains credulity to think that "moderate" governance causes such backlashes. *Democrats dismissed 1994 by inventing the "angry white male" trope*, a supposed outbreak of white-hot white rage over affirmative action.

However, data shows a national trend of falling support for preferences among all groups 1986-1994. (Patrick Hynes. *In Defense of the Religious Right: Why Conservative Christians Are the Lifeblood of the Republican Party and Why That Terrifies the Democrats*. Nashville: Nelson Current, 2006, p. 89-90) Democrat support among white women also dropped. (Ruy Teixeira, "Who Deserted the Democrats in 1994?" *American Prospect*, September 1995). But "angry white males" was too good a smear to discard on account of facts, so Democrats still use it.

4) A True History of Race and Racism

Pronouncements of recent soft science graduates aside, "race" wasn't invented by Europeans, but by Arab slave traders, especially of the Cairo slave markets, which reached Europe via Muslim-occupied Spain and Portugal. Downstream of this, the later Spanish Empire devised a taxonomy of 32 grades of racial admixture, such as negrito, mulatto, octoroon, etc.

This Arab Muslim slave trade arose not from Islam *per se*; but from Caliph Omar's ban on enslaving Arabs and fellow Muslims, and his orders freeing existing Arab slaves. Thus, only taking slaves from outside *Dar al-Islam* was *halal*, thus began three slave trades, one to Central Asia, the Slavic Slave Trade from Eastern Europe, and the Trans-Saharan Slave Trade. The first brought Turkic people called *Mamluks*, the Slavic one ranged from Bulgaria to Russia, all called *Saqaliba*, and the Africans all became *Zanj*; skin color, not tribal identity, delineated the categories, and this, is the invention of "race." The racially defined slaves served different roles, *Mamluks* as soldiers, *Saqaliba* as domestics or craftsman, and *Zanjas* field slaves. *Saqaliba* women were often used in harems, as Arabs wanted lighter offspring, disdaining darker skin even before European colonists showed up and supposedly "taught them."

Likewise, the leading public intellectuals, such as Al-Farabi (872-950 AD), Avicenna (980-1037 AD), or Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406 AD) said about Black Africans practically everything the soft-headed soft-science grads accuse Europeans of concocting: biological inferiority, lower intelligence, fit only for forced manual labor and ideal for enslavement to perform the same. They had similar justifications for enslaving Europeans, the "Saqaliba."

None of this aims to disparage Arabs or Muslims, only to undercut the nonstop hitpieces on Europeans posing as "scholarship." And in fairness, do note that the Arabian Peninsula and Middle East form an intersection of three continents, making it unsurprising Arabs would invent racial categories; they were the first conquerors with access to multiple races to enslave. Contrastingly, most prospects within the grasp of Greece or Rome would have looked like their captors.

Not to mention, Europeans of the 16th through 19th Century battled each other for dynastic,

and increasingly, religious aims, amid the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. Disputes over theology, science, dynastic squabbles, and whether to replace monarchy altogether all loomed larger than racial questions. The era's thinking spawned freedom of religion and conscience, plus the realization that both kings and majorities must be restrained by limiting government power.

Europeans didn't collude to oppress non-whites; they were too busy fighting each other. Such colonialist oppression and forced labor, while certainly real, served as the means to leapfrog European rivals, not an end of coordinated suppression of worldwide POC in itself.

As little consolation as this fact offers, it highlights the folly of today's ADOS ethnonationalist thinking, which promotes interpreting history as a tale of a coordinated "Team Europe" against "Team Color." Such ADOS ethnonationalist thinking, projected onto the history of the rest of the world, creates a *fake history* that can't explain why Europeans or Africans or Native Americans all fought amongst themselves as much as against each other, and would totally lack any plausibility before 1870 and the scramble for Africa.

Historical Distortions: The True History of Slavery, the American Revolution, and the American Constitutional System, all of Which Exonerates America

A True History of Slavery: America Did Not Invent Slavery, Nor Is it Uniquely Guilty

Slavery is universal. Abolition is Western. Uniquely Western.

Slavery predates recorded history, and existed on every inhabited continent. Yet the Left singles out Western Culture, Europeans, Christendom, Capitalism, and America, as though they were the only--or the worst--culprits, when the only thing unique about them is abolitionism. The West abolished slavery under its own power. The rest of the world was forced--at gunpoint, by European colonial powers--to abolish slavery.

Africans captured and sold other Africans into slavery. Absent this complicity, no slave trade occurs; until the invention of quinine in the 1850s, Europeans had no practical answer to malaria. (The "Scramble for Africa" came post-1850s for a reason). The notion of Europeans kidnapping Africans from the jungle themselves comes not from history, but from a 1970s TV show called "Roots."

The Muslim Arabs took as many or more slaves from Africa than Europeans did (sources range from 10-17 million), and for longer. The Arab slave trade from Africa lasted until European colonial powers compelled it to cease in the late 1800s.

"Only" 4.5% of the Transatlantic Slave Trade's 15-20 million victims went to North America. The rest went to Central and South America, its slavery harsher and more extensive than that in North America. Masters there worked slaves to death, constantly importing replacements, hence it comprising 96% of the Transatlantic Slave Trade. The Left omits this. Many Latin American countries enacted Leftist policies in the present, so the Left generally avoids critiquing their past.

Slave-traders transported about 400,000 slaves to North America. (Philip D. Curtin, *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census* (Madison, Wis., 1969), 74-75, 88-89). More slaves were brought to Haiti (864,000), Jamaica (748,000), or Cuba (702,000) than were sent to America. Barbados got 387,000, scarcely less than then all North America, and the French holding of Martinique received 366,000, which is comparable. (Philip D. Curtin, *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census* (Madison, Wis., 1969), 88-89) A whopping 3.6 million slaves landed in Brazil. (Philip D. Curtin, *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A*

Census (Madison, Wis., 1969), 47-49) The zealous America-haters omit this; Latin America's larger slave populations *debunk* the lie that the USA's wealth came from slavery. If slavery causes national wealth, the greater poverty of more slave-intensive nations can't be explained away.

Slavery existed in the New World before 1619, a date selected solely to defame America. Spain started slavery in the New World in 1501, facing a slave revolt in Mexico in 1537. Yet *The New York Times*' did not call their fake history endeavor "The 1501 Project" or "The 1537 Project."

Western Culture abolished slavery. *The West alone had abolitionist movements.* Kings elsewhere sporadically banned slavery, only to see it later return. Slavery only stayed dead because of Western mass movements demanding it. While slavery's unpopularity skyrocketed in the West, the rest of the world hardly shared such sentiments: slavery's demise caused celebrations in Brazil, but when the slave trade was banned in the Ottoman Empire, riots erupted. African rulers fought to keep slavery. King Gezo of Dahomey (modern geographical Benin) informed English visitors, "The slave trade is the ruling principle of my people. It is the source and glory of their wealth...[T]he mother lulls the child to sleep with notes of triumph over an enemy reduced to slavery."

There you have it. Europeans had to force Africans to stop enslaving Africans. Blacks sold Blacks into slavery, and in the Civil War, whites fought other whites to end slavery. The Congresses that passed the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments were 100% composed of white males. The narrative-pushing identity-politics-loving race-hustlers can't explain facts like that away. Their race-centric vision of the world is fundamentally wrong, *and because it is a wrong view of the world, it has failed to fix any problems.* Sixty years of identity politics, and the ghetto is still the ghetto: the schools are still no good, the streets are still not safe, the jobs are still leaving, and there's still no more hope. *The irrefutable fact is that if racialized bloc voting for Democrats to dismantle the American system and capitalism was the answer, every problem facing Black Americans would have been solved a long time ago. That's just the truth and there's no way around it.*

In closing: America didn't invent slavery, everyone did slavery, and white people abolished slavery. Liberals put the greatest blame on the least guilty in order to push a political agenda, using fake history to shape present politics. Liberals are not truly disturbed by past injustices; they are merely interested in the present political uses of constantly talking about past injustices. If Liberals cared about Black Americans, they would care whether their policies were helping, and adjust their ideas accordingly.

A True History of the American Revolution: The American Revolution Was a Fight For Freedom, and the 1619 Race-Hustlers Don't Have a Leg to Stand On

The American Revolution arose from a desire for freedom. The 1619 Project is fake history, whose writers knowingly published falsehoods for political purposes. They aim to drum up support for radically altering this country, and sliming the present system is the first step.

The race-hustlers behind The 1619 Project spin all opposition as the fearful reactions of whites against the inclusion of Black and Brown people in America's story. But 1619's critics object, not to *representation*, but to BRAZEN DISTORTIONS, motivated by present politics; they object to the *false emphasis on slavery and racism as central when it's one detail among many.*

For example, The 1619 Project claims, *without evidence*, that the American Revolution arose from slaveholders trying to preserve slavery. The 1619 Project claims, *without evidence*, that the

British Crown intended to end slavery in the colonies, and that the 1772 Somerset decision caused great alarm in the Colonies (it barely made a handful of papers). The 1619 Project claims, *without evidence*, that Governor Dunmore's proclamation proves the war aimed to defend a slavocracy, when Dunmore issued his proclamation *after the war started*. Neither the writers of The 1619 Project, nor any other race-hustlers like them, can cite any person or any document of the era to support their "slavery motivated the American Revolution" thesis. And, if defense of slavocracy inspired the Revolution: 1) Why did resistance to the Crown start in Massachusetts, rather than the South? 2) Why didn't the more slave-intensive Caribbean colonies join in the Revolution?

Long story short, the *Declaration of Independence*, Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*, and Jefferson's *Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms* tell the real motivations of the Revolutionaries. And The 1619 Fake History Project is a left-wing smear campaign against our Founding, a cover story for the extremist political transformation of the United States, to dismiss its lofty principles and their defenders as "racist." Just remember: The Founding Fathers won our freedom, and anyone smearing the Founders is smearing the idea of you having freedom. (Proof? Look at what they're doing to free speech already!)

A True History of the American Founding: Liberals Malign the Founding Because It Blocks Them From Controlling Your Life

America was founded on freedom. This is why Democrats and liberals malign it: they want to run other peoples' lives, and the American system that the Founding Fathers installed impedes their vision of playing God.

The Constitution did not ordain slavery. The Constitution omitted the word *slavery* because its signers imagined one day it would no longer exist. Per James Madison, he "thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in men." Frederick Douglass agreed, saying, "If the Constitution were intended to be, by its framers and adopters, a slave-holding instrument," how come "neither slavery, slaveholding nor slave...be anywhere found in it?"

Douglass continued: "Abolish slavery tomorrow and not a sentence or syllable of the Constitution needs to be altered." Slavery, merely "scaffolding to the magnificent structure, to be removed as soon as the building was completed." (Frederick Douglass, "Address for the Promotion of Colored Enlistments," July 6, 1863). Lincoln for his part defied anyone to name any person from the Founding era who denied Blacks were included in the Declaration of Independence, as well as tallying in his Cooper Union speech those Founders who'd had an occasion to vote on slavery. He found 23 had such occasion, and 21 voted against it; then he computes for those with no record, Franklin, Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, etc, finding all but one antislavery. He wasn't alone. Most abolitionists viewed their quest not as overturning the Founding, but its completion.

Nor does any specific clause in the Constitution derive from any supposed desire to protect slavery.

The Electoral College was created, not to defend slavery, but in order that the states might pick the President. Alexander Hamilton explains as much in the Federalist Papers, No. 68, "The Mode of Electing the President." The words "slavery," "enslavement," and "servitude" are not present in the text, much less cited as a rationale. Leftist hacks circulated this lie, and count on you to not check their story by reading the Federalist Papers! The 3/5 Compromise dealt with Congressional representation, not the worth of African-Americans. The Slave States wished to count Blacks as 5/5 of

a person, and thus gain greater representation. The 3/5 Compromise *limited* their power, but race-hustlers leave that out

The 2nd Amendment has nothing to do with slavery. The same "keep and bear arms" language appears in the state constitutions of Northern states. Not to mention Democrats used gun control to *uphold slavery and Jim Crow*. Not to mention that the author who concocted the "2nd amendment is about slave patrols" story, one Carl T. Bogus, admits on *page one* of his magnum opus ("The Hidden History of the Second Amendment") that he has no direct evidence to support his idea. Not to mention, one of the reasons SCOTUS ruled against Dred Scott was that (*and they explicitly say this in the ruling!*) were they to concede he was a citizen, that, by implication allowed Blacks to own guns.

America's economic system didn't arise from slavery. Capitalism contradicts slavery, *because paying people for their work is the opposite of not paying them for their work*. Everyone at the time agreed: capitalist theorists like Adam Smith, Richard Cobden, and Frederic Bastiat opposed slavery, while proslavery theorists like George Fitzhugh opposed capitalism. Only modern (and very confused) Marxists pretend slavery and capitalism are connected. America's wealth owes nothing to slavery. The free North was richer than the slave South. If the free North's wealth depended on the slave South, then the Northern economy would have collapsed when the South seceded. This, of course, did not happen. The American economy grew faster *after* abolition, incongruent with stories of slave-built greatness. Another obstacle: Central and South America imported far more slaves (the future United States got "only" 4% of the Transatlantic Slave Trade), yet are *far poorer* than today's USA. No surprise. Free market capitalism produces wealth for entire societies, slavery only enriches the slaveholders. Today's South remains poorer than the North; in Brazil too, the slavery-intensive northern region is poorest today.

Liberals citing slavery to smear our Founding fall flat. Slavery ended 150 years ago. What's their excuse to discard the rest of the Constitution or to overturn everything else about the Founding? They're being disingenuous: Slavery isn't the real reason. Other countries had more slaves, and more racism, but draw less criticism, because adopting Leftism saves them from Leftist criticism.

America wasn't founded on slavery, as shown its abolition in every state north of Maryland by 1804, by the 1808 abolition of the slave trade, by the outlawing of slavery in the Northwest Territories in 1787, by legislation in the 1780s banning Americans from employment or investment in the slave trade, and by Congress barring American ships from slave trade involvement in 1794.

If America's founders built a nation to further a slavocracy, how did all these limitations on slavery arise *during their lifetimes*? The Founding Fathers inherited slavery, did nothing to expand it, and did at least some things to constrain it.

It's time to tell *the real story about slavery in America*. *The British installed slavery, the Founders curtailed it, the Democrats expanded it (and started the Civil War over it), and the Republicans ended it.*

*
*
*

[The Democrats Own Slavery: A Refutation of The Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory](#)

Prelude: Everything Pre-1960, and How Dan T. Carter, Earl and Merle Black, and Kevin M(ountebank) Kruse invented the Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory For a more thorough refutation of "the parties switched," see my other work, *From Martin van Buren to Joe Biden: Debunking the Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory* (2021).

The Democrats ran slavery and Jim Crow and segregation and are responsible for every lynching and race riot in this country's history, a legacy they blame on either 1) "America," 2) "white people" (party affiliation conveniently unspecified), or 3) the Republican Party. This means white non-Democrats don't need to feel any guilt. It also means the Democrats' free stuff is morally tainted.

Democrats can't claim they just "inherited" slavery, because the Founders curtailed slavery. The cotton gin generated profits, but profits can't stop abolition; blocking abolition involved political muscle, in the form of the Democratic Party, founded by Martin Van Buren and Thomas Ritchie to do precisely that.

Whigs also owned slaves, but Democrats uniquely advanced the "positive good" theory, arguing that slavery was good for the slave. This logically implied expanding slavery, and with it support for both the Mexican-American War (which Whigs opposed), and the militancy that set off the Civil War. It's hard to picture Whigs fighting a civil war to defend slavery, and harder to see them creating the KKK or enacting Jim Crow.

All Democrats were complicit. Democrats split on secession, not on slavery itself. Northern Democrats, or "Copperheads," undermined Lincoln's efforts to win the war. Post-war, Democrats opposed the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments--and these were *Northern* Democrats. Southern states weren't yet readmitted to the Union. Northern Democrats sent money and guns South to help the Klan, and later upheld FDR's vetoes of four different anti-lynching bills, while drawing votes from unions that refused Blacks as members. Northern Democrats were complicit, the entire party is guilty, not merely its Southern delegations.

The facts prove so obvious that practically no one disputes that the Democrats bear the guilt 1828-1964. In recent years we've seen attempts to claim the parties "switched," that racists became Republicans (or that the GOP acquired a new ideology, that modern conservatism is white supremacy with a facelift). Narrative-pushers declare past Democrats were "conservatives," with past Republicans as the "liberals" of their day, so this goes beyond rescuing post-1964 Democrats; it's a brazen rewriting of pre-1964 America to cast old heroes as the modern Left's predecessors.

This is not history, this is The Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory, aka, "The Lie That Turned Millennials Liberal."

No speech, press release, or book by any civil rights leader in the 1960s claims the parties had "switched," or that they were about to. Black radicals likewise made no such claims. No history textbook nor any historian before the 1990s pretends this is "history." Many claim a "Southern strategy," but this differs from the MSPCT; for claims that specific candidates made dogwhistle appeals diverges from the claim that the parties themselves switched philosophies and platforms on civil rights, causing voters to realign--a notion dismissed until the mid-1970s.

The earliest work (see *From Martin Van Buren to Joe Biden: Debunking the Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory*, "The "Big Switch" Narrative" for more) I could find that claims Goldwater or the 1964 election transformed US politics, or that the political parties had "switched" platforms on civil rights was Jack Bass & Walter DeVries, *The Transformation of Southern Politics* (1976, p.10, 378-389 esp.)

From there, refinements were added by Alexander Lamis, *The Two Party South* (1984--invents the oft-repeated Atwater Smear by *narrating his quotes*). This in place, all that remained was for a little more scientific veneer to be applied by Edward G. Carmines & James A. Stimson (*Issue Evolution: Race and the Transformation of Southern Politics*, 1989) in which they claim a new kind of conservatism ("racial conservatism") emerged as a result of a supposed 1964 realignment. From there, most of the above--and much similar literature--were referenced in Thomas Edsall & Mary Edsall, *Chain Reaction* (1992), whereby the MSPCT made the leap from obscure political science to journalism, and *Chain Reaction* in turn featured in the footnotes of Dan Carter's *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich* (1996, p.63, 79-80).

The Edsalls in *Chain Reaction* assert Republicans invented small government ideology using "coded" racial messages about "big government" and "special interests" to sway average whites to vote against their economic interests, destroying the 1964 civil rights consensus. Essentially, the Edsalls' *Chain Reaction* popularized the "you're a racist for wanting lower taxes" meme, subsequently deployed against Gingrich's Republicans, then the Tea Party.

Dan T. Carter blended it all together and called it history. His 1996 work *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution* forcefully advances the party realignment story, asserting the GOP has an ideology adopted from Wallace that it dares not credit him for, that this "politics of rage" driving anti-DC establishment appeals consists of coded racial appeals from "welfare queens," "colorblindness," and "taking the country back."

Earl and Merle Black added to it with *The Rise of Southern Republicans* (2002), a work applying racial explanations to lower-level Southern GOP takeovers, as Joseph A. Aistrup attempted to explain away the 1990s (not 1960s) GOP takeover of the South with his work *The Southern Strategy Revisited: Top-Down Advancement in the South* (1996). In her book *The Dixiecrat Revolt and the End of the Solid South, 1932-1968* (2001), Kari Frederickson spun Strom Thurmond as a "bridge candidate" to lead Southerners to Republican Dwight Eisenhower, attempting to avoid the "Eisenhower won Southern states before Goldwater" problem faced by the Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory. Finally, Kevin M(ountebank) Kruse wrote *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism* (2007). As the name would imply, Kruse pretends white supremacy gave itself a facelift, acquired some coded language, became modern conservatism, with the suburbs as both its byproduct and natural habitat.

They all draw on earlier, less complete mythmaking from Democrat political operatives--both the ones in office and the ones in the press--claiming Republican candidates, particularly Presidential ones, made coded appeals to segregationists. Joseph Alsop, an op-ed writer posing as a columnist, invented the phrase "Southern Strategy," and accused GOP candidates of using it. Alsop had no documents to prove it, cited no sources, and did the "anonymous sources say" trick to pretend he was privy to actual information. Democrats ran with it, but a complete, fleshed-out conspiracy theory of parties trading racial stances would have to wait, finally triumphing in the 1990s, as the Soviet collapse discredited the "free markets bad" narrative, impelling adoption of a new workable myth, one they've employed to this day.

We can test theories--and conspiracy theories--with the right questions. Had the parties "switched," we'd see four things: 1) personnel switching parties, 2) Southern voters becoming Republicans in the 60s and 70s, 3) party platforms reversing, and 4) patterns of partisan behavior switching. None of that occurred.

1) The Two-Guys-In-Congress Realignment

Over 100 Segregationist Democrats voted against the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Only TWO changed parties: Strom Thurmond and Albert Watson. The state level sees a few dozen more. Yet adding up the state house representatives, state Senators, Governors, Attorneys General, and Secretaries of the 11 former Confederate States, we arrive at 1,815 officials. A few dozen out of over 1,800 is no "realignment."

Desperate for more than two examples, the Left invokes Jesse Helms, John Tower, and Trent Lott, and a few others; yet none of these men ever held Congressional seats as Democrats, so they're not "switchers." *Counting them anyway*, adding them to Thurmond and Watson, we get all of five examples, hardly a stampede. Some muddy the waters by citing folks like Bo Calloway (Georgia), Rubel Phillips (Mississippi), or James D. Martin (Alabama), as though "segregation-lite" running against also-segregationist Democrats "proved" a "party switch"--not to mention the South turned Republican gubernatorially and congressionally in the 1990s, not by the work of these footnotes.

Nearly all segregationists stayed Democrat, unrepudiated, never expelled, seldom seriously challenged in primaries. They didn't switch, and the party didn't want them to; they needed their votes. Southern Democrats comprised roughly 33-40% of Congressional Democrats for every session between 1950 and 1990.

2) The Segregationist Democrats weren't "conservatives."

To circumvent the above facts, narrative-pushers frame Southern Democrats as "conservatives," in spite of their votes for the New Deal, Woodrow Wilson's wish list, even much of the Great Society, for these, just like Jim Crow, are forms of big government.

"But conservative coalition!" But it's a HOAX! Legendary political scientist V.O. Key Jr. --in Chapters 16 and 17 of his 1949 classic *Southern Politics*--obliterated this myth, pointing out that this "Southern Democrat + GOP vs. Northern Democrat" pattern is only seen in TEN PERCENT OF ALL ROLL CALL VOTES. It is *profoundly dishonest* to spin what happened 10% of the time as the general rule or a "coalition." Inasmuch as it existed, it confined itself to labor union questions; on other matters of big government spending and planning and regulation, Southern Democrats joined Northern Democrats. Columbia historian Ira Katznelson replicated V.O. Key Jr's findings in 1993. (Ira Katznelson; Kim Geiger; Daniel Kryder. "Limiting Liberalism: The Southern Veto in Congress, 1933-1950," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 108, No. 2 (Summer, 1993), pp. 283-306.) And if state-level Southern Democrats were "conservative" in any meaningful sense, what great "conservative" legislation did they pass that would do the Tea Party proud?

To rescue the narrative, Democrats conflate the Great Society with Civil Rights and opposition to one with opposition to the other, to forward the notion big government and civil rights go together, and that small government is racism's partner. In reality, there's no connection between welfare and civil rights, and nobody 1860-1965 claimed otherwise, which is why Republicans voted for civil rights and against Great Society programs, and why segregationist Democrats voted for Great Society programs and against civil rights.

"In fact, all of Lyndon Johnson's major War on Poverty programs were enacted with a majority of Southerners voting for final passage. The 1964 Economic Opportunity Act --the omnibus bill establishing Job Corps, a federal work-study program, adult education funding, and various other

things — was sponsored in the House by staunch anti-labor segregationist Phil Landrum of Georgia, and passed with 60% of Southern Democrats voting in favor, even as 87% of Republicans opposed it. Likewise, Medicare passed in 1965 with 61% of Southern Democrats in favor and 93% of Republicans opposed. The 1964 Food Stamp Act, after an intra-party log-rolling deal involving farm subsidies, went through on virtually a straight party-line vote..."(Tea Party Yankees", by Seth Ackerman, in *Jacobin*, October 14, 2013).

And the anti-civil rights filibusters were led by...Senator Richard Russell. The same guy who got the School Lunch Act on the books. MSPCT pushers don't give up though, calling villains "conservative" and heroes "liberal," no matter how they voted. We crush this next.

3) Southern Democrats Labelled "Conservative" Using Dubious Definitions MSPCT narratives tell tall tales of "conservative white southerners" and their journey from "conservative Southern Democrats" (an odd title for the nation's strongest New Deal backers--Numan V. Bartley, *The New South: 1945-1980*, 1995, p.23-24--or their New Deal-backing Congressmen) to the Republican Party.

Cornered leftists call segregationists "social conservatives," citing support for faith, family, or anti-communism, while omitting most Americans of all persuasions liked religion and the traditional family and hated communism. Racists were pro-traditional family? So were their opponents! Before the 60s, it wasn't political to think kids needed two married parents.

Next we see the "racial conservative" label, a smear term designed to circumvent segregationists' liberal voting records by casting segregation (not "conservative" in the Northeast, Midwest, or Plains) as "conservative" in the most Democrat area of America.

Yet in reality, *the word "conservative" cannot be rightly used without reference to what is being conserved*. Segregationists "conserved" a recent system they built in the 1890s, of government social engineering. Republicans defend a system from the 1790s, in turn drawing on John Locke in the 1680s, and arguably the 1640s English Leveller movement, of limiting government to protecting person and property.

Thus, Left-wing academics go *criteria shopping*, inventing definitions to call segregationists "conservative," playing wordgames to make their claim become "true." A real historian would understand a group's goals on its own terms first, and *then*, only once this is understood, figure where on the political spectrum to put it. It's all a smear, whereby Leftist historians describe Segregationists using the words conservatives use to describe themselves, *an academic "dirty trick."* If conservatives called themselves "Porcupines," Dan Carter and Kevin Kruse would call segregationists "Porcupine Southern Democrats." If conservatives called themselves "Platypuses," Carter and Kruse would call segregationists "Platypus Southern Democrats." You see how this game works? Whatever conservatives call themselves, the fake historians will slap that label on history's villains, even though conservatives don't believe what segregationists did, so that the Academic Bodyguard of the Democratic Party can pretend modern Republicans continue history's horrors.

4) The "Wings Narrative" Interlocks with the Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory, And Is Also FALSE! Tall tales of "conservative" Southern Democrats and "liberal" Republicans depend on the related "Wings Narrative," the notion that each party had conservative and

liberal/progressive wings of equal size and ideological intensity. This misleads; birds have two "wings" of equal size; the parties didn't. "Faction" better describes the matter, and "Progressive" Republicans were nothing like half the party--it figures a free market party would lack many progressives. As DW-NOMINATE scores show, "progressive" Republicans voted more conservatively than "conservative" Democrats; "progressive" Republicans were progressive *for their party*, and "conservative" Democrats were conservative *for their party*, not in an absolute sense. The "conservative" Southern Democrats seemed that way aside NYC and San Francisco Democrats, but leaned left of the national average and far left of typical Republicans. *This is why so few switched parties!*

The Wings Narrative projects present traits onto the past, without proof, or even inquiry. Citing present New England, they assert old Northeast Republicans were liberal. Today's conservative South "proves" Southern Democrats were too. Why New England Republicans of old opposed the New Deal while segregationists voted in favor, they don't even ask.

Award-winning political scientists Keith Poole and Howard Rosenthal developed a vote-scoring database, called DW-NOMINATE (Dynamically Weighted NOMINA[L] Three-step Estimation). Available at voteview.com, it charts every legislator ever to cast 25 or more roll call votes on a 2-axis system, with the x-axis accompanied with a numerical score available in tabular form. The x-axis, comprising most of the score, is the "economic/redistributive" scale, measuring enthusiasm for free markets versus more government. What the y-axis measures varies by era: slavery in the 1860s, farm radicalism and bimetallism in the 1890s, civil rights in the 1960s, culture war issues in the 1980s/1990s, etc. On another important note, Keith Poole wrote a 2007 *Public Choice* article, "Changing Minds? Not in Congress?", showing that "bridge legislators" can be validly used, because most long term Members of Congress do not wildly change their views during their careers, a discovery with implications.

In short, the voting records kill the story of Edward Carmines and James Stimson, who in *Issue Evolution* (1989) assert that the *same* legislators reversed their party's stances on civil rights voting, with the charts on pages 63, 64 and 150 purporting to prove it. *Yet they don't tell us, not even in the footnotes, which bills they evaluated to create the scores.* The Civil Rights Act, Voting Rights Act, Fair Housing Act, and Equal Employment Opportunity Act had proportionally more Republican support, so either 1) there's a half dozen civil rights bills so secret that historians don't know about them, 2) they're counting as "civil rights bills" things most people wouldn't think of as "civil rights bills," or 3) they just plain made it up. *Issue Evolution*, far from the profound work some have claimed, is perhaps the best case of obfuscation anyone has ever produced, its conclusions sweeping, its supporting documentation minimal, its data computation cryptic, compounded by their *Eisenhower Denial*, to enable centering Goldwater and 1964. Yet steady, constant lawmaker voting records close any path for a "big switch," absent wholesale replacement of the legislators, which didn't happen in the relevant time period (1964-1972).

The left of center votes Segregationists cast matched their Southern Democrat voters: the voters too, never switched.

5) None of the Voting Data Fits the Narrative

If the parties "switched," we'd see the GOP win the backlashing South at all levels of government in the 60s and 70s, Black voters simultaneously becoming Democrats. But the timeline alone obliterates the narrative. Republicans won Southern states presidentially since the 1950s, and swept other Southern offices in the 90s, and

the Black vote became Democrat in the 30s.

State congressional delegations in nearly every Southern state stayed Democrat until 1994, ditto for state legislatures. Some states had a GOP governor or two before 1990, but inconsistently. And in the Deep South the first GOP governors typically arrived late: Alabama's first was in 1986, Mississippi's in 1991, and Georgia waited until 2002.

Democrats magnify Presidential results to negate the other data, yet they fail here too.

The 1964 Election was an anomaly. No other American election featured each party losing its strongest areas and winning its opponents' strongest areas (this even holds true for Democrat/Whig and Federalist/Jeffersonian Democratic-Republican contests.) So is it honest for MSPCT pushers to base their case on 1) just one data point and 2) on the most anomalous data point in American history? The only switch in 1964 was the Democrat pivot to a strategy of race-hustling and Nazi-accusing; every GOP candidate since 1964 faced such claims. It's a playbook.

No race changed which party they voted for in the Civil Rights Era. Blacks were Democrats since the 1930s. Latinos--insofar as anyone can disentangle them in the government statistics of those days--also were Democrats before 1960. Asians became Democrats in the 1990s. Southern Whites were as likely as not to vote for Republican Presidents before the Civil Rights Act, and did not embrace Republicans for other offices until the 1990s.

Even *Southern* Blacks voted Democrat pre-1964, and had ever since *Smith v. Allwright* (1944) invalidated the all-white primary. While rural Deep South counties impeded Black voter registration (leading to the 1965 Voting Rights Act), the number of Southern Black voters pre-1965 was not zero. Blacks entered the electorate, more easily in the Outer South and cities, and did, albeit in underrepresented fashion, vote, and did so as Democrats, electing such Democrats as Atlanta Mayor William B. Hartsfield (1937-1941, 1942-1962), Congresswoman Helen Douglas Murray (1946-1947), Memphis Mayor Edmund Orgill (1956-1959), Nashville Mayor Ben West (1951-1963), and Winston-Salem Mayor Marshall Kurfees (1949-1960). (Numan V. Bartley, *The New South: 1945-1980*, 1995, p.173)

Facts like these nuke the MSPCT and related canards of Southern Strategies and Goldwater Backlashes. Already Democrats: 1964 changed NOTHING! Southern Blacks even backed the very same Democrats who did them wrong, as with George Wallace's 1962 gubernatorial bid, or the ballots for John Stennis (MS) and Fritz Hollings (SC), among others. (Terrel L. Rhodes, *Republicans In The South*, 2000, p. 112) Narrative collapse!!! (Earl and Merle Black's *The Rise of Southern Republicans* never mentions this fact, neither does Dan Carter in either his biography of George Wallace, or his shorter book, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich*--most deceptive!)

Eisenhower won Southern states in 1952 and 1956, as did Nixon in 1960. Republicans didn't need the Supposed Southern Strategy of appeals to segregationists; they were *already winning Southern states without it*. Plus, realignments don't occur ten years before the events (1952/1956/1960 GOP Presidential gains in Southern states) in question, or thirty years after (GOP takes over majority of Southern House reps, Senators, Governors, state legislatures). Real "realignments" occur right after their alleged "cause." Thus, the only "realignment" here is Democrats "realigning" their narratives to fit recent political necessity. No pre-1957 civil rights bill enjoyed majority support from Democrats; the post-1957 pivot towards civil rights involved no moral principle, occurring only *after Republicans were already winning Southern states*. Faced with losing the South, *and* keeping

their pro-racism reputation in an era where whites were losing their racism, Democrats figured the South was a lost cause and opted to at least have their narrative, thus 1964 saw the first deployment of "you're a racist" against the GOP.

County-level election maps underscore *The 1964 Anomaly* and cut down tales of a *Supposed Southern Strategy*: Nixon wins in 1968 where he wins in 1960--the Appalachians and the suburban areas of South & Central Florida and in Texas near Dallas and Houston. He also wins the panhandles of Oklahoma and Texas, but loses the Deep South rural areas both times. Nixon wins where Eisenhower wins and loses where Eisenhower loses: his voters are the old Ike voters, not some supposed newfound trove of Segregationist voters. Nixon's voters weren't on loan from Wallace either, they were upwardly mobile, white-collar urban and upper income voters. Wallace captured poor, blue-collar rural voters. **Not only that, THIS WAS KNOWN AT THE TIME!!!! Democrats lied about this for 50 years to push narratives.**

Many contemporary authors confirmed that Nixon and Wallace voters weren't the same kind of people, from Richard M. Scammon and Ben J. Wattenberg in *The Real Majority* (1970) and James Clotfeller and William R. Hamilton, who said "Republicans and Wallacites are different types of people--they belong to different kinds of clubs and churches, go different places on Saturday night and Sunday morning, and respond differently to "bigness." (James Clotfeller and William R. Hamilton, "Beyond Race Politics: Electing Southern Populists in the 1970s" in *You Can't Eat Magnolias*, ed. H. Brandt Ayers and Thomas H. Naylor (New York, 1972), 155).

Byron E. Shafer and Richard Johnston explain what truly happened in their groundbreaking, mythbusting book, *The End of Southern Exceptionalism: Class, Race, and Partisan Change in the Postwar South* (2006), finding that post-1936 Southern economic development fueled the Republican rise by creating a GOP-backing middle/professional class, culminating in 1952, when the power of Eisenhower's celebrity and falling levels of personal racism combined with the rising urban white-collar Republicanism to flip multiple Southern states.

Nor did Thurmond or Wallace serve as "bridge candidates" to convert racists into Republicans by first dealigning them into independent voters. County-level election maps scuttle this idea, as Dixiecrat areas generally rejected Eisenhower, and Wallace areas backed Jimmy Carter in both 1976 and 1980. (We'll ignore 1972, as all-but-Massachusetts is a sea of red, adding no insight). In other words the class, income, and occupational differences between Nixon and Wallace voters fit a longer-term pattern. Southern Republicans were richer, more white-collar and suburban, and more lived in the Outer South (TX, TN, VA, NC, FL) rather than the Deep South (AR, LA, MS, AL, GA, SC). It's hardly the profile of a Thurmond voter, and *certainly not the profile* of a George Wallace voter. Nor did Governor George Corley Wallace run a particularly conservative campaign. The Alabamian promised Medicare and Social Security increases, a near-immediate end to the Vietnam War, opposed right-to-work laws, and denounced concentrations of wealth. He sounds more Huey Long than Ronald Reagan.

The slow, steady nature of GOP gains for other offices from 1936 through 1994, rather than quick conquest of all offices 1964-1975, also belies claims of backlash-induced GOP takeovers. Kevin Phillips quotes of "negrophobic" whites induced to become Republicans notwithstanding, Black Belt Southern whites were the *last* to realign, by a few decades. (Byron E. Shafer & Richard Johnson, *The End of Southern Exceptionalism*, 2006, p. 64-65). Republicans grew fastest among richer suburban and

urban whites in white collar occupations, more so in the Outer South than the Deep South. Hoax: "Party realignment on civil rights." Truth: The Southern *Class-Based Voter Shift*.

6) Misleading Phrasings and Framings, or My Deconstructive Delight! Raw data in hand, let's reverse engineer how the hoaxers built the Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory:

Artificially start the timeline in 1964, call it a watershed, say "the GOP won the white vote ever since 1964," call today's GOP "mostly white", omit that both parties were majority white for their whole history; spin a centuries-long fact as "civil rights backlash." Omit who won the white vote in any pre-1964 contest, nor mention the Black vote turned Democrat in the 1930s, because that proves *it's not about civil rights, obliterating your pretend moral superiority, while also proving Black Republicans aren't sellouts*. Let people think, by your silence, that Black votes switched in 1964.

Omit the details of 1968, "use states to conceal what counties reveal" to hide the 1952-1980 *Red County Continuity*; lump all Southern whites together, say "the GOP won a majority of Southern whites," hide voter percentages, county maps, income, class, white/blue collar, age, or education level, and hide *where within the South* the GOP grew earliest and strongest by not subdividing the data into Outer/Deep South, or urban/suburbs/rural, to disguise that the GOP did best where racism didn't.

Emphasize the South in 1972, ignore Nixon winning 49 states. Hype the Deep South and spin 1964-1980 as "three straight elections of not-Democrats, begun by Goldwater, with one interruption from Carter, and sealed by Reagan."

Omit context as needed to frame Goldwater, Wallace, and Nixon as peas in a pod. For example, Kevin M(ountebank) Kruse tells on Twitter of Wallace's attempts to become Goldwater's VP. Yet Goldwater's team refused; the two held different appeals, their vote profiles outside the Deep South show it. Big-spending Wallace ran well in Baltimore, Milwaukee and Gary, but Goldwater didn't. (Ripon Society, *From Disaster to Distinction*, 1966, p.36) Wallace came from, and returned to, the Democrats, and his voters went to Carter. Hide Reagan's slim Southern margins in 1980 by using state-level maps and omitting percentages.

Call Southern whites "conservatives," and omit they backed the New Deal, as did their segregationist representatives, most of whom were left of center (voteview.com), just like the Democrats elected after them into the 1990s.

Push tropes about mythical "conservative coalitions" that "conservative Southern Democrats" made with Republicans to produce "conservative majorities in Congress," but avoid naming any bills that would do the Tea Party proud that these supposed "conservatives" voted for.

And if all else fails, quote disgruntled ex-Nixon staffers with an ax to grind, who never said such things pre-Watergate, and clip that one Lee Atwater interview out of context.

7) The "Southern Strategy" Debunked The "Southern Strategy," as described by liberals, is--per the voting data--a conspiracy theory, as Republicans won Southern states since Eisenhower without needing any such thing. Nixon won where Eisenhower won and lost where Eisenhower lost; both of them did best with white-collar, educated, middle- and upper-class voters concentrated in the Southern suburbs. Insofar as any Nixon voters *didn't* fit this profile, they were Appalachian poor rural whites, who had been Republican since the Civil War era.

Nixon did well in suburbs, Southern or otherwise. His appeals weren't specifically Southern,

not even "law and order"; most riots were in the North. He made no appeals to white unity; indeed, the infeasibility of this attests to the lack of a white power structure, not its underground endurance. Nixon also won the Chinese-American and Japanese-American vote, even in hyper-liberal New York City and San Francisco, showing the non-racial nature of his appeals.

Nixon made no explicitly racist appeals. Contrary claims--swarming, numerous and noisy attempts at "social proof"--can't hide narrative-slaying flaws, including 1) lack of documentary evidence, be they documents or recordings, 2) all of the contemporaneous "evidence" is just accusations from the outside, 3) all the "evidence" from the inside comes years later from people with an ax to grind, again lacking documentary evidence (the claims themselves cut-and-pasted from earlier accusations from the outside), and 4) *even if all of the above weren't issues, it still contradicts the actual voting data!* The voting data is the failsafe, the touchstone confirming another explanation must exist for the quotes, characterizations, and accusations, explored in detail in the next section.

Not to mention by 1964, plausible accusations of racism, even absent hard evidence, sank candidacies. The notion that "Tricky Dick" Nixon, one of the most cunning politicians ever, would copy Goldwater's failed gameplan is the trashiest of all trash takes in the history of trash. Indeed, Nixon speechwriter Jeffrey Hart stated they had a Border State strategy, not a Southern one, calling the press "very lazy," and Harry Dent said Nixon "has no Southern strategy, but rather a national strategy which, for the first time in modern times, includes the South."

Importantly, while many Leftists claim that Kevin Phillips' *Emerging Republican Majority* recommended a racist "Southern strategy," the book contains no strategy, much less a Southern one, *and says so on the first page of the introduction!* Anyone calling it a racist strategy guide has not read the book! Phillips' book advised nothing, but predicted everything. He never advised racist strategies, and his prediction was that Deep Southerners would come to the GOP, not vice versa, and I quote: "*For national political reasons, the Republican Party cannot go to the Deep South, but for all the above-mentioned reasons, the Deep South must soon go to the national GOP*" (*Emerging Republican Majority*, 1970 edition, 289; 286-289 bears reading in full. In the 2015 Princeton University Press reprinting, see pages 325-329). Whatever you think of his logic, notice that it is a prediction, not a strategy. Whatever you think of his prediction, it is a far cry from the claim Nixon went actively appealing to bad elements because the parties magically switched.

No documentary evidence supports the Democrat version of the supposed "Southern strategy," as Nixon made national appeals so uniform, formless, and bland as to prompt Phillips' complaints that Nixon let "Madison Avenue" advisors run an issueless campaign. (James Boyd, "Nixon's Southern Strategy 'It's All In the Charts'," *New York Times*, May 17, 1970) Indeed, take 1972, 1980, 1984, and 1988: did a "Southern strategy" cause national landslides? And no, jumping up and down and pointing at the 1964 Anomaly doesn't make these facts go away. Sorry liberals.

Lacking a smoking gun document, the case rests on *maliciously clipped and viciously interpreted quotations*. In all this time, narrative-pushers never produced any RNC document remotely resembling the accusation. This failure is itself a smoking gun, the dog that didn't bark. Between the CIA, NSA, and FBI, between how FDR, JFK, LBJ, and Obama wiretapped opponents, there'd be a smoking gun by now. A party-level decision to entice segregationists based on defending segregation (that is what's alleged, nothing less proves the matter) doesn't exist. All that exists is liberal papers of the era *accusing them* of so doing, without documentation. Sometimes they unearth a letter or memo

with the word "Southern" followed by the word "strategy," but never any saying "and by Southern strategy we mean using coded racial appeals." *Merely containing those two words proves nothing; it must be shown they meant what Democrats accuse them of meaning.* The GOP claimed it went for white-collar Outer South suburbanites, where they'd won since Ike, and that's where Nixon won. So academically-worded smears are still smears; a hitjob with footnotes is still a hitjob

8) But the Quotes!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! But the Confessions!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Enter the same dozen recycled quotes and "confessions," spanning four categories:

1) From someone not in a position to know (ex., not at the top of the RNC, not on the Nixon campaign, etc) 2) Ex-Nixon staffers seeking rehabilitation by telling the press what it wants to hear (recycling the media's story back to it), upheld by *nothing contemporaneous to the alleged actions or events, whether documentation/recordings/anything else.* 3) [Highly partisan] "experts" from the outside doing "analysis" that is then printed as "news" by the papers of the day. 4) Misleadingly quoted or outright fictitious.

So between those who wouldn't know, have nothing to back them up, are demonstrably making it up, or didn't say what they're quoted as, there's nothing left. I defy anyone to produce a quote that doesn't fall into those four categories! Might be hard: Most Southern strategy "confirmation" quotes come from people who didn't even work on Nixon's campaign. That, and most of the quoted individuals clearly got their idea of what Kevin Phillips' *Emerging Republican Majority* says from the newspapers' attacks, not by reading the book itself, which contains no strategy, much less a Southern one, *and says so on the first page of the introduction!* Anyone calling it a racist strategy guide *has not read the book!*

Defections explain many confessions. Two oft-quoted ex-Nixon staffers, H.R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman, claim "law and order" was a dogwhistle, yet they only repeat (post-Watergate) in circular fashion what the press said at the time of Nixon's election. That murder doubled, rape tripled, and crime overall skyrocketed 1960-1970 goes conveniently unmentioned, as it justifies Nixon's "law and order" messaging. And Harry Dent's change in tune followed a 1974 conviction for partaking in an illegal White House-organized fundraising operation. *But where are the damning quotes from people without an axe to grind?*

Lee Atwater gets the worst of it. In a 1981 interview with Professor Alexander Lamis, Atwater mentioned the accusations and debunked them. So thenation.com omitted his preface, omitted his debunking, took his "here's what we were accused of," and spun it as a "confession"; they *quote-raped* him, *knowing most visitors wouldn't read the transcript!* Reading the full transcript reveals that Atwater deemed race *de minimis* by 1980, that the South converged with America, prioritizing economics and national defense as the top issues. He contrasts Reagan's plans with Nixon's "Harry Dent-type strategy," which, per the voting data, didn't happen. Atwater speculates some voters opposed welfare from racial animus, but even then, data in Shafer & Johnston's *The End of Southern Exceptionalism* shows those *most opposed* were richer, white collar types who'd vote GOP elsewhere too. GOP hatred of handouts predates the New Deal, much less the 1960s. Finally, Atwater shouldn't use the N-word, not even for illustrative purposes while completely exonerating Reagan; even that isn't a good enough reason.

It's a collection of "almosts," clipped or fake quotes that don't back the very specific accusation.

Yet even if they said what they're accused of, and lacked doubt-inducing contexts, how does one explain the *actual voting data*? If John Smith confesses he robbed the bank, and all his neighbors affirm it, and yet we find the money still in the vaults, then the fact remains that John Smith did *not* rob the bank. If ex-Nixon staffers with an ax to grind claim a racist Southern strategy, along with newspapers and academia, and yet Nixon wins in 1968 where he wins in 1960 and Nixon wins where Eisenhower wins, how can he have used a different strategy? Different strategies win different voters. *If it's not in the voting data, it didn't happen.*

9) Dogwhistles: For When the Voting Data Doesn't Oblige Your Conspiracy Theory, Try Our "Dogwhistles" Canard! Lacking explicit proof, party switch hoaxers invoke imaginary "dogwhistles," a circular-reasoning conspiracy theory of "We can't prove you're racist, therefore you're just a very clever racist." Democrats make voluminous accusations, hoping it strains credulity for anyone to call them *all* false. Yet *what is their method to identify dogwhistles*, when presented with a new statement? If a Republican says it, and it works, it's a dogwhistle! It's all *post hoc*! Plus, Democrats can't keep a straight story. The American Founding, traditional values, colorblindness and meritocracy are simultaneously a cover for racism, yet racist in themselves. So Republicans are using racism to hide their racism? How does that work?

The King of Construing any GOP utterance as coded racism is Dan T. Carter, in his book *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (1996), where he says George Wallace's "politics of rage" blending "racial fear, anticommunism, cultural nostalgia, and traditional right-wing economics" created modern conservatism. Yet the GOP never adopted segregationist policies. Carter evades this, claiming the GOP's new positions on new issues are proxies for old positions Democrats held on now-dead issues: affirmative action, busing, traditional family values, tough on crime, etc. Yet nothing besides liberal label-slapping marks these as racist: *labels to claim, labels to blame.*

White racism never defined conservatism. Segregationists voted for Woodrow Wilson and FDR, and their elected officials voted for the New Deal; by Dan Carter's logic, white supremacy produced Social Security and lynching produced the Wagner Act. Dan Carter frames the story as "big government equals civil rights, racism pairs with markets and small government," but Republican positions were neither veiled racism or old Southern Democrat positions; they were pre-New Deal Republican positions.

When the academic bodyguards of the Democrats are stuck arguing Republicans speak in code and that colorblindness is coded racism and not giving out free money is coded racism and opposing communism is coded racism and wanting American immigration law to apply on American soil is coded racism and wanting criminals put in prison is coded racism and wanting there to be honest elections is coded racism, they're slyly admitting liberal ideas have failed on their merits. *If liberal ideas had a laudable track record, their pet professors would crow about it, instead of seeing magical invisible racism in mundane political positions that Republicans held even before the New Deal.* But it gets even better. Some Quackademics even say "liberal" is a dogwhistle! (Ricky Hill (March 2009) "The Race Problematic, the Narrative of Martin Luther King Jr. and the Election of Barack Obama." *Souls: A Critical Journal of Black Politics, Culture, and Society*. 11 (1): 133-147) Then again, Hill spends half his highly deranged essay claiming Democrat candidates used "southern strategies" too--worst of all Bill Clinton telling off

Sister Souljah--so there's that.

Most "examples of GOP racism" collapse unless one believes the parties "switched" in the first place, starting with Clif White's "Choice" film that Goldwater ultimately vetoed. Leftist historians (hoping you won't look it up and see for yourself) portray the film as racial, because it *also showed* Black rioters in addition to showing white rioters; the Quackademics take the James Dobson-style jeremiads over declining sexual mores, rising crime, and public corruption, and *reframe the generic as specific*, turning a generic moral complaint into a specific racial one by using their imagination. Next, take Richard Nixon, his civil rights record unquestioned before 1968. No examples exist of any explicitly racist pitch by Nixon over his entire career. "Acid, amnesty, and abortion" wasn't about race. The Silent Majority was less "segregation forever" and more "Okies from Muskogee." That, and no one ever proved racists can comprehend messages indecipherable to the rest of us, and nobody would have gotten the idea they were "dogwhistles" absent the DNC media accusations. The party with no history of overt racism to conceal had no use for covert racism. Yes, Nixon said bad things behind closed doors, but anyone mentioning this is *pulling a sleight-of-hand*, when the *original claim* was that Nixon used racist PUBLIC appeals, which is false.

As to "law and order," the civil rights LARPer ought to learn something: between 1960 and 1970, murder DOUBLED, rape TRIPLED, and overall crime skyrocketed. 1967 saw 150 riots, and 1968 saw another 100, with countless campus disturbances incited by Leftist agitators. Nixon said "law and order" because (wait for it!)...there was an actual "law and order" problem in America at the time! Yet Dan Carter and Kevin Kruse omit this, because it doesn't fit their prepackaged narrative.

Some "historians," hoping you don't know the context, say the 1968 GOP platform cut the civil rights plank, deeming it a sly appeal to segregationists. *Yet the reason the 1968 platform lacked a civil rights plank was...because civil rights had been enacted into law by then, with the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, and the Fair Housing Act.* This also explains Nixon's dearth of a civil rights task force; he figured the bills on desegregation, voting, and housing covered all the bases. *When Republicans do something, they consider it done; they don't demagogue off it for the next fifty years by pretending it's still not done!*

While MSPCT pushers gawk at headlines and SCOTUS nominations, the allegedly racist Nixon administration oversaw desegregation, as the percentage of Black children in all-Black schools in the South plummeted from 70% to 18.4% in Nixon's first two years, and fell to 8% by his resignation in 1974. On busing, Nixon did nothing wrong. Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 specified in authorizing the AG to file desegregation suits: "...nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue an order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or from one school district to another in order to achieve racial balance, or otherwise enlarge the power of the court to ensure compliance with constitutional standards"

So Nixon's "Southern Strategy to appeal to white racists" was to....enforce the Civil Rights Act as written? How does that work? Busing, unpopular *nationwide* (even with Black parents), proved popular only with the liberal media and politicians (their own kids in private schools) and the miseducators writing today's textbooks. A thing most Blacks opposed and no Blacks benefitted from is no civil rights litmus test. In any case, *those convinced Nixon courted segregationists can't explain what Nixon actually offered segregationists; they wanted white superiority.* He offered equality. Also

inexplicable: Congressional Democrats just as happily punted the busing issue to the courts.

Nor did Nixon obstruct civil rights enforcement. The EEOC's 1968 Budget and staff: \$13.2 million, 359; 1972 Budget and staff: \$29.5 million, 1,640. (*Wall Street Journal*, 11 May 1971) For Fiscal Year 1973, civil rights enforcement budget increased from \$49.9 million to \$66.3 million, "providing for doubling of OFCC compliance checks from 22,500 in 1971 to 52,000 in 1973" (*Wall Street Journal*, 25 January 1972) Democrat-captured civil rights groups shrilly shrieked about phantom cuts to civil rights enforcement. Meanwhile, in the real world, the Fiscal Year 1974 budget doubled 1972's. The EEOC budget rose 107%, the "contract compliance budget for all agencies rose by 66%, and the Justice Department's budgets for the Office of Civil Rights increased by 67%" (*Business Week*, 24 March 1973, 74-75.) Between 1972 and 1974, the EEOC budget rose from \$20.8 million (actual) to \$43 million, and the Justice Department's budget for the Civil Rights Division jumped from \$10.7 to \$17.9 million. (Graham 448)

Increasing budgets plus decreasing racism equals mission creep. Yet Democrats refuse to concede the point. Unable to cite explicit statements or specific documents, they deploy the "dogwhistles" conspiracy theory; a favorite canard alleges racism drove welfare-cutting sentiments.

Anti-welfarism isn't racism; Republicans opposed big government and loved markets long before 1960. Undeterred by easily located facts, "historian" Joseph Aistrup deems Reagan's welfare stance coded racism, citing a source: a study by the Communications Research Group, funded by...the DNC. You know, the guys that rigged the primary for Hillary.

Then there's The Philadelphia Smear, the "Reagan said 'states' rights' where civil rights workers were murdered, OMG dogwhistles southern strategy the parties switched" smear. But Reagan spoke not in Philadelphia, but at the Neshoba County Fair, a stomping ground for politicians since the 1890s. Speaking there (as Dukakis did in 1988) holds no hidden meaning. Reagan's speech, mostly about inflation, included, *within a laundry list of other things*, the 10th-Amendment concept of "states' rights" (note for liberals: the 10th Amendment was written in the 1790s as a constitutional amendment, it was not written in the 1960s as a dogwhistle) and Reagan was courting Black voters and flew to NYC afterwards to speak at the Urban League. Reagan's wish "to restore to states and local governments the power that properly belongs to them" reflects libertarianism. "I still believe the answer to any problem lies with the people. I believe in states' rights. I believe in people doing as much as they can for themselves at the community level and at the private level, and I believe we've distorted the balance of our government today by giving powers that were never intended in the Constitution to that federal establishment," declared Reagan, in Jeffersonian language.

Another classic, perhaps racebaiting's go-to, is smearing the 1988 Willie Horton ad as "racist." Dan Carter on pages 68-80 of *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich* narrates how the Horton issue swayed Lee Atwater's focus group in Paramus, New Jersey. Yet the ad persuaded, not because of "race" or some supposedly widespread fear of a specifically Black criminal, but because it is objectively ridiculous to furlough convicted murderers; the ad was defining because of what it proved about Democrat crime policy. Democrats spun such furloughs as either Republican or mainstream national policy (not for 1st degree murderers, it wasn't), said it was just one case, and counterattacked blaming a paroled drug dealer-turned killer on George H.W. Bush. The public didn't buy it. Democrat retellings omit this, but *Democrats only called the Willie Horton ad "racist" after all other defenses of Dukakis' furlough policy had failed.*

Not content to misconstrue the Willie Horton ad, Dan Carter claims Guy Hunt and Jesse Helms made "racist" TV ads, because their ads tied their Democrat opponents to "black leaders" like Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson, *as if their radicalism was a non-issue*, only their skin color. Yet white Southern Republicans never disdained Tom Sowell or Walter E. Williams, and voted without hesitation for Tim Scott in South Carolina, Allen West in Florida, Bobby Jindal in Louisiana, and Daniel Cameron in Kentucky.

In closing, no "backlash against civil rights" occurred; a backlash raged against the *redefinition* of civil rights from a matter of equal opportunity to one of taxpayer-guaranteed equal results. Calls to preserve the original civil rights vision and equal application of the law are not "dogwhistles," claims of credentialed partisans notwithstanding.

10) The Republican Position on Civil Rights Was Constant: There Was No Switch

Republicans never stopped supporting civil rights. The only reason anyone is confused about this is because Democrats have spent decades slapping the civil rights label on non-civil rights issues. Democrats call citizenship for border cheaters a "civil rights issue"...along with the ability to point guns at cops without being shot, along with the right to burn down cities when this expectation goes unrealized. Democrats conflate handouts and government bureaucracies with civil rights, and conflate opposition to them with racism, calling everything racist as a political tactic.

In truth, political hacks post-1968 shifted the definition of civil rights from equal opportunity (the *undisputed* definition 1865-1968) to government-guaranteed equal results--an idiotic new standard the public never voted on. For more, see Professor Hugh Davis Graham's book *The Civil Rights Era* (1990), especially pages 248-250, 366-390, and 457-475.

Capitalist, individualist, and meritocratic Republicans exhibit perfect consistency in supporting civil rights (equal opportunity) while opposing distortions like quotas (government-guaranteed equal results). Such a stance is *no shift*, and the parties can't have "switched" when Republican beliefs held constant both before and after the supposed "realignment."

The voting records agree. Congressional Republicans voted at higher percentages than Democrats for 1) The Civil Rights Act of 1964, 2) The Voting Rights Act of 1965, 3) The Fair Housing Act of 1968, and 4) The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. If the parties "switched," how come Republicans continued backing civil rights bills more strongly than Democrats throughout?

--->>>the Civil Rights Act of 1964, House: Democrats 153-91 (63%), Republicans 136-35 (80%).

Senate: Democrats 46-21 (69%), Republicans 27-6 (82%)

--->>>the 1965 Voting Rights Act--House: Democrats 221-61 (78%), Republicans 112-24 (82%); Senate: Democrats 47-16 (75%), Republicans 30-2 (93%)

--->>>the 1968 Fair Housing Act--House: Democrats 166-67 (71%), Republicans 161-25 (86%); Senate: Democrats 42-17 (71%), Republicans 29-3 (90%)

--->>>and the 1972 Equal Employment Opportunity Act--House: Democrats 156-80 (66%), Republicans 132-28 (82%); Senate: Democrats 39-7 (84%), Republicans 32-5 (86%)

Eight years after the supposed "switch," nothing has. Republicans maintained the same position on civil rights the entire time: individualism, colorblindness, equal opportunity. True, Democrats bolstered the Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory with related drivel that colorblindness or individualism are tools of "white supremacy" --theories of recent origin **that cannot**

explain why the 1860s Republicans who freed the slaves believed in those very things!

11) The Republican Position on the Role of Government and the Propriety of Free Markets Held

Constant: There Was No Switch

Voting records held constant because Republican philosophy held constant. Republicans want government to do *practically nothing but* protect people and property. Democrats want government to do *practically everything but* protect people and property. Banter about state or federal is irrelevant; relevant is the *role* of government. *Opposing lynching, the Klan, the New Deal, and the Great Society is consistent with Lockean minarchism, which the GOP supported, more or less, since the start.*

The Republican *philosophy* of government underwent no meaningful shift from use of Federal power to stop illegal secession during the Civil War, to rejection of Federal economic micromanagement today: anyone in favor of our Founding principles would do both without any contradiction, and would embrace state governments in reaction to growing federal power and spending 1930-1980.

After the discovery of Nazi deathcamps, Southern Democrats rebranded as "segregationists," pivoting from open racialism to constitutional-sounding arguments like "states' rights." (Kari A. Frederickson, *The Dixiecrat Revolt and the End of the Solid South, 1932-1968, 133*)

These Jim Crow defenses differ from the GOP's long record of pro-market rationales for decentralization and/or doubt of the merits of federal power (which did little for civil rights in Democrat hands, the final victory courtesy of Republican support, not the federal government *per se*.)

Likewise, economics: The Republican Party was capitalist in 1860, capitalist in 1960, and is capitalist today, and the GOP's capitalist roots, interlocked with abolition, are seen as early as the William Seward's 1858 "Irrepressible Conflict" speech. Seward spends the first three pages waxing on the superiority of the "free labor" aka capitalist system to slavery, contrasting them as if they were different (because they were), *which practically no one of the era disputed; only modern leftists do.*

Lincoln, no progressive he, endorsed capitalism, favoring free markets internally, tariffs externally, and equal application of the law, like today's GOP. Individualist Lincoln declared "every man can make himself" and "the man who labored for another last year, this year labors for himself, and next year he will hire others to labor for him." (Abraham Lincoln, Speech at Kalamazoo, Michigan, August 27, 1856, *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln, Volume 2, 364*). Unequal growth of wealth was a nonissue, as long as all got richer. "It is best for all to leave each man to acquire property as fast as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich; it would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose any war on capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else." More Lincoln: "Property is the fruit of labor--property is desirable--is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise." Rejecting Bernie Sanders and his envy, Lincoln said, "Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another; but let him labor diligently and build one himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built." (Abraham Lincoln, "Reply to a Committee from the Workingmen's Association of New York," March 21, 1864 (*Complete Works, X, 53-54*))

Tying capitalism to abolitionism, Lincoln said, "Whenever I hear anyone arguing for slavery, I feel a strong impulse to see it tried on him personally." (March 17, 1865, speech before 140th Indiana

Regiment) Lincoln deemed slavery evil because it was theft, a case of "You work, I eat," reasoning, "As each man has one mouth to be fed, and one pair of hands to furnish food, it was probably intended that that particular pair of hands should feed that particular mouth." (Abraham Lincoln, Address by Abraham Lincoln Before the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, September 30, 1859)

And the Republican government that ended slavery was *smaller* than any government after FDR's New Deal, outright tiny by modern standards, and did little a Reaganite or Trumpian would disagree with. Framing Lincoln as "big, interventionist, federal government" and his enemies as "small, laissez-faire government" analogous to today's GOP is *nothing but word games!*

And they're word games with one hell of a payoff, especially in election season....

12) No, GOP Election Integrity Measures Are Not The Continuation of Democrat Voter Suppression

Paydirt for the Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory is its use as a bludgeon against any attempts to ensure honest elections; it simultaneously drives minority turnout for Democrats while serving as fodder for Democrat-appointed judges to make it easier for Democrats to cheat. Yet the falsity of "party switch" theories imply the falsity of the "voter suppression" canards that Democrats employ, using *forced analogies* to spin election integrity as "Jim Crow." Zero GOP election laws derive from Jim Crow, least of all voter ID--which figures--because Jim Crow Democrats were rather busy stuffing the ballot box themselves, most notably in their 1890s counterattack against a combined GOP-Populist Party surge, (for more see C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*), plus sporadic efforts afterward.

Democrats have stuffed the ballot box for 200 years, going back to the 1830s Tammany Hall machine, and there is no evidence it ever stopped. Democrat conspiracy theorists attribute fraud concerns to fear by white Republicans that a rising tide of minority voters will sweep them away, and hope you don't realize that 1800s Republicans, and their predecessors, the Whigs, complained about fraud in the same precincts of the same cities, over a century ago. It's just a racially charged excuse for the same old Tammany-style practices.

Regardless, no continuity exists between Republicans now and segregationist Democrats. A 1968 report detailed various county-level evasion measures, chiefly in Alabama and Mississippi. (US Commission on Civil Rights, *Political Participation* (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1968) Praising the compliance of 94% of the 593 counties covered by the Voting Rights Act, the report mentioned 38 counties drew complaints, 75% of which were in Alabama and Mississippi. These rebels were hammered down using Section 4, not Section 5 (seldom used except as a cudgel against GOP election verifiability efforts.)

Segregationist Democrats engaged in: "Such racist manipulations of otherwise permissible changes including switching from district to at-large elections, switching from elective to appointive office, extending the terms of elective offices and even abolishing them, increasing the minimum qualifications and filing fees for office, and preventing newly elected officials from obtaining required bonds." (Hugh Davis Graham, *The Civil Rights Era*, 1990, p.357)

Notice what we do not see: We see no mention of voter ID mandates, citizenship checks for registering, purging dead, inactive, incorrectly spelled/duplicate/wrong address voters, or bans on Tammany-style ballot harvesting (back then they were called "strikers," not "harvesters")

This brings us to *Shelby v. Holder* (2013), 40 years since *actual voter suppression* was a thing, after nearly everyone involved is dead (and voting Democrat). Constraining present Republicans from stopping fraud because past Democrats suppressed the vote is illogical. Liberal conspiracy theories aside, there's no proof turnout fell *because of Shelby* or *because of voter ID*, or *because dead peoples' names got purged from the rolls*. It's always (conspiracy) theoretical, without even anecdotal cases of an eligible voter being denied.

Photo ID mandates aren't discriminatory, it's not a poll tax, in no state does an ID cost over \$25. Canada and Mexico have voter ID; if it's not "racist" in Canada or "racist" in Mexico, it's not "racist" here either. That wasn't cherry-picked, nearly every industrialized country requires it, so if that's a good enough reason to change our healthcare system, it's a good enough reason for voter ID. The UN and State Department favor the use of ID to stop voter fraud, in the modern world, and in the 3rd world.

Photo ID is required for alcohol, cigarettes, opening a bank account, applying for welfare, unemployment, renting or buying a house or a car, boarding an airplane, getting married, buying a gun, picking up a prescription, purchasing nail polish at CVS, purchasing cold medications, and entering a federal building. You even need photo ID to see Eric Holder speak about why photo ID voting requirements are racist. (No, I'm not making that up).

Proving the fraudulency of "voter suppression" claims, Democrats accuse each other when it suits them, such as AOC's claims establishment Democrats suppressed Bernie's 2020 Michigan primary vote. The 2018 Georgia gubernatorial race saw the highest Black turnout ever, and this voter suppression claims still emerged. It's just a tactic.

In closing, it's history versus a conspiracy theory. History: One party stuffed the ballot box since Tammany Hall. Conspiracy Theory: The other engages in "voter suppression." Hardly surprising. Conspiracy theories are the operating system of identity politics.

*
*
*

Identity Politics: Morally Defective, Dependent Upon Conspiracy Theories, Stoking Violence

Identity politics heavily uses prepackaged narratives, relies only minimally on hard data (and cherry-picks too), and acts affronted if anyone demands evidence; as such identity politics is the political corollary to personally-enriching race-hustling. Two types of race-hustling exist: 1) attempts to get money, ex. Al Sharpton, Jesse Jackson, Shaun King, and 2) ***attempts to launder unrelated political demands by cloaking them in civil rights rhetoric***, to paint opponents as racist, ex, what Black Lives Matter does. Both types prevail today, fail to help actual Black people, and indulge in no-substance theatrics.

For example, there are more marches today than in civil rights era. Elephrame lists 2,406 BLM marches rallies, "protests and other...demonstrations" over 1,467 days. Dismissing anyone noting it's not 1963 anymore as a covert racist, BLM's 100%-optics marches persist. The BLM organization's platform makes demands unrelated to police reform: "open admissions to public colleges" for Blacks, plus, "re-payment to Blacks of all wealth ever extracted from a majority Black community" via "racism, slavery, food apartheid, housing discrimination...and capitalism." *Abolishing capitalism has no connection to police reform, except in the minds of literal communists.* ("Platform," Movement for Black Lives, <https://policy.m4bl.org/end-war-on-black-people/> and, "Reparations," Movement for Black Lives,

<https://policy.m4bl.org/reparations/>)

Identity Politics: Promising Wakanda, Delivering Rwanda, Since 1965, or, "Since the Democrats Ran Slavery and Jim Crow, There's No Justification For Scapegoating Either Republicans or White People in General"

No moral justification exists for an oppositional identity politics against America, nor for using bogus smears against the American Founding or using the 1619 Project/W.E.B. DuBois narrative to turn Black Americans against America. The British installed slavery, the Founders curtailed slavery, the Democrats expanded slavery, and the Republicans ended slavery, and, as previously proven, the parties never "switched." Thus, anyone telling Black Americans to hate this country is 1) not acting in their best interest, 2) pushing a sinister agenda indeed.

In no country do Black Americans have it better than in America, whose faults, such as they are, are largely (if not entirely) the Democrats' doing! When Black identity politicians tell their voters that dismantling the American Founding advances Black interests, let's just say they've *lost the plot!*

Identity politics is not some benign self-help scheme of uplift, because: 1) it entails voting for the guilty Democrat party. 2) The demonization of Black conservatives reveals identity politics as a mere affinity scam and herding mechanism for machine politicians. If similarly oppressed people have different opinions, that means there is no singular authentic "Black opinion." Identity politics and related intersectionality provide no guidance for the "same group/different experience & conclusions paradox." Finally, Black freedom must mean more than "freedom" to think as charlatans instruct. 3) It has failed to actually uplift Black Americans. 4) It rejects Martin Luther King Jr.'s efforts to make race *de minimis* in American life, and instead attempts to make race central again--*race's centrality was the problem in the first place!*

Office-holding race-hustlers contrive fake incidents or inflate trivial incidents to boost their own income and influence, to keep the focus on them to portray identity politicians as key to the group's rise. Yet while Asians and Jews top US income tables, it's hard to name any Asian and Jewish identity politicians; *indeed, the groups lagging worst are precisely the ones that spend so much time playing identity politics!!!*

Unique to Blacks, this is not, 'tis but a sad replay of the 1800s, where Irish politicians dominated political machines as Irish at large lagged other white Americans. Identity politics enriches identity politicians, not their frenzied constituents. It's not unique to America: identity politicians worldwide, from the Philippines to Malaysia making rules to benefit Filipinos and Malays over the Chinese, to Idi Amin expelling the more productive Indians from Uganda (the economy promptly collapsed), to the confiscation of land from white farmers in Zimbabwe (which promptly starved), identity politics has proven economically self-destructive to all who practice it. Identity politicians worldwide evade this by inventing elaborate conspiracy theories, for example, the "white flight" theory of why identity politics fails urban Black Americans; mirroring how 3rd-world politicians blame colonialism, decades after its end, even as other former colonies that eschew such excuses leave them in the dust economically.

Proposed solutions, such as affirmative action, disproportionately damage Jews and Asians, who never oppressed Blacks; of note, this fact would give "civil rights activists" pause, for what justice is there in this? That this doesn't disturb identity politicians disproves the notion that they are "civil rights activists in office," and combined with their circling the wagons around every criminal in a

conflagration with the police, combined with the obsession with the racial bean-counting that is "representation," it all adds up to something else entirely--yes, there is a word for what identity politicians do: ethnonationalism. ADOS ethnonationalism.

Not even "Black ethnonationalism," as Afro-Caribbean and Nigerian immigrants can hardly relate; the first outearns the national average, the latter outearns whites, no government favoritism needed. This proves inconvenient.

The unstated premise of ADOS ethnonationalism is that preferential government policy causes wealth, not group beliefs and behavior, not the even-handed application of laws, and further, that wealth is zero sum, the total amount is fixed, not increasable. But the aforementioned Caribbean and Nigerian Americans obliterate this worldview, an extremely damaging thing to Democrats, and to the ADOS ethnonationalist identity politics it relies on.

I stress Black identity politics despite the other variants because it's the template. Intersectionality's inventor, Kimberle Crenshaw, is a self-described "black feminist," and intersectionality, arising from critical race studies, attempts to launder the moral power of the Black experience for unrelated Left-wing political purposes via misinterpreting the experience, then projecting it onto every dissimilar group, first by omitting the *Democrat* culprits and blaming America is a whole, and second by use of civil rights rhetoric to assert parallels to all other non-white/non-male groups exist, in order to assert everyone has a stake in demolishing America, and third, Democrats rally many others, from Latinos, to Asians, to college-(mis)educated whites to their cause by citing their possession of the Black vote as a form of "social proof" that they're the good guys. Thus Black identity politics undergirds all other "everybody hate America" movements, and thus its logical and theoretical flaws also hobble other identity-based movements; they all fall like dominos.

The Role of Conspiracy Theories In Promoting Identity Politics

Limited government produced America. Identity politics produced Zimbabwe and Detroit. To circumvent this unavoidable fact, identity politicians invent ingenious explanations for how it's always somebody else's fault but theirs.

Identity politicians call everything racist, and invent new kinds of "racism" to shift the blame for the results of their own job-killing, school-quality-destroying, unsafe-streets-creating policies, declaring the dangers of everything from "well-meaning racism" to "representational racism" to "institutional racism" to "ideological racism" to "cultural racism" to "benevolent racism" to "discursive racism" to "structural racism" to "subtle racism" to "crypto racism." If whites move out it's "white flight," if whites move in, it's "gentrification," if whites see color, it's "racism," if whites don't see color, it's "ignoring racism," which is also "racism," if whites don't partake in culture they're "not inclusive," but if they engage with Black culture, it's "cultural appropriation," and so on.

This talk doesn't prove widespread racism, only *a willingness to frame the generic as racism*. Further, proof that some trace of racism remains is not proof that racism causes Problem X today.

This deceptive framing relies on "snapshot fallacies," looking at present disparities while absenting inconvenient comparisons with the past. For example, in New York City in 1979, Blacks composed 12.9% of the students at the very selective and prestigious Stuyvesant High School, but by 1995, it had fallen to 4.8%, and by 2012, 1.2%. But Blacks had more rights by 2012, not fewer. The narrative fails. (Fernanda Santos, "Black at Stuy," *New York Times*, February 26, 2012, Metropolitan

Desk, p.6)

We have had civil rights laws on the books for fifty years, plus a Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice, with plenty of lawyers and a big budget. We don't lack civil rights; we lack sensible public policy. And those claiming to see racism everywhere...just so happen to be the very same politicians responsible for the bad public policy.

Blacks enjoy more rights and wealth in America than in any African country. If America and white people were culpable, the opposite would be true, Blacks would migrate from America to Africa not vice versa, and non-whites worldwide wouldn't move to "white supremacist" America. It's almost like the whole world, minus professional race-hustlers and recent American college graduates, knows the "America is racist" narrative is bullshit.

Debunk identity politics conspiracy theories in five words: DIFFERENT BEHAVIOR CAUSES DIFFERENT RESULTS. The only way to make results be equal is for everyone to behave the same.

Similar behavior-based disparities once existed between Irish and other white Americans. Irish-Americans had worse alcoholism, worse high school graduation rates, and lower average incomes than other White Americans. In 1904, Irish Americans had five times the incarceration rate of German Americans. But they were also (wait for it) *over-represented* in the political process. Democrat machine politicians then, just like Democrat machine politicians now, told them that Anglo-Saxon society was stacked against them, and that only electing Democrats could save them. Yet what fixed these problems was Irish leaders, notably those in the Catholic Church, launching campaigns of self-improvement. They fixed their problems by fixing themselves, then drifted away from bloc voting Democrat.

Democrats promote victimhood among Blacks and Hispanics to prevent the realization that they themselves possess the power to fix their own problems, and Democrat lies are their only obstacle.

When you want to help someone, you tell them the truth. When you want to help yourself, you tell them what they want to hear. Guess which one the identity politics Democrats are doing.

MAGA Is Not Identity Politics

MAGA is not "white identity politics." Neither Republicans or Trump ever said MAGA was for white people; only Democrats and their pet media ever claimed that. Trump policies benefitted not only whites, but any American who's not part of the Swamp, who's not part of the free-speech hatin' & lyn' racebaitin' fake news media--hence why they are his biggest critics. Trump never promoted any idea that a nonwhite person couldn't support, nor used any racial appeals, except in the minds of people who hear ghosts, because the worst racist ever, is a man who doesn't talk about race! Go figure that one out! (Insert *100% post hoc rationale* that ordinary statement X is a "dogwhistle" HERE)

MAGA isn't identity politics, it is *issue politics*, it is *idea politics* (ISSUEPOL and IDEAPOL, not IDPOL) A tax cut is an idea, not an identity. Concealed carry, guarding the border, draining the swamp, school vouchers to force educational quality improvement, these are *ideas, not identity*, and Trump plays *idea politics*, as the GOP always has.

Far from a mirror image of the Democrats' so-called "anti-racism," the GOP speaks of other issues entirely, and get smeared as racist by those *determined* to inject race into non-racial issues. Less government, cutting taxes, gun rights, and guarding the border are philosophical, financial, self-defense, and national security issues, not racial issues, and only those choosing see race as a

starting point to their thinking could see them as "racial issues." Democrats call everything racist because they are defensive about how their policies have failed Black Americans.

Stoking Victimhood, Stoking Violence

Stoking victimhood damages a group more than economic hardship ever could. Identity politicians produce economic backwardness, and as one scholar noted, 'backwards groups are overwhelmingly initiators and advanced groups are targets of ethnic riot behavior.' (Donald L. Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 180) Hostility to more productive minorities has plagued lagging groups throughout history. Ethnic leaders often stir up such resentments to further their own interests rather than those of the group. Yet culture produces disparities; often the productive group holds no power to exploit the other group, as with Jews in Germany pre-Hitler, or with Chinese in the Philippines or Malaysia, or with Indians in Uganda. Cultural notions of what to think and do, what we value, and how we think the world works impact behavior, and thus anything from educational attainment to generational wealth or avoiding prison.

The other vision, grievance-based identity politics, never created peace or prosperity anywhere, producing instead endless examples of Balkanization (including in the Balkans) unrest, civil wars, and genocides, such as Rwanda and 1990s Yugoslavia.

Domestically, racehustler rhetoric about whites is practically interchangeable with antisemitic rhetoric about Jews, and will have the same effect. America needs politicians who speak truth as fiercely as racehustlers lie, who will point out, repeatedly, and as obnoxiously as possible:

- 1) White privilege is a myth: Asians outearn Whites and go to jail less than Whites.
- 2) The order in which races perform, highest to lowest, in nearly everything measurable, is the same order they succeed in maintaining married two-parent families. It's not "white privilege." It's "having two married parents privilege."
- 3) Single motherhood causes poverty. Mass crime causes mass incarceration. Riots drive out employers. Civil rights activism can't fix non-civil rights problems.
- 4) In all things: Different behavior causes different results!

Institutional Racism Debunked: Affirmative Action and Preferential Policies

Exhaustively litigated "reverse discrimination" tropes prove uninteresting. More relevant: preferential policies don't work as advertised. Preferential policies, affirmative action, quotas, set-asides, etc, fail to lift any lagging groups to parity or prosperity, at home or abroad. Neither the policies, nor their failure, is unique to America. Thomas Sowell, in *Affirmative Action Around the World: An Empirical Study* (2004) tells us that affirmative action and quota policies, allegedly the uniquely-required solution in America, have already failed--worldwide. Sometimes they cause resentment and violence, such as in India and Sri Lanka and Malaysia. The Sri Lankan case saw a Sinhalese Prime Minister Bandaranaike, push a quotas program to marginalize the dominant Tamils, resulting in a civil war 1982-2001, leaving 64,000 dead in its wake.

While such violence has not occurred here, affirmative action does injure Jews and Asians, while benefitting middle- and upper-class Blacks. As for graduations, those admitted under affirmative action fail at higher rates to graduate than those admitted under normal academic standards, the fault of the defective Democrat K-12 systems they came from.

Black vs White Graduation rates: University of Michigan (67/88), MIT (81/94), UCLA (73/88),

Carleton College (69/90), Berkeley (70/86), etc. ("Black Student College Graduation Rates Remain Low, But Modest Progress Begins to Show," *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, http://www.jbhe.com/features/50_blackstudents_gradrates.html). Other colleges score similarly.

Affirmative Action causes a mismatch, as outlined in *Mismatch: How Affirmative Action Hurts Students It's Intended to Help, and Why Universities Won't Admit It* (2012), by Richard Sander and Stuart Taylor Jr. Black students who could earn a degree in a state university, despite the damage done K-12 by Democrat school systems, are being artificially turned into failures so that liberal university administrators can congratulate themselves for having "virtuous" admissions statistics, as new admittees replace the churned dropouts, with their massive debt and no degree.

Even more profoundly, this isn't really a college-admissions problem, but an urban teacher's union K-12 quality problem. And "representation" doesn't require preferential hiring. Blacks are well-represented in competitive endeavors like sports, entertainment, music, etc, no affirmative action needed. Do racist legacies only affect less competitive (and less glamorous) endeavors?

The much-touted Devah Pager study, and studies replicating it, look only at entry-level private-sector white-owner types of employment. Other fields have different hiring dynamics, which as Professor Wilfred Reilly notes in his book *Taboo*, go largely unexamined, including academic hiring, where Sanders' and Taylor's *Mismatch* (2012) demonstrate a Black candidate is generally 300-400% more likely to be hired than equivalent whites. (Reilly, *Taboo: 10 Facts You Can't Talk About*, 87-88.)

Demonstrating racism's existence doesn't prove it drives official decision-making, or prove it more impactful than other factors. Thus, we get data and analyze. Plus, all contemporary studies ignore historical unemployment rates, which show that pre-New Deal Black unemployment was *lower* than white unemployment. Unless today's racism exceeds that of the 1930s, we must conclude capitalist hiring isn't driven by racial animus.

Incomes & Poverty & Wealth: Causes, Effects, Implications

Incomes By Race Disprove Claims of White Supremacy

Despite expectations of equal results, disparity is the norm the world over, because different behavior causes different results. Market-dominant minorities often lead the larger society, despite lacking political power to oppress anyone. Look at the Chinese in Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia or America; the Indians in America or Uganda; the Lebanese in Africa; or the Jews, most anywhere they settle. The very existence of market-dominant minorities debunks misinformation that disparities prove discrimination.

One need not consult right-wing sources to learn this. It sometimes makes the left-wing papers (Amy Chua and Jed Rubenfeld, "What Drives Success?" *New York Times*, January 25, 2014, <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/26/opinion/sunday/what-drives-success.html>). The data itself comes from government reports, and show, that in these United States, incomes-by-race defy the race-hustlers' narrative of continued white supremacy (which, when it existed, was run by the Democrats anyway!)

Median Household Incomes by Race & Ethnicity

Indian Americans lead all groups, with a median household income of \$100,295, followed by Taiwanese Americans with \$85,500, Filipino immigrants with \$82,389, Americans of Japanese heritage with \$70,261, Lebanese Arabs with

\$69,685, Iranian Americans ("Persians") with \$66,186, Nigerian Americans and \$61,289, Syrians Americans \$61,151; all these finished ahead of Whites as a group

Egyptians Americans earned a median household income of \$60,543, followed by Guyanese Americans with \$60,234. Black West Indians, Jamaicans, Bahamians, Afro-Caribbean Blacks et. all, finished not far behind whites, and ahead of ADOS Blacks.

Asian Americans lead whites at all metrics from incomes to grades and test scores to average credit rating. Nor is this the result of Asians being used as some sort of pawns of white supremacy; they exhibit the same behavior *wherever they settle*, from working long hours (by reputation both here and Southeast Asia) right down to college majors. In the 1960s, Chinese in Malaysia earned 100 times as many engineering degrees as the Malays, and still maintain a substantial lead today.

The Black/White Income Gap Gaps themselves, such as Black/White income gaps, do not prove, *ipso facto*, that something nefarious* occurred. For example, the gap between the incomes of 50 year-old men and 20 year-old men far exceeds the gap between white men and Black men, yet few would assume anything malign happened there. Likewise, the gap between Western and Eastern Europeans is also greater, without drawing accusations of exploitation.

The Black/White gap diminishes to a single digit number** if controlled for age, family composition, and region. About 55% of Black Americans live in the South, where nominal wages are lower, thus why controlling for region eliminates much of the gap. The South also has lower costs of living, a fact that nominal income stats don't convey. (June O'Neill, quoted in Dinesh D'Souza, *The End of Racism* (Free Press Paperbacks: New York, 1995), 302)

The typical age ("modal average") of a Black male is 27, and for a white male it is 58. Peoples' earnings peak during their late 40s and early 50s, so groups with a different "center of gravity" age-wise have their average tilted.

Controlling for family composition: Blacks earn 61% of white earnings: accurate median in 1995, but includes a disproportionate number of welfare mothers. Contrastingly, Black 2-parent families earned 87% of what white 2 parent households earned.

*Most of the same points apply to the gender pay gap for the "same work," which makes no sense. If true, why are any men employed? Men and women differ in majors earned, different jobs, hours worked, etc. More men work jobs that are either dangerous, demanding or disgusting, ex coal miners, oil rig workers, sewage workers, etc, that can earn a hefty salary without a degree needed.

**This remainder could be discrimination, but even if so, it has a smaller effect than some would have us believe; not to justify it, only to say we must discuss this with the actual data.

Sustained Poverty & the Elephant in the Room Single motherhood all but causes poverty. The behavior of adults damages childrens' well-being, starting with poverty and diminished incomes. Indeed, female-headed Black families only earn 36% of what two-parent Black families do, and female-headed white families only earn 46% as much as two-parent white families. (Stephan and Abigail Thernstrom, *America in Black and White*, 1997, p.197, Table 8) Child poverty in white single mother households is 22%, compared with 7% for Black children whose parents were married. Thus, "the poverty rate among black married couples has been in single digits every year since 1994" (US

Census Bureau, "Table 4: Poverty Status of Families, by Type of Family, Presence of Related Children, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2013," in Tom Sowell, *Wealth Poverty and Politics*, 117)

Slavery didn't produce this gap--unless one contends slavery's legacy skipped the first 100 years after slavery, only to reappear during the sexual revolution and the welfare state. As recently as the 1960 census, Blacks had a higher marriage rate than whites. Most Black children grew up in two-parent households between the end of slavery and 1960.

Fatherless Black children were rarer when discrimination was more common, and poverty worse. "As Walter Williams pointed out, during a typical mid-twentieth-century year (1938), only "11 percent of Black children...were born to unwed mothers." Even by the early 1960s, the nation's overall illegitimacy rate stood at only 7.7%, with Blacks slightly but not wildly overrepresented among parents of illegitimate children." In the 1960, 22% of Black children grew up raised by a single mother, a figure jumping to 52% by 1995. (Stephan Thernstrom and Abigail Thernstrom, *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), 237, 238; Herbert G. Gutman, *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom, 1750-1925* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1976), 455-456)

Anti-family ideology enacted into public policy since 1960 destroyed the family unit. *No previous community in human history* ever had a majority of its children growing up without two married parents present. The crushing fact that *the Left can't evade* is that two married parents were the rule for the entirety of human history, *and this only broke down during the lifetimes of people presently alive.*

Actual data reinforce the point. In 1940, 87% of Black households were below the poverty line. By 1960, that fell to 47%. (Stephan Thernstrom and Abigail Thernstrom, *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997) 233-234). Today, it is around 20%. In other words, poverty fell faster before welfare destroyed the family unit than since, a 40% drop in 20 years as opposed to a 27% drop in 60 years.

Counter "studies" can proclaim the welfare state innocent all they like; the fact remains this never happened anywhere, at any time, until the welfare state appeared. Invoking other countries is invalid unless their welfare systems contain the same incentives seen in the USA. That, and welfare destroyed the traditional family and created generational poverty and rising crime among poor whites in Britain, none of whom were slaves; an effect of policy, not a legacy of slavery.

The Wealth Gap: Completing the Liberals' Incomplete Analysis

The racial wealth gap owes largely but not entirely to slavery and Jim Crow. Post-1960s behavior compounded the damage; a group can be victimized and injure itself too--as the data shows.

The median white household earns 65% more than the median Black household (Income and Poverty in the United States: 2016, US Census Bureau, Current Population Reports), yet has over six times the net worth (Recent Trends in Wealth-Holding by Race and Ethnicity: Evidence from the Survey of Consumer Finances, <https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/notes/feds-notes/recent-trends-in-wealth-holding-by-race-and-ethnicity-evidence-from-the-survey-of-consumer-finances-20170927.html>) This can only be true if something different happens to the money once earned.

Slavery alone doesn't explain. Most Americans never owned slaves, free Northern states were richer, and America's economy grew faster in the decades *after abolition*. The South today remains poorer, mirrored by the modern greater poverty of Brazil's most slave-intensive regions. Slavery

enriched slaveholders, not the general white population.

Redlining, while sinisterly intentioned, fails as an explanation, its central fallacy consisting of the erroneous belief that homeownership causes wealth, that a house is an asset. It is not: if it was, the bank would be writing you a monthly check, not the other way around. A house, while nice to have, *does not cause* financial success; *it is a sign* of financial success. The Democrats in government confused cause and effect, chalked up differences to lending discrimination, and thought pressuring banks to lend to bad credit would fix the homeownership gap. Available data proved the opposite:

"The very same report by the US Commission on Civil Rights, which showed that blacks were turned down for conventional mortgages at twice the rate for whites, contained other statistics showing that whites were turned down for those same mortgages at a rate nearly twice that for "Asian Americans and Native Hawaiians." (United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Civil Rights and the Mortgage Crisis* (Washington: US Commission on Civil Rights, 2009). Also Jim Wooten, "Answers to Credit Woes are Not in Black and White, *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, November 6, 2007)

This produced the Housing Crash of 2008. Democrats then blamed banks lending too freely, after castigating them for being too stingy. The entire mess arose from the belief that Blacks require government rescue from overpowering, oppressive society, that they can do nothing to better themselves. Yet not only can they, they have. The median income of white men tripled from \$1,112 in 1939 to \$5,137 in 1960, while the median Black male income quadrupled from \$460 in 1939 to \$3,705 in 1960. The percentage of Black households below the poverty line fell from 87% in 1940 to 47% in 1960. In spite of greater discrimination than today, Black Americans made great strides forward.

Market competition lifted many a persecuted minority; waiting for government never has. Asian immigrants lacked government handouts, endured the California Alien Land Law of 1913 (struck down in 1952), plus internment in the case of Japanese Americans. Yet today, Japanese Americans outearn Whites.

This pattern of market salvation holds true in religious as well as racial terms. The median Jewish net worth is \$150,890, six times as much as conservative Protestants (\$26,200), and three times the median of the sample (\$48,200). Belief that official discrimination alone explains income and wealth discrepancies becomes impossible to sustain. (https://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2003-09/osu-rhs091603.php --figures from 2003, no doubt all higher now)

This also holds true internationally. Singapore has higher median wealth per adult than either Portugal or Britain, which colonized them. Spain colonized more than Britain, yet is poorer. Mongols out-conquered just about everybody, but Mongolia struggles today. Long-term wealth arises from internal causes; plunder contributes a short-term boost at best.

Disparities within races illustrate underlying, determinative variables. For one example, Taiwanese incomes in America are 4 times that of Hmong people. For another, Afro-Caribbean Blacks outdo ADOS Blacks. A 2015 survey of wealth in Boston said the median Black household had \$8 in wealth. *Newsweek* reported it as "Racism in Boston," yet Black Bostonians of Caribbean ancestry had \$12,000 of wealth, despite identical college graduation rates, only marginally higher incomes, and being just as Black.

This last difference is the decisive clue: historical explanations fall flat, only one answer remains, a difference in attitudes towards money, which research confirms. Analyzing data from the

Consumer Expenditure Survey 1986-2002, economists Kerwin Charles, Erik Hurse, and Nikolai Roussanov wrote the paper "Conspicuous Consumption and Race." (Charles and Hurse are University of Chicago professors, and Roussanov is a University of Pennsylvania professor.) Among the findings, Blacks spend 30% more than whites with comparable incomes on "visible goods" (cars, clothes, jewelry), spend 50% less on healthcare than whites with the same incomes, and 20% less on education.

Echoing the professors' findings, a 2017 Nielson report found Black women, as compared to white women, were 14% more likely to own a luxury vehicle, 16% more likely to purchase costume jewelry, and 9% more likely to purchase fine jewelry (Nielson, 2017, African-American Women: Our Science, Her Magic) As of 2013, 71% of Blacks owned a smartphone, versus 62% of the general population. Greater spending propensities held true regardless of wealth or income. (Nielson, Resilient, Receptive and Relevant: The African-American Consumer, 2013) Researchers at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis tracked 40K families for the years 1989-2013, scoring them 1-5 on a range of financial decisions, ex. saving any amount of money, paying credit cards on time, low debt-to-income ratio. On that scale, Asian families led the back with a 3.12 score, followed by whites at 3.11, Hispanics at 2.71, and Blacks at 2.63. *At higher levels of education, the gap widens:* Asians 3.49, Whites 3.38, Hispanics 2.94, Blacks 2.66. (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, The Demographics of Wealth: How Age, Education and Race Separate Thrivers from Strugglers in Today's Economy, Essay No. 1: Race, Ethnicity and Wealth, February 2015)

Without judging anyone's spending choices, it bears mention some choices amass greater wealth than others. *Past policies caused disparities, but present behavior will not eliminate them.* Even the disbursement of reparations will not fix internal problems, and absent said fixes, disparities will re-emerge. Finally, while successful self-help programs have been carried out, there remains *zero cases* of lagging groups rising to prosperity by demanding cash transfers, preferential educational and employment policies, or apologies for past injustices. Such policies succeed for politicians, but not their voters.

No, the Suburbs Aren't Racist

The "White Flight" Conspiracy Theory

Urban Democrat politicians, unimpeded by local Republicans, have enacted their wish lists unopposed. This produced bankruptcy, rising crime, and diminishing job opportunities for those without college degrees. Seeking a scapegoat, they invented a conspiracy theory blaming the suburbs, specifically their white, presumably Republican, inhabitants. While Princeton professor Kevin M. Kruse didn't invent this story, he raised it to absurd new heights in his 2005 book *White Flight*. He even claims suburbanization itself produced a modern conservatism containing white supremacy as a core doctrine.

Five flaws plague Kruse's thesis. First, non-racial reasons exist to move to a suburb, where one can attend to a city's benefits yet suffer none of the nuisances from crime to corruption to pollution.

Second, the timeframe fails: his story rests on the popular belief that the late 1940s originated suburbs, it depends on those unaware America rapidly built suburbs in the 1920s, a trend paused for two decades by the Depression and the War. And, white flight could just be ethnic succession, seen many times before, but presumed malign because the last, Black-skinned, wave was

visually distinct from those leaving. And what of the reverse? Around 1900, Polish immigrants moved into many Detroit neighborhoods and Blacks moved out. Are Blacks guilty of anti-Polish, and presumably anti-Catholic prejudice?

Third, examining *which whites* fled cities tells us *why* they fled cities. Most "suburbs are racist" hoaxers tell only the aggregate story: Blacks moved into the city, whites moved out. The details tell a different story. An analysis of suburbs 1940-1970 in 70 Northern & Western metro areas shows, per Census Bureau maps, in 1940, the average white urban household lived 3 miles from a Black enclave. For most urban whites, Blacks were an abstraction. By 1970, areas adjacent to Black enclaves became Black, but distant areas stayed white. Only 1/3 of white neighborhoods in 1940s cities bordered Black enclaves. True, *these whites* were over 1/3 of leavers, *but the clear majority of leavers left all-white neighborhoods, selling their old homes to other whites*. All told, "white flight" as described was a thing, but not much of one.

Fourth, we see the same trends in cities of the Plains & Mountain States with minimal Black populations; they grew suburbs at the same time, around cities like St. Paul & Minneapolis, Omaha, Lincoln, Denver, Boise, and Phoenix. (All this and more found in Leah Boustan, "The Culprits Behind White Flight," *New York Times*, May 15, 2017).

The fifth (and insurmountable) hurdle to this story is Black flight, and what *they* declare they fled, namely, they fled the hood and do not appreciate politicians subsidizing the hood to follow them. "The harshest criticism of dispersing public housing's tenants comes not from whites but from Blacks. In Harvey, a struggling, working class African-American suburb south of the city, nearly one of every 10 housing units is already occupied by renters with subsidies." (Alex Kotlowitz, "Where is Everyone Going?" *Chicago Tribune*, March 10, 2002)

Pushback by working and middle-class Blacks "in some cases has been fierce" at public meetings, where Black homeowners "protested, loudly" that they "didn't want 'those people' moving back into their rejuvenated neighborhood." Black homeowners at public meetings "would shout at officials that they'd worked hard to get where they were and that they didn't want to live next door to people who would just tear up their homes. They called them 'project people,' 'lowlifers' and 'freeloaders.'" "Some Blacks feel that 'those people' make it tough on those of us trying to make something of ourselves," says Shirly Newsome, a homeowner in Kenswood-Oakland and a longtime voice of moderation. "That's why white America doesn't want me living next to them, because they look at me and figure I'm from a place like public housing." (Alex Kotlowitz, "Where is Everyone Going?" *Chicago Tribune*, March 10, 2002)

Simplistic "suburbs are racist" narratives fail to capture the nuances of real life. And in any case, self-interest, not white solidarity, motivated the initial moves to the suburbs. White suburbanization owes more to white incomes tripling 1939-1960 than to race, and if one can own a house in a nice area, why not? It symbolized personal success. Later, middle classes of color (TM) moved to the suburbs as well, and to the extent anyone stays in the city, to that extent they aren't their race's middle class. What Kontextless Kevin Kruse calls "white flight" is a conspiracy theory.

But What About Redlining?

I'm glad you asked: for all the time Democrats spend talking about this, *the Democrats did it!* The creation of redlining is explained in Richard Rothstein's book, *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*. In 1933, a

federal housing program to remedy a housing shortage included state-backed segregation; this is where the "projects" come from.

The Federal Housing Administration, established in 1934, refused to insure mortgages in or near Black neighborhoods, aka "redlining," while subsidizing white subdivisions, requiring such homes not be sold to Blacks. The term "redlining" refers to the color-coded maps developed by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for FHA use, coloring anything near Black areas red, "too risky," to insure the mortgages of.

And despite the word "corporation" in "Home Owners' Loan Corporation," it's a government-created monstrosity, making redlining the result of government, not capitalism. (Terry Gross, "A 'Forgotten History' Of How The US Government Segregated America," May 3, 2017, NPR, about Richard Rothstein's book *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*).

Democrats passed the bills making the FHA which did all this; Republicans didn't think it the proper role of government. Yet by the late 1960s, the Kerner Commission's Report shifted the blame to "white racism," party unnamed (Carnes Garraty 811), concealing big government policy caused it, and the guilty party South *and North* that did it.

Capitalism Is Anti-Racist, Socialism Is a Fraud, and Jim Crow Was Big Government in Action
The Democrats' Anti-Capitalist Opposition to Reconstruction Postwar Democrats imposed Black Codes, which required annual employment contracts, banned movement between counties without official permission, and employed "vagrancy" charges to impede hunting for the best wages. Further anti-market measures included huge license fees on out-of-state job recruiters and hefty occupational licensing fees to block Blacks from lucrative professions and opportunities. (Larry Schweikart & Michael Allen, *A Patriot's History of the United States*, 2004, p.367-368) For example, South Carolina required any "person of color" to get a license to do the "business of an artisan, mechanic, or shop-keeper, or any other trade, employment, or business." A license, valid for only one year, cost \$100, or about \$1,818 today. Gun control laws upheld all the above: disarmed means controlled.

Jim Crow Was Government Restriction of the Market, Not the Will of the Market The 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibited private discrimination, leading many to believe Jim Crow sprang from capitalism. Yet Democrats used government to impose Jim Crow, crushing modern narratives about big government "saving" Blacks from "racist" capitalism.

Contract enforcement laws, vagrancy laws, and laws to inhibit migration to better paying jobs all attempted to enact a labor-market cartel, to do what markets wouldn't. Occupational licensing laws, enticement laws, contract enforcement laws, which limited labor market competition to the start of each contract year; vagrancy laws prevented Blacks from seeking the best wage; emigrant agent laws hamstrung labor recruiters, and convict lease upheld it all.

By contrast, Republicans, then as now, championed the free-labor capitalist system, where the laboring man could freely job search and hold out for whatever wages he thought he could get by so doing. (Jennifer Roback Morse, "Exploitation in the Jim Crow South: The Market or the Law?", September 26, 1984, *American Enterprise Institute*)

Competition between white employers and landowners collapsed any purely economic attempts to suppress Blacks. (Robert Higgs, *Competition and Coercion: Blacks in the American Economy, 1865-1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 47-49, 130-131) Black pay and sharecroppers' shares rose, their per capita incomes grew more rapidly than whites over last 1/3 of 19th Century. (Robert Higgs, *Competition and Coercion: Blacks in the American Economy, 1865-1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 102, 117, 144-146)

Non-government suppression failed. Democrats turned to big government Jim Crow. Indeed, the Plessy in *Plessy v. Ferguson* struggled to find a railroad that wanted the law enforced on its railcars, to facilitate a court challenge. (For more, see C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*) Democrats obscure all this, to disguise the culprit was Democrat-controlled government, not capitalism. Democrats also don't want voters knowing Blacks rose under free markets, in spite of persecution, proving big government isn't their salvation now.

Where Did Anyone Get the Idea Jim Crow Was Conservative or Capitalist? Leftists conceal the left-populist anti-market aspects of Jim Crow by hyping the socio-political aspects of exclusion, vote denial, lynching and terror. But only certain socio-political aspects: they omit the gun control, massive election fraud, occupational licensing, emigrant agent laws, vagrancy laws, and antibusiness rhetoric.

Much material also highlights *where* the signs were, in businesses, rather than on *who* made these rules, the government. Cut through the fog by asking what happened to Rosa Parks: Was she merely kicked off the bus? No, she was arrested, indicating a law, indicating government action. Jim Crow is big government.

Adding to this, Numan V. Bartley's *The New South: 1945-1980* details many cases where moderates, fearful of losing Northern investment, undercut segregationist diehards, and with it the narrative of "capitalist" Jim Crow.

Where Did Anyone Get The Idea Capitalism Was Racist or that Socialism Was Anti-Racist? Part 1: Slavery and Capitalism are Opposites DuBois. Everything you hear is basically DuBois, minus "the parties switched," which was a group effort starting in the mid-70s under Jack Bass and Walter DeVries, with efforts from Alexander Lamis and Ed Carmines and James Stimson, which Dan T. Carter then spun off as "history." Nearly all else, and specifically, the narratives that "America" is guilty or that "white people" (party unspecified) are guilty--this is the work of W.E.B. DuBois. More on him later. Let's go chronologically.

Leftists declare capitalism the unrecognized child of slavery, its wealth thus illegitimate. The 1619 Fake History Project trumpets this, on the basis of "scholarship" by Sven Beckert (*Empire of Cotton*), Ed Baptist (*The Half Has Never Been Told*), and Walter Johnson (*River of Dark Dreams*), the so-called New Historians of Capitalism (NHC). This group of "historians" make no substantive critique of capitalism, just arguments by analogy, and focus on superficial parallels like the presence of management techniques, greed, and violence, as though these only existed under capitalism.

Matthew Desmond's idiotic essay for *The 1619 Project* asserts that capitalism grew out of antebellum slavery, ignorant of its real roots in Adam Smith, Richard Cobden, and Frederic Bastiat, who all opposed slavery. Proslavery theorists hated capitalism, especially widely-read antebellum author

George Fitzhugh (who, like the previous three people, goes unmentioned Desmond's essay). Capitalism says no theft, force, or fraud. Slavery involves the first two, thus is definitionally not capitalist. Hence the intersection between free marketers and abolitionism: classical liberalism assumes self-ownership, per John Locke.

The slave South was *in* the capitalist world, not *of* it, trading with capitalists no more makes slavery capitalist than the USSR's trade with the West made the Soviets capitalist. The South never developed a bourgeoisie, a Marxist criterion for the presence of capitalism. If slavery is capitalism, then both sides in the Civil War had the same system, and the war has no cause. Definitions calling slaveholders "capitalists" defending "their property" fall flat; only *they* held that definition of "property." The Founders' ideology, derived from Locke and the Levellers, presumed self-ownership, and where slavery existed it relied on government enforcement, most notably the Fugitive Slave Act and censorship of abolitionist literature in the mails.

Slavery was profitable, but profit didn't necessitate capitalist mentality; were the planter class good capitalists, they'd have branched out into the even more profitable manufacturing. (Larry Schweikart & Michael Allen, *A Patriot's History of the United States*, 2004, p.257) Instead, slaveholders fancied themselves an aristocracy, with an increasing (by the time of the Cornerstone Speech, complete) repudiation of our Founding philosophy, rather than its fulfillment--as The 1619 Fake History Project would claim. With their anti-capitalist mindset, the planter class "grew into the closest thing to feudal lords imaginable in a nineteenth century bourgeois republic." (Eugene D. Genovese, *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy and Society of the Slave South* (New York, 1965), p23, 28, 30) As Professor Gordon Wood put it, "They came closest in America to fitting the classical ideal of the free and independent gentleman." (Gordon Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), 115-116)

Nor did slavery's defenders find the practice "capitalist." George Fitzhugh, the most widely read Southern author of the 1850s, led many in saying the opposite, that Northern capitalism was "wage slavery," treating workers worse than slaves. He likened Northern capitalists to cannibals in his 1857 work *Cannibals All!* Nor was Fitzhugh some irrelevant nobody; Lincoln denounced him as the most irritating defender of slavery, his "House Divided" speech is a response to Fitzhugh, and Fitzhugh's *Cannibals All!* was quoted more in William Lloyd Garrison's *Liberator* than any other pro-slavery author. Fitzhugh has been written out of the curriculum. He prevents Democrats from spinning anti-capitalist slaveholders as akin to modern Republicans. (I'll bet money you can't find a K-12 history textbook used in America today informing kids the most influential slavery defender denounced capitalism).

This anti-market mentality continued under the Confederacy. By 1863 the CSA had direct income taxes, taxes on gold, and had tremendously debased the currency. The CSA's command economy created its own powder works, and 7/8 of Virginia Central Railroad freight was government-related. (Jeffrey Rogers Hummel, *Emancipating Slaves: Enslaving Free Men: A History of the American Civil War* (Chicago: Open Court, 1996), 236-237). The CSA government confiscated all railroads, steam vessels, telegraph lines, and impressed their people for government work, resembling Jefferson's complaints about King George's agents: "He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

Confederates impressed private property for forced payments of increasingly worthless Confederate money. Shortages soon abounded, as in the USSR when they had government-run

everything. Scholar Richard Bense's analysis found the North less centralized and more open than the South, and credits its comparative openness for its victory. (Richard Bense, *Yankee Leviathan: The Origins of Central Authority in America, 1859-1877* (New York: Cambridge, 1990), passim.)

Closing this section, let's add insult to injury: If past slavery in America proves we need to dismantle American systems, then the greater slavery of Latin America proves they need to dismantle all the socialism--the very fact that this argument can be effortlessly turned around on its users proves it is disingenuous of them to use this argument against America

Where Did Anyone Get The Idea Capitalism Was Racist or that Socialism Was Anti-Racist? Part 2: How DuBois' Conspiracy Theories Tying Slavery to "America," All "White People" (Party Unspecified) and "Capitalism" Affected Black Voting Habits And Caused **THE BIG 1930s SELLOUT** Blacks voted over 70% Republican in 1932, but shifted to voting 75% Democrat in 1936, where Blacks remained since. *Black voters switching to Democrats in the 1930s means that Blacks voting Democrat is not about civil rights* (it also proves Black Republicans aren't "sellouts"). The New Deal caused The Big 1930s Sellout, through taxpayer-funded government jobs Democrats created. Most relief programs excluded Blacks and the jobs were second rate, but FDR appeared the best deal available.

Yet this raises more questions. Black voters remained Republican following the 1870s "Long Depression," the 1893 Depression, the 1907 Panic, and the 1921 stock market crash and downturn, so why was 1929-1936 different? As recently as Booker Washington's death in 1915, most Blacks were not big government liberals, so how did that change?

The apparent answer is W.E.B. DuBois, an influential and pernicious mythmaker responsible for any number of ridiculous lies, whose civil rights *bona fides* deserve more scrutiny than they get. For example, DuBois attacks Booker Washington in *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903) over the Atlanta Compromise, ignores that Washington had a weak hand to play, and calls him a sellout.

Yet DuBois proved the real sellout, backing Woodrow Wilson in 1912, who segregated the Federal government and caused a Klan revival. Plus, Booker Washington did more for civil rights than DuBois, denouncing lynching and lobbying Congress to ban both it and racial segregation, while secretly funding lawsuits against Jim Crow measures from vote deprivation to the *Bailey v. Alabama* anti-peonage case. (Robert Norrell, *Up From History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), 83, 392, 406) Meanwhile DuBois achieved nothing for civil rights, while endorsing Wilson and several despots abroad. The shift in Black partisan attitudes regarded the proper role of government, not civil rights, as more Blacks abandoned capitalist Washington for socialist DuBois (though most Blacks favored "more government" rather than outright socialism).

While DuBois was not the first or only Black socialist, forerunners like Peter H. Clark had little impact on Black voting. Others shared DuBois' goals, like Chandler Owens, A. Phillip Randolph and Hubert Harrison ("the father of Harlem radicalism"), and helped further *The Big Losing of the Plot* and compounded *The Big 1930s Sellout*. But DuBois proved most impactful.

Historian James Weldon Johnson said DuBois' affected Black attitudes as much as *Uncle Tom's Cabin* affected the antebellum public; DuBois swayed a once capitalist, conservative, Republican Black electorate away from Booker Washington's outlook. As Historian C. Vann Woodward said of Washington, "The businessman's gospel of free enterprise, competition, and *laissez faire* never had a more loyal exponent." That such a man was viewed as Frederick Douglass' heir proves Blacks weren't

big government liberals before *The Big 1930s Sellout*.

Indeed, Southern Blacks built and ran their own businesses, becoming barbers, undertakers, restaurateurs, shopkeepers, etc. "According to the most conservative estimates, the living standard of the average southern Black more than doubled between 1865 and 1890. But this only made southern whites more angry and vindictive." (Carnes Garraty 540) In 1921 there was Black Wall Street, yet by 1970, Nixon got called racist for advocating the very "Black capitalism" that was once commonplace; DuBois' handiwork paid off.

But DuBois didn't act alone. His narratives echoed throughout some very influential Black press as early as 1928, notably the *Chicago Defender*, "America's Black newspaper" the most widely circulated Black newspaper, even smuggled into the South by Pullman porters (overwhelmingly Black). *Chicago Defender* on October 20, 1928, printed an op-ed "What We Want", following the DuBois line of questioning GOP loyalty, as though it was their fault courts blocked civil rights laws. The *Defender* had broken with the GOP in 1912 by not endorsing Taft, then praised FDR in 1932. Likewise, Robert L. Vann, of "My friends, go home and turn Lincoln's picture to the wall" infamy, ran the *Pittsburgh Courier*. (Chicago Magazine, "How the Party of Lincoln Lost Virtually the Entire Black Vote in 88 Years," Whet Moser, July 29, 2016 <https://www.chicagomag.com/city-life/July-2016/Republicans-Black-Voters>)

Much of the Black press spread DuBois' outlook, planting the seed, whose 1936 blossoming shows Depression woes prompted a rethink of governmental philosophy (1928 snubs from Hoover explain nothing). This shift completed a 49-year project: DuBois tried to pry Blacks away from Republicans as early as 1887, at age 19, while attending Fisk University, saying Blacks should end their "political serfdom" to the Party of Lincoln. (Francis L. Broderick, "DuBois and the Democratic Party 1908-1916." *Negro History Bulletin*, vol. 21, no. 2, Association for the Study of African American Life and History, 1957, p. 41-46) And Daniel Levering Lewis, in his two-volume biography of W.E.B. DuBois, documents repeated pre-1930s attempts to induce defection from the GOP, in both Volume 1 (1993, p. 340), and Volume 2 (2000, 27-28, 246)

Blacks switched in 1936. Nazi deathcamps were discovered just 9 years later, and discredited racism plummeted. Sadly, DuBois' anti-capitalism conterminously infected the civil rights movement. The "capitalism is racist"/"America is guilty" narrative (*The Big Losing of the Plot*) took hold right as the civil rights movement started winning, explaining stalwart Black Democrat loyalty; many believe civil rights and restricting capitalists are an inseparable package deal, a notion that liberal professors happily generate quack "studies" to reinforce.

The very Dubious DuBois produced some quackery of his own, distorting history to recast Blacks as intrinsically anti-capitalist radicals. (How he'd explain capitalist Black Wall Street or Bernie's miniscule Black support, I leave to your imagination; Black opinion could be better characterized as "regulationist capitalism"--DuBois never succeeded in enshrining outright *Socialism per se*.)

In *Black Reconstruction* (1935), he declared Blacks natural opponents of capitalism (its origins allegedly rooted in slavery), which made shirking under slavery akin to shirking within capitalism; he analogized slaves to labor unions, even though abolitionist Republicans were capitalists and contemporary unions excluded Blacks (as did many socialist parties and organizations). Moving Blacks to the big government Democrats entailed hiding all that, so in *Black Reconstruction*, DuBois asserts business interests captured the GOP by 1870, furthering a capitalist system little better than slavery. Yet Democrats did every lynching and created Jim Crow, after running slavery, so how could

Dubious DuBois achieve his goal?

DuBois found his solution in *blaming America*. In *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903), DuBois launched the bogus narrative that "America" was a "guilty nation," ignoring the role of a certain party, and assigning guilt to all "white people." Guilty America needed big government to fix it from being racist, and this scheme needed Blacks to vote Democrat. Democrats still use this silly, pedantic story. The 1619 Fake History Project is but an updated version of DuBois' original hitjob.

After starting the tactic of blaming "America" for slavery in *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903), DuBois dreamt bigger. In *The Negro* (1915), DuBois sold anti-capitalist sentiments, elaborating a vaguely racialized, Pan-African version of Lenin's later *Imperialism* (1917).

Building on this, *Darkwater* (1920) outlines a racialized exploitation/imperialism theory, setting another trend in not only blaming "America," but pretending it's the worst of all countries, calling the South "America's Belgium" vis a vis the Congo (*Darkwater* 34; see also *Darkwater* 50, "No nation is less fitted for this role" & surrounding paragraph). Notably, *Darkwater* mentions no party names, and Lincoln only once. Such obfuscation! And what he despises, previously a regional problem, went national via federalized discrimination, courtesy of Woodrow Wilson, built upon by FDR.

His spoken words spread narratives too. DuBois' Niagara Movement Speech (1905) omits which party did Jim Crow, and attacks capitalism more than the party lynching Blacks. The only party he attacks by name...Republicans! A GOP majority seems to have failed to advance a passable civil rights bill; yet this fails to exonerate Democrats or indict America wholesale.

It gets no better. His speech at the 1949 Scientific and Culture Conference for World Peace in New York expounds an absurd vision of worldwide race struggle, with a rising tide of color & socialism submerging a white capitalist oppressor. (A system that ended more poverty than any other is "white" and "oppressive" apparently!)

That's right, most leftist racebaiting, including the pretend connection between racism and capitalism, and equating socialism with anti-racism: it's all recycled DuBois. It's the work of a guy who endorsed Mussolini, Hitler, Stalin, and Woodrow Wilson, of a guy who achieved NOTHING for civil rights. That's where their ideas come from. Imagine if voters knew that.

Socialism's Long History of Racism and Genocide

Socialism's Racist History: The "Anti-Racism" of Socialism is a Scam Paralleling DuBois' phony narrative in the USA, international socialists invented an imaginary history of racial virtue to match their imaginary economics. Their true history flatters them far less, from Soviet massacres of non-Russians, to CCP oppression of Uighurs and Tibetans today. Others have covered Socialism's general human rights record (or lack thereof), from Robert Conquest in *The Great Terror* (1968) to *The Black Book of Communism* (1997) to R.J. Rummel's *Death by Government* (1994). This is an overview of socialism's ethnic and racial oppression.

Soviet anti-racism was a total sham. Groups the Soviet regime distrusted, including non-white groups like Balkars, Crimean Tatars, Chechens, Ingush, Karachays, Kalmyks, Koreans, and Meskhetian Turks were deported to Siberia during 1940s, causing up to 400,000 deaths. Soviets expressed concern for American Blacks as an insincere ploy, and tried, largely unsuccessfully, to infiltrate and co-opt the Civil Rights movement.

Soviet Russia purged white-but-ethnically-different Ukrainians in the Holodomor, showing the danger of government dependency for your daily bread, as well as the danger of being vilified if politically convenient. As rations fell in urban Ukraine, Soviet authorities thought it most important to...show urban workers agitprop portraying peasants as "counterrevolutionaries" hiding grain and potatoes while the workers, the "bright future" of socialism, starved. Kind of like how urban political machine Democrats tell urban Blacks and Hispanics that the greedy white suburbs are holding out on them and that's why everything is underfunded.

Germans settled in Russia in Czarist days. Soviets arrested and mass murdered these Germans within Russia in...1937. *Before* the war, the Soviets engaged in ethnic cleansing, sentencing 41,898 ethnic Germans to death over claims, likely bogus, of being Nazi agents (I hear Stalin's pretty paranoid). Soviet deported ethnic Germans to Siberia by early 1942, and State Defense Committee Order 7161 interned all able-bodied Germans in the Balkans for forced labor in USSR.

Poles fared even worse. The Soviets NKVD Order No. 00485 mass arrested Poles, sentencing 111,071 to death. The mass killing of hundreds of thousands of Poles in the USSR, Ukrainian SSR, and Belorussian SSR, arguably meets definition of a genocide.

Turning now to China, the Chinese Communist Party, which has killed more people than Hitler, sent 500,000 Tibetans into forced labor camps. The CCP also engaged in (and still engages in) widespread mass detainments and torture, complete with ironically-named "Patriotic Education" consisting of mandatory criticism sessions of the Dalai Lama, complete with signed denouncements (Chinese soldiers compelled American POWs of the Korean War to do the same about the United States). China's government, which has killed more people than Hitler, is also moving large numbers of Han Chinese into the region, doing to Tibet what Mexico's government does to the American Southwest.

The Uighurs fare no better. A Muslim minority Democrats don't care about (because there's no way to slam Trump with them) the Uighurs are an oppressed people in Northwestern China, whose government has killed more people than Hitler. As Democrats deemed detention centers for border cheaters "concentration camps," the Chinese Communists, who have murdered more people than Hitler, moved multitudes of Uighurs into *actual* concentration camps. Under the pretext of "fighting radical Islam" and "counter-terrorism," the Chinese Communist Party, which has killed more people than Hitler, terrorizes Uighurs and demolishes mosques and attempts to turn them from Islam altogether. To do so, the CCP, which has murdered more people than Hitler, uses Uighurs as a test-run for police state surveillance tech they then install in the rest of China. A Chinese tech firm called Megvii developed facial recognition tech to help the CCP government--which has murdered more people than Hitler--identify Uighurs. A company called Bohai Harvest RST held investments in Megvii, and on Bohai's board sat a "gentleman" named...Hunter Biden.

The "Socialism is Anti-Racist" Scam: How the Very Very Very Racist Socialists Rebranded Themselves as Anti-Racism Crusaders Race has always been part of socialist thought. George Watson in his 1998 book *The Lost Literature of Socialism* documents all this and more, and concludes "From Engels' article in 1849 down to the death of Hitler, everyone who advocated genocide called himself a socialist."

Marxist theory saw an inexorable trail from feudalism to capitalism to socialism to communism.

Karl Marx noted in 1853 in the *New York Tribune* that: "The classes and the races, too weak to master the new conditions of life, must give way." Watson spells out that Marxists thought that people stuck in feudalism like Slavs, "as well as Basques, Bretons and Scottish Highlanders" could not progress straight from feudalism to communism. They would have to be exterminated so as to not hold the rest back. "They were racial trash, as Engels called them, and fit only for the dungheap of history," Watson says.

From the horse's mouth, we have Friedrich Engels writing in 1894 to German economist Walther Borgius "We regard economic conditions as that which ultimately determines historical development, but race is in itself an economic factor." In his 1877 Notes to Anti-Duhring, Engels observed "that inheritance of acquired characteristics extended...from the individual to the species." Engels continued, "If, for instance, among us mathematical axioms seem self-evident to every eight-year-old child and in no need of proof from evidence that is solely the result of 'accumulated inheritance.' It would be difficult to teach them by proof to a bushman or to an Australian Negro." And mind you, this was 16 years before Francis Galton wrote in Macmillan's Magazine urging eugenics.

In the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Friedrich Engels blasts the Austrian Empire's rural population for failing to back 1848 revolution: "Among all the large and small nations of Austria, only three standard-bearers of progress took an active part in history, and still retain their vitality---the Germans, the Poles, and the Magyars. Hence they are now revolutionary. All the other large and small nationalities and peoples are destined to perish before long in the revolutionary world storm. For that reason they are now counter-revolutionary." "The Austrian Germans and Magyars will be set free and wreak a bloody revenge on the barbarians." "The next world war will result in the disappearance from the face of the earth not only of reactionary classes and dynasties, but also of entire reactionary peoples. And that, too, is a step forward."

Josef Stalin loved Engels' article, praising it in his 1924 work, "The Foundations of Leninism." Now we know where the Ukrainian genocide came from.

Nor was Engels the only pre-Stalin socialist to love mass-killing. Western socialists like H.G. Wells, Jack London, [Henry] Havelock Ellis, and Sidney and Beatrice Webb, among others, loved the idea of exterminating alleged inferiors. (*No wonder so few socialists were moved to abandon socialism by the mass killings of Stalin.*) H.G. Wells, socialist and eugenics-loving racist, wrote in his 1902 work "Anticipations of the Reaction of Mechanical and Scientific Progress upon Human life and Thought: "There is a disposition in the world, which the French share, to grossly undervalue the prospects of all things French, derived, so far as I can gather, from the facts that the French were beaten by the Germans in 1870, and that they do not breed with the abandon of rabbits or negroes." He added, "I must confess, I do not see the Negro or the poor Irishman or all the emigrant sweepings of Europe which constitute the bulk of the American Abyss, uniting to form that great Socialist Party."

Eugenics-loving anti-Semitism, far from "right-wing," ran wild in socialist circles. *The most remarkable things about Hitler today were the least remarkable things about socialists of his time.* Most eugenics supporters were self-described progressives and socialists. And it could hardly be otherwise: academic-led movements seldom include many conservatives or Republicans, then or now. Eugenics relies upon (distortions of) Charles Darwin, who conservatives never cared for anyway. (A well-known American Eugenics Society decal declares "Eugenics is the Self-Direction of Human Evolution"). Also, conservatives, particularly religious ones, view the world as inherently imperfectible, view man as by

nature sinful and fallen, and believe that only so much can be done to alleviate the world's ills beyond ending obvious oppression. Progressives and eugenicists saw mankind in scientific rather than cosmic and theological terms, and thus as perfectible, not only in his institutions, but in his genetics. But modern progressives remain determined not to own up to past mistakes, or past historical figures with beliefs in common. For example, one Herr Hitler comes to mind.

Hitler shared his love of eugenics with many Western socialists. Take the statements of Karl Pearson, protege of Francis Galton and a socialist, among many many others. In fact, Pearson proved so committed a socialist that he declined knighthood when so offered in 1935. Regardless, read these statements, and ponder, if you had to blindly guess who said them, you'd think they were from *der Fuhrer*, no?

Karl Pearson wrote in 1925, in the first issue of a journal he founded called *Annals of Eugenics*, that Jewish immigrants to Britain "will develop into a parasitic race...Taken *on the average*, and regarding both sexes, this alien Jewish population is somewhat inferior physically and mentally to the native populations." (Karl Pearson and Margaret Moul, "The Problem of Alien Immigration into Great Britain, Illustrated by an Examination of Russian and Polish Jewish Children," *Annals of Eugenics*. 1 (2): 125-126) Pearson continued: "My view--and I think it may be called the scientific view of a nation, is that of an organized whole, kept up to a high pitch of internal efficiency by insuring that its numbers substantially recruited from the better stocks, and kept up to a high pitch of external efficiency by contest, chiefly by way of war with inferior races." (Karl Pearson, *National Life from the Standpoint of Science*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1901. pp.43-44) Pearson goes on: "History shows me one way, and one way only, in which a high state of civilization has been produced, namely, the struggle of race with race, and the survival of the physically and mentally fitter race. If you want to know whether the lower races of man can evolve a higher type, I fear the only course is to leave them to fight it out among themselves, and even then the struggle for existence between individual, between tribe and tribe, may not be supported by that physical selection due to the particular climate on which probably so much of the Aryan's success depended." (Karl Pearson, *National Life from the Standpoint of Science*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1901. pp.19-20)

Pearson was joined by British socialists Sidney and Beatrice Webb. The Webbs, writing in the *New Stateman* in 1913, bemoaned falling birthrates among "higher races," warning "a new social order [would be] developed by one or other of the colored races, the Negro, the Kaffir or the Chinese."

The National SOCIALIST Adolf Hitler declared: "I have learned a great deal from Marxism as I do not hesitate to admit." Hitler explains that while he rejects many of their obtuse theories, he copied the way their ideology colonized all the institutions of civil society, comparing Marxists favorably to the bourgeois traditionalists and Social Democrats, whom he considered weak and tepid. (Adolf Hitler, as quoted in Hermann Rauschning, *The Voice of Destruction*, New York: NY, G.P. Putnam's Sons (1940), p. 186) Hitler also says in his youth he "never shunned the company of Marxists," and thought while a "petit bourgeois Social Democrat [or trade unionist] will never make a National Socialist...the Communist always will" (Adolf Hitler, as quoted in Hermann Rauschning, *The Voice of Destruction*, New York: NY, G.P. Putnam's Sons (1940), p.131) Also, "the whole of national socialism was based on Marx." He didn't merely mean his contempt for capitalism or tradition; Hitler copied the concentration camps and secret police from USSR.

In his memoir written in 1947, "Commandant of Auschwitz: The Autobiography of Rudolf

Hoess," Hoess recounts that Germans knew of the USSR program of forced-labor-as-extermination as early as 1939. "If, for example, in building a canal, the inmates of a [Soviet] camp were used up, thousands of fresh kulaks or other unreliable elements were called in who, in their turn, would be used up." Per George Watson, the Germans collected info and marveled at the "Soviet readiness to destroy whole categories of people through forced labor." Indeed, at Nuremberg, Stalin sent Andrey Vyshinsky, orchestrator of the 1936-38 purges to steer Nuremberg investigators away from lines of inquiry that would reveal the Germans knew of, and copied, Soviet practices.

Nor do distinctions between Nazi and Communist atrocities make much sense: Stalin's whites (Russians) killed other whites of different ethnic background (Ukrainians). Germans and Jews were both white. It cannot be said one is racist and the other isn't, because all involved were white. True, Hitler killed Asian Gypsies, but so too did Stalin kill or forcibly relocate Asian Tatars of Crimea. If Hitler counts as a racist par excellence, so does Stalin, busting Marxist claims they're "anti-racist." Returning to Jews, Hitler's hatred of Jews was partly rooted in his idea that the Jewry invented capitalism. "How," asked Hitler, "as a socialist, can you not be an anti-Semite?" Hitler had a welfare state, detailed in Gotz Aly's 2008 book *Hitler's Beneficiaries: Plunder, Racial War, and the Nazi Welfare State*. Plunder from conquered territories funded it, and captured people did forced labor.

"Anti-Zionism," or, "Hating the Jews, Soviet Style": How the Soviet Union Invented the Label Used by Jew-Haters and Israel's Enemies Today

"Anti-Zionism," a cute way to say anti-Semitism, was created by the Soviets to do just that. Soviet anti-Semitism--as official policy, not merely the personal prejudices of Russians in general--further undercuts claims that Marxism-Leninism and National *Socialism* exist at opposite ends of the spectrum. Lenin and Stalin made contradictory public statements and policies. Lenin in theory condemned anti-Semitism, then issued orders to forcibly impress Jews into the front lines of fighting.

"The policies on the Ukraine" in Autumn 1919: "Jews and city dwellers on the Ukraine must be taken by hedgehog-skin gauntlets*, sent to fight on front lines and should never be allowed on any administrative positions (except a negligible percentage, in exceptional cases, and under [our] class control)" -- Alexander Nikolaevich Yakolev, *Time of Darkness, Moscow, 2003, ISBN 5-85646-097-0* p 207. Letter includes footnote by Lenin, who instructed to "use a politically correct wording like "Jewish petty bourgeoisie" (*Russian expression "Ezhovy rukavitsy," this can also be translated as "ruled by iron fist")

Stalin started campaigns against antisemitism in the Red Army and workplaces and banned incitement against any ethnicity in Soviet law, then reversed himself when convenient to trot out antisemitic arguments against Trotsky. In Stalin's Russia, they called their own Jew-hatred "anti-Zionism" to create a fake difference with Nazi anti-Semitism.

Stalin saw anti-Semitism/anti-Zionism as linked with anti-Westernism, as two sides of the same anti-cosmopolitanism coin. To Stalin, Jews and the West (and related capitalism) shared a money-making obsession driving disloyalty to all else. This mirrors Hitler's assertion that Jews invented capitalism, and echoes Marx's claim the Jew's religion is "huckstering" and that "his God is money." Jews endured charges of "groveling before the West," aiding "American imperialism," "slavish imitation of bourgeois culture," and "bourgeois aestheticism."

Subordinates shared Stalin's opinions. In East Germany for example, the SVAG (Soviet

Military Administration in Germany 1947-48) possessed a "growing obsession" with presence of Jews in administration, especially in Cadres Department's Propaganda Administration. (Norman M. Naimark, *The Russians in Germany: A History of the Soviet Zone of Occupation, 1945-1949*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap of Harvard UP, 1995, 338)

After the claimed "Doctors Plot" (most of the accused doctors were Jewish), the Soviets cracked down on "rootless cosmopolitanism," for "corrupting" Soviet movies, music, and literature. It reminds one of the charges made against rock and roll, though in the US, the fringe blamed communists rather than Jews. But Back in the USSR (you see what I did there?), state-controlled mass media put the real names of Jewish writers in parentheses to out them as ethnic Jews to the public.

Stalin's personal views seem less about Jews per se and more a transference of everything he hated about Trotsky. The feelings of the Man of Steel about the Chosen People aside, Stalinist-originated "anti-Zionism" acquired a life of its own. Zionism, the Soviets claimed, imitated Nazi racism, and thus merited study, which they called "Zionology." The USSR's "Zionologists," like Yuri Ivanov, wrote books with titles like "Beware! Zionism," warning: "Modern Zionism is the ideology, a ramified system of organizations and the practical politics of the wealthy Jewish bourgeoisie which has closely allied itself with monopoly circles in the USA and other imperialist countries. The main content of Zionism is bellicose chauvinism and anti-communism." Many such books "exposing" Zionism were mandatory reading for Party members. Third Edition of 30 volume Great Soviet Encyclopedia, published 1969-1978, claims the following:

>"the main posits of modern Zionism are militant chauvinism, racism, anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism"

>"the anti-human reactionary essence of Zionism" is "overt and covert fight against freedom movements and against the USSR"

>"International Zionist Organization owns major financial funds, partly through Jewish monopolists and partly collected by Jewish mandatory charities", it also "influences or controls significant part of media agencies and outlets in the West."

>"serving as the front squad of colonialism and neo-colonialism, international Zionism actively participates in the fight against national liberation movements of the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America."

>"A natural and objective assimilation process of Jews is growing around the world"

"In late July 1967, Moscow launched an unprecedented propaganda campaign against Zionism as a "world threat. Defeat was attributed not to tiny Israel alone, but to an "all powerful international force."...In its flagrant vulgarity, the new propaganda soon achieved Nazi-era characteristics. The Soviet public was saturated with racist canards. Extracts from Trofim Kichko's notorious 1963 volume, *Judaism Without Embellishment*, were extensively republished in the Soviet media. Yuri Ivanov's *Beware: Zionism*, a book essentially [that] replicated *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, was given nationwide coverage." (Howard Sachar, *A History of the Jews in the Modern World*, (New York: Knopf, 2005) p. 722)

The mass media "all over the Soviet Union portrayed the Zionists (i.e. Jews) and Israeli leaders as engaged in a world-wide conspiracy along the lines of the old Protocols of Zion. It was,

Sovietskaya Latvia wrote 5 August 1967, an 'international Cosa Nostra with a common centre, common programme and common funds' (Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews* (1987), p575-576) Johnson and other historians also contend UN General Assembly Resolution 3379 of 10 November 1975 was orchestrated by the USSR. The resolution equated "Zionism" with "racism"...inadvertently also proving that calling things "racist" that aren't actually racist is a trick conjured up by Communists.

BUT WAIT! THERE'S MORE! "...By its nature, Zionism concentrates ultra-nationalism, chauvinism and racial intolerance, excuse for territorial occupation and annexation, military opportunism, cult of political promiscuousness and irresponsibility, demagoguery and ideological diversion, dirty tactics and perfidy... Absurd are attempts of Zionist ideologists to present criticizing them, or condemning the aggressive politics of the Israel's ruling circles, as antisemitic... We call on all Soviet citizens: workers, peasants, representatives of intelligentsia: take active part in exposing Zionism, strongly rebuke its endeavors; social scientists: activate scientific research to criticize reactionary core of that ideology and aggressive character of its political practice; writers, artists, journalists: fuller expose anti-populace and anti-humane diversionary character of propaganda and politics of Zionism..." (Highlights in original) >"From the Soviet Leadership," *Pravda*, 1 April 1983 (front page)

The Soviets created the Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public to spread ridiculous Jew-hating pronouncements (while calling enemies "Nazis" and "Fascists" without any sense of irony). The Soviets even blamed Israel for the Ugandan hostage crisis, Soviet media claiming "Israel committed an act of aggression against Uganda, assaulting the Entebbe airport." (Newspaper *Novoye Vremya*, cited in Valispanoraam 1981 (*Foreign Panorama* 1981), (Tallinn, 1981) p. 156)

Soviet Zionologists claimed secret ties existed between Nazis and Zionist leaders. (Yes, you read that correctly). Mahmoud Abbas, PLO leader and President of the Palestinian National Authority, earned his degree in...the Soviet Union! Abbas earned a "history" degree at Oriental College in Moscow, his doctoral thesis entitled "The Secret Connection between the Nazis and the Leaders of the Zionist Movement." Indeed, "Abbas claimed in his work that the Zionist leadership was interested in convincing the world that a large number of Jews were killed during the war in order to 'attain larger gains' after the war and to 'divide the booty.' Abbas' primary claim in his thesis is that the Zionist movement and its various branches worked hand in hand against the Jewish people, collaborating with them for the Jews destruction because the Zionist leaders viewed 'Palestine' as the only legitimate place for Jewish immigration." (History News Network - Was Abu Mazen a Holocaust Denier? 28 April 2003.)

Instead of keeping his thesis secret, Abbas got it published as a book in 1984, titled "The Other Side: The Secret Relationship Between Nazism and Zionism."

The Left wing's long history of anti-Semitism continues with Jeremy Corbyn's Labour Party in the UK, and with anti-Semites like Ilhan Omar and Rashida Tlaib in the United States, and the anti-Semites who made the "Women's March" like Tamika Mallory. Rising Leftist anti-Semitism is a throwback, not a fluke. Added to Hitler's central economic planning, it debunks the "Nazis are right-wing" hoax. (More on this in *Meta-Narrative #2: The "Nazis" Narrative*)

Before World War 2, one would be hard-pressed to find non-Soviet-aligned persons claiming the Nazis were "right-wing." But after the death camps came to light, Western Marxists soon distanced themselves from former-Soviet-ally Hitler via a more elaborate "Nazis are right wing" hoax,

itself the work of three communist academics named Richard Hofstadter (set the stage by spinning social Darwinism as "capitalist" and eugenics as "right-wing"), Theodore Adorno, and Herbert Marcuse. They and their followers soon constructed a parallel myth that their Marxist brand of socialism had a record of civil rights triumph. But Marxists themselves achieved little if anything for civil rights, and Reconstruction-era Republicans (conservative and capitalist, then as now) originated the concept of civil rights. Marxists have capitalized on an unearned reputation, which they ironically owe to the Southern Democrat claims that communists controlled the civil rights movement.

Marxists did not control, and achieved little for, the real civil rights movement. *They did, however, realize the potential of wrapping their failed economic policies in civil rights rhetoric, and in propping up a variety of more recent fake civil rights groups, who call for different things than the actual civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s.* (For more, see the Black Lives Matter platform that calls for abolishing capitalism and the nuclear family, goals that are completely unrelated to reforming the police).

Marxists realized that class divisions aren't enough to destabilize society. Class isn't predestined in free capitalist societies, as people better themselves over time, unless totally irresponsible or extremely unlucky. So Socialists turned to racial divisions. A man can stop being poor, but a Black man cannot stop being Black, hence the potential for permanent division. Furthermore, few people can be roused by being told their great-great-grandparents were poor, but they can be inflamed by learning their great-great-grandparents were slaves in the very society in which they presently live.

Hence Marxists, just like the Democrats with their Magical Switching Parties Conspiracy Theory, have decided to not only sweep their own history under the rug, but to invent conspiracy theories that capitalism is somehow racist. Compounding all other lies, they smear anyone who notices as a "Fascist," and a "Nazi." The canard of "right-wing" Nazis was taken up by the broader left-wing of the spectrum in the USA, which, baselessly and ruthlessly employed it as a bludgeon. This false narrative crumbles next.

*
*
*
*
*

META-NARRATIVE #2: THE "NAZIS" NARRATIVE

Contemporary Frame-Ups & Hitjobs: Fascism is Not Right-Wing, and the Alt-Right Is Not Conservative---Part 1: The Original Fascists Were Not Right Wing

Fascism Is Left Wing in the Role of Government

Fascists and Nazis weren't "right-wing."

Rejecting the Founding Fathers' classical liberalism, they thought rights, insofar as they existed, came from the state. Giovanni Gentile, the leading Fascist thinker, stated: "Everything in the state, nothing outside the state, and nothing against the state." (A. James Gregor, *Giovanni Gentile: Philosopher of Fascism* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2008), 63)

Also, "For Fascism...the State and the individual are one" (Giovanni Gentile, *Origins and Doctrine of Fascism* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2009) Also, "The authority of the state is not subject to negotiation. It is entirely unconditioned. It could not depend on the people, in fact,

the people depend on the state. Morality and religion...must be subordinated to the laws of the state."

Fascism is a "total conception of life...One cannot be a Fascist in politics and not a Fascist in school, not a Fascist in one's family, not a Fascist in one's workplace." (Giovanni Gentile, *Origins and Doctrine of Fascism* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2009), 28, 31, 55, 57, 67, 87)

And Gentile was no outlier. Mussolini affirms Gentile's centrality: "It was Gentile who prepared the road for those like me who wished to take it." (A. James Gregor, *The Ideology of Fascism* (New York: Free Press, 1969), 223) Reagan and Trump favor individualism, liberty, and free markets, Gentile favored collectivism, communitarianism, and corporatism. So Fascism isn't conservative.

Likewise National *Socialists* hated capitalism, accused Jews of inventing it, had central planning (by the Reichswirtschaftministerium), public works and autobahns as stimulus, price controls and wage controls. Contra Reaganism and Trumpism, the Nazis made a welfare state (Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt, NSV, National Socialist Peoples' Welfare) and disbanded private charities, thus closing down any alternatives. Gotz Aly documents all this and more in *Hitler's Beneficiaries: Plunder, Racial War, and the Nazi Welfare State*.

Also, anyone with secret police and death camps can hardly be likened to small government American right-wingers (though some do try!) *Indeed, it's hard to name another self-declared "socialist" party that anyone denies is socialist.*

Adding insult to injury, *Hitler called the Jews "privileged," most inconvenient for those calling foes "privileged" today:* "The deduction from all this is the following: an antisemitism based on purely emotional grounds will find its ultimate expression in the form of the pogrom. An antisemitism based on reason, however, must lead to *systematic legal combating and elimination of the privileges of the Jews*, that which distinguishes the Jews from the other aliens who live among us (an Aliens Law). The ultimate objective [of such legislation] must, however, be the irrevocable removal of the Jews in general." (Adolf Hitler, letter to Herr Adolf Gemlich (September 16, 1919), cited in Eberhard Jackel (ed.), *Hitler. Samtliche Aufzeichnungen 1905-1924* (Stuttgart, 1980), pp. 8890. Translated by Richard S. Levy; H-German Website. Found at jewishvirtuallibrary.org/adolf-hitler-s-first-anti-semitic-writing)

This hardly resembles American conservatism, which despite Leftist smears revolves around conserving America's founding principles and the permanent, enduring truths that undergird free societies. Conservative individualism opposes the collectivism favored by both German Nazis and American Leftists---what is Nazism but the German version of identity politics, plus some central economic planning?

America's Founders built a system to subordinate politicians and bureaucrats to morality. The Left wants to subordinate morality to politicians, bureaucrats, and their craptivists, hence their seething hatred for the Founding. "But slavery! But racism!" they say. I got news for you: Leftists were pushing the "living document" theory as long ago as Woodrow Wilson, *long before they even pretended to care about any of that.* It's not the real reason, merely today's excuse. Tune in tomorrow for tomorrow's excuse.

As to isolated contemporaneous quotes declaring Hitler or Mussolini to the "right" of somebody, remember that Europe's entire political spectrum is 1) considerably to the Left of the US spectrum and 2) divided on a different basis. European conservatives defended an alliance of throne and altar. The partisans of the French Revolution sat on the left side of the French National Assembly,

and those more inclined to defend the king sat on the right. But what does that even mean in an American context, where conservatives relentlessly quote anti-monarchists Jefferson and Madison? American conservatives *defend a revolution* and status quo it established, one of less government, low taxes, individual liberty and economic liberty, and maintaining the common culture that supports all the above. They have nothing in common with fascists, who are collectivists (fascism literally translates as "group-ism") and aim to elevate the government over everything. In fact, as long as we're going to play this game, the Left has more in common with fascism than anyone they smear as fascist.

For example, the Left loves FDR and the New Deal.

But you know who else admired the New Deal?

Hitler.

FDR, Democrats, Progressives, and their Great Love for Mussolini, or "IF IT'S THE END OF THE WORLD THAT DAVID DUKE PRAISED TRUMP, WHAT DO YOU CALL HITLER ENDORSING FDR AND THE NEW DEAL?"

FDR and Mussolini had a mutual admiration society, writing adoring letters to each other. Mussolini praised FDR's book *Looking Forward*, calling FDR a fellow Fascist.

Nazi Party paper *Volkischer Beobachter* also liked FDR's book: "Many passages in President Roosevelt's book could have been written by a National Socialist. One can assume he feels considerable affinity with the National Socialist philosophy." (*Volkischer Beobachter*, May 11, 1933; Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *Three New Deals* (New York: Henry Holt, 2006), 19.)

As late as 1940 Josef Goebbels insisted Nazi and New Deal policies were alike, including an article titled "Hitler and Roosevelt: A German Success--An American Attempt," lamenting democracy impeded the New Deal's completion. (Thaddeus Russell, *A Renegade History of the United States*, 2010, p.242-243)

Anne McCormick, in the *New York Times* of May 7, 1933, wrote FDR's inauguration "is strangely reminiscent of Rome in the first weeks after the March of the Black Shirts." And FDR "envisages a federation of industry, labor and government after the fashion of the corporative state as it exists in Italy." FDR's Brains Trust visited and took notes on Fascist Italy, and one of them, Rexford Guy Tugwell, called Fascism: "the cleanest, neatest, most efficient operating piece of social machinery I've ever seen. It makes me envious." (Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *Three New Deals* (New York: Henry Holt, 2006), 32; Rexford G. Tugwell, "Design for Government," *Political Science Quarterly* 48 (1933), 330)

Further, "Mussolini certainly has the same people opposed to him as FDR" though "he has the press controlled so they cannot scream lies at him daily." (Thaddeus Russell, *A Renegade History of the United States*, p.250) Leading progressives like Ida Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens, Horace Kellen, Charles Beard, Herbert Croly, George Soule, William Pepperell, and Philip La Follette, among others, praised Mussolini. Some, like Gertrude Stein, Lawrence Dennis and W.E.B. DuBois, even praised Hitler. Methinks fighting Fascists in WW2, *after they already attacked us*, would be unnecessary absent their cheerleader-aided rise in the first place.

Now, if Fascists and Nazis were "right-wing," "conservative," or "capitalist," how come there's no record of them praising FDR's Republican, conservative, capitalist opponents the same way they praise FDR, nor any record of FDR's Republican, conservative, capitalist opponents sending advisors to copy Fascist Italian economic policies, and what's with the parade of American progressives cheering Fascists

and Nazis?

That's just one of many things we're not supposed to notice.

Likewise, I know we're not supposed to notice Hitler youth Magazine *Will and Power* praised FDR, and Nazi-controlled *Berlin Illustrated Magazine* featured heroic photo spreads of FDR, and praised "the fascist New Deal." (James Whitman, *Hitler's American Model* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017), 6)

And I know we're not supposed to notice that Nazi newspapers praised Roosevelt, such as on May 11, 1933, when Nazi newspaper *Volkischer Beobachter* praised FDR in an article called "Roosevelt's Dictatorial Recovery Measures," and delighted in his "carrying out experiments that are bold. We too, fear only the possibility that they might fail. We, too, as German National Socialists are looking toward America."

Also, the June 21, 1934, edition of *Volkischer Beobachter* declared, "Roosevelt's adoption of National Socialist strains of thought in his economic and social policies" caused the National SOCIALIST much delight. (Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *Three New Deals* (New York: Henry Holt, 2006), 18-19)

And I know we're not supposed to notice Hitler's effusive praise for Roosevelt. Hitler told a NY Times correspondent: "I have sympathy for Mr. Roosevelt because he marches straight toward his objectives over Congress, lobbies and bureaucracy." (John Toland, *Hitler* (New York: Anchor Books, 1992) 312.)

IF IT'S THE END OF THE WORLD THAT DAVID DUKE PRAISED TRUMP, WHAT DO YOU CALL HITLER ENDORSING FDR AND THE NEW DEAL?

And I know we're not supposed to notice that Harold Ickes (FDR's Interior Secretary) declared "What we're doing in this country are some of the same things that are being done in Russia and even some things that are being done under Hitler in Germany"

And I know we're not supposed to notice that Mussolini, hearing of the National Industrial Recovery Act declared "Ecco un ditatore," aka "Behold a dictator!" (Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *Three New Deals* (New York: Henry Holt, 2006), 28, 33; James Whitman, "Of Corporatism, Fascism and the First New Deal," 1991, Faculty Scholarship Series, Yale Law School)

And I know we're not supposed to notice that the National Recovery Administration was run by Hugh Johnson, who loved Mussolini and handed out pamphlets by Mussolini to FDR's cabinet and tried to get them to read it.

And I know we're not supposed to notice that the National Recovery Administration issued a pamphlet, *Capitalism and Labor Under Fascism*, which stated "the fascist principles are very similar to those which have been evolving in America." (John P. Diggins, *Mussolini and Fascism: The View From America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 280)

And I know we're not supposed to notice that Roger Shaw, a progressive writing in *North American Review*, the NRA "plainly an American adaptation of the Italian Corporate State."

And Shaw was right. Roosevelt and company enacted the National Industrial Recovery Act, which cartelized all the economy into trade associations encompassing business, labor, and government bureaucrats. These "Code Authorities," under which bigger businesses had more votes, got to set prices, quantity of production, quality of production, and accounting practices, all with the government's permission, and in fact, blessing. FDR lovers call it "recovery." The Italians did the exact same thing, just they called it "Fascism," their equivalents to "Code Authorities" were called

"corporatives," and the Nazi German equivalents were called "industrial cartels." (Thaddeus Russell, *A Renegade History of the United States*, p.245)

Everybody at the time knew what was up. Why has this been buried?

Which political party benefits from this being buried?

It wouldn't happen to be the SAME PARTY SMEARING EVERYONE AS A NAZI TODAY, would it?

The Reason for the Affinity: Nazis, FDR, and Mussolini Had Similar Economic Policies

Wolfgang Schivelbusch wrote a book called *Three New Deals*, about how all three (New Deal, Fascism, Nazism) "centralized power, all put a new class of planners in charge of the productive wealth of society, restricting the operations of the free market; and all used modern propaganda techniques to rally the masses in the name of collective solidarity." (Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *Three New Deals* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006)

Fascism is a third way between international socialism and free market capitalism; government control of private ownership, a central plan ruling private property. The oft-repeated claim Fascists let the capitalists rule contradicts what we know of Hitler and Mussolini. Are we to believe they wanted to control peoples' very thoughts, but not the national economy? Fascism is more than merely an active government within a framework of capitalism. It forces the capitalists to operate within its own framework, for the goals that Fascists want.

"Fascists opposed both international socialism and free market capitalism, arguing that their views represented a third position." (Cyprian Blamires and Paul Jackson. *World Fascism: A Historical Encyclopedia, Volume 1*. ABC-CLIO, 2006. pp.404, 610>>>George Watson, 22 November 1998, "Hitler and the socialist dream", *The Independent*) In Fascism, the government plays favorites regarding companies that get subsidies and investment, not the passive regulatory role seen elsewhere. (James A. Gregor, *The Search for Neofascism: The Use and Abuse of Social Science*, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p.7)

Fascist Italy's Government-Run Economy

Mussolini's original platform, outlined by the *Fasci di Combattimento* in Milan, 1919, included universal suffrage, voting at 18, abolishing the senate, mandating an 8 hour workday, massive public works programs, worker participation in industrial management, nationalization of defense industries, old age/sickness insurance, confiscation of uncultivated land, progressive taxation, anti-clerical bans on religious instruction in schools/appropriation of religious institutions' property. However, Mussolini never had absolute power in the way Hitler or Stalin did. The King, Victor Emmanuel III, had power to depose him, and eventually did. Mussolini cut deals with the Church because he had to, not because he wanted to (he was an atheist). At the height of his power, he grabbed control over industrial and finance activity. After his fall from power, Hitler had Skorzeny and his commandos to free Mussolini, and installed him as ruler in Salo, in German-held Northern Italy. As his own man, able to enact what he pleased, what did Mussolini do? He enacted what he called "true socialism," blaming "plutocratic elements and sections of the clergy" for his previous inability to do so. This new platform of November 1943 called for state takeover of energy, raw material, social services, indeed everything but savings and private homes, with a public sector run by management committees, inclusive of workers. Some wanted

more. His advisor Ugo Spirito wanted to abolish private property. *Il Duce* kept interesting company. His closest advisor in Salo, Nicola Bombacci, was a onetime acolyte of Lenin, and in 1921, cofounder of the Italian Communist Party. (Dennis Mack Smith, *Mussolini* (New York: Vintage Books, 1982), 312)

"But privatization!" shout the Marxist-inspired narrative pushers, who for the sake of their self-righteous terrorizing of God-fearing tax-paying Americans *need Fascism to be "right-wing."* Alas, "privatization" is a smokescreen. Practical control means more than formal ownership. Who gave the orders? Who made the central economic plans they had to follow? The Fascist *governments*. Fascism is *big government*.

Despite early moves, "once Mussolini acquired a firmer hold of power...*laissez-faire* was progressively abandoned in favor of government intervention, free trade was replaced by protection and economic objectives were increasingly couched in exhortations and military terminology" (Patricia Knight, *Mussolini and Fascism*, Routledge, 2003, p.64) Cartels, *istituti or enti nazionali*, combined representatives from government and major business to finesse and manipulate prices and wages in a cartel-like fashion rather than let the market decide. Mussolini bailed out banks during a deflation crisis that started in 1926, rescuing financial houses like the Banco di Roma, Banco di Napoli, Banco di Sicilia. "In 1933, Mussolini created the Istituto par la Ricostruzione Industriale (IRI) with the special aim of rescuing floundering companies. By 1939, the IRI controlled 20% of the Italian industry through government-linked companies (GLCs), including 75% of pig iron production and 90% of the shipbuilding industry" (Martin Blinkhorn, *Mussolini and Fascist Italy*, 2nd edition, New York: NY, Routledge 1991, p.26) Public works spending tripled, aiming to stimulate the economy, overtaking military spending as the largest item. (Nicholas Farrell. *Mussolini: A New Life*, Sterling Publishing, 2005. p.233) By 1939, Italy had the next highest percentage of state-owned enterprises after the Soviet Union. (Patricia Knight, *Mussolini and Fascism*, Routledge, p.65) Academic Marxists spin, twist and contort, trying to make that "capitalism!"

Nazi Germany's Government-Run Economy

Nazi Germany had central economic planning, price controls, wage controls, and Hitler accused the Jews of inventing capitalism. National Socialism's 25 Point Platform called for nationalization of large corporations and trusts, government control of banking and credit, seizure of land, prosecution of bankers and lenders for "usury," abolition of "unearned income," more pensions, and universal free healthcare. Remove references to "Germans," "Versailles Treaty" and "Jews," and it passes for a Bernie Sanders platform. Contra Robert Paxton, brothers Otto and Gregor Strasser didn't draft this platform alone. Hitler and the Strassers together created it, and Hitler at no point repudiated the 25 Point platform. Hitler's later dispute with the Strassers--causing Otto's exile and Gregor's purging on the Night of the Long Knives--wasn't over whether to have socialism, but whether socialism or national liberation came first. (Volker Ullrich, *Hitler* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2016), 193)

Whereas the 25 Point Platform wasn't followed to a T, it's true enough that the National Socialists implemented central economic planning. The Reichswirtschaftministerium (Reich economic ministry), put the German economy on a series of Four Year Plans (like Stalin's Five Year Plans, another parallel between both forms of Socialism). Adam Tooze's book *Wages of Destruction* details central planning in Nazi Germany, and its dismal results. Price controls and bureaucratic meddling caused shortages and rationing. Hitler thought economics obeyed ideology: "The nation

does not live for its economy, for economic leaders, or for economic or financial theories; on the contrary, it is finance and the economy, economic leaders and theories, which all owe unqualified service in this struggle for the self-assertion of our nation."

Joseph Goebbels held no illusions about the systems of the Nazis' enemies proclaiming "England is a capitalist democracy," whereas "Germany is a socialist people's state." Nazi propaganda portrayed Britain as a capitalist plutocracy. Goebbels also declared in 1925: "It would be better for us to end our existence under Bolshevism than to endure slavery under capitalism." (Goebbels speech, "England's Guilt," blaming the war on Britain's "capitalist warmongers" asserting "English capitalists want to destroy Hitlerism")

All hullabaloo over "privatization" in Italy and Germany ignores the matter of who gave orders and who had to take them. The central planners gave the orders, private businesses took them. In an actual *laissez faire* economy, businesses are free to chase profits rather than mandates from planners. Evaluate also Hitler's statement: "Why need we trouble to socialize banks and factories? We socialize human beings." He means that by socializing the people, he had by implication socialized the banks and factories.

Just to keep piling on, let's hear it from the horse's mouth:

"It is not Germany that will turn Bolshevist, but Bolshevism that will become a sort of National Socialism. Besides, there is more that binds us to Bolshevism than separates us from it. There is, above all, genuine, revolutionary feeling, which is alive everywhere in Russia except where there are Jewish Marxists. I have always made allowance for this circumstance, and given orders that former Communists are to be admitted to the party at once. The *petit bourgeois* Social-Democrat and the trade-union boss will never make a National Socialist, but the Communist always will." (Adolf Hitler, as quoted in Hermann Rauschning, *The Voice of Destruction*, New York: NY, G.P. Putnam's Sons (1940), p.131)

"But we as National Socialists wish precisely to attract all socialists, even the Communists; we wish to win them over from their international camp to the national one." (Otto Wagener, in *Hitler--Memoirs of a Confidant*, editor, Henry Ashby Turner, Jr., Yale University Press (1985), p.26)

"After mastering its internal divisions, National Socialist Germany has proceeded step by step to cast off its enslavement...Nevertheless, the **Jewish-international capitalists** [notice the blaming Jews for capitalism] in connection with socially reactionary classes in the Western States have successfully roused the world democracies against Germany." (Adolf Hitler, New Year's Proclamation to the National Socialists and Party Comrades, January 1, 1940--Speeches)

"The worker in a capitalist state--and that is his deepest misfortune--is no longer a living human being, a creator, a maker. He has become a machine. A number, a cog in the machine without sense or understanding. He is alienated from what he produces" (Joseph Goebbels, "Those Damned Nazis", a 1932 pamphlet)

Finally, the National *Socialists* warred with trade unions as a facet of their war on the Marxists who controlled the trade unions. It's no endorsement of capitalism, but another parallel between the two socialisms; Marxist governments persecuted independent unions (for more, see the Polish *Solidarity* movement). Ironically, the only places permitting independent trade unions...capitalist countries!

The Nazi Welfare State

The Nazis created a welfare state, Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt (NSV, National Socialist Peoples' Welfare), whose chairman Erich Hilgenfeldt was to "see to the disbanding of all private welfare institutions" to ensure only Nazi-approved folks got money. (Martina Stever and Bernhard Gotto, *Visions of Community in Nazi Germany: Social Engineering and Private Lives*, Oxford: UK, Oxford University Press, 2014, p.2, p.92) NSV was declared the party welfare organ on May 3, 1933, with Eric Hilgenfeldt as leader. The NSV provided old age insurance, rent supplements, unemployment & disability benefits, old-age homes, interest-free loans for married couples, and healthcare insurance, (Gotz Aly. *Hitler's Beneficiaries: Plunder, Racial War, and the Nazi Welfare State*. New York City, New York: Metropolitan Books, p.50) By 1939, 17 million Germans received assistance, and the agency "projected a powerful image of caring and support." (Richard J. Evans, *The Third Reich in Power, 1933-1939*. New York City, New York: The Penguin Press, p.489) "We and we alone [the Nazis] have the best social welfare measures. Everything is done for the nation." (Goebbels, in editorial April 30, 1944. cited in Victor Klemperer, *I Will Bear Witness: A Diary of the Nazi Years, 1942-1945*, Vol. 2, Random House, Inc., 2001, p.317) The NSV had 4.7 million members, and 520,000 volunteer workers. (Wolf Gruner, *Public Welfare and the Persecution of Jews: Interactions of Local and Central Politics in the Nazi State (1933-1942)* Oldenbourg Verlag, 2009, pp.30-31 [cited on wiki, original is in German])

A similar *Winterhilfswerk* (Winter Support Programme) was created, funded by an annual charity drive run through NSV, its slogan "None shall starve or freeze." The drive was "voluntary," in the sense that authorities put non-donor names in the paper instead of compelling them to cough up cash at gunpoint.

NSV spending rose from 640.4 million Reichsmarks in 1938 to 1.395 billion Reichsmarks by 1941, sustained by plundering Jews and foreigners as the war raged. (Gotz Aly. *Hitler's Beneficiaries: Plunder, Racial War, and the Nazi Welfare State*. New York City, New York: Metropolitan Books, p.163) The American Military Government forcibly disbanded NSV after the war, under a decree called "Law Number Five," which disbanded not only NSV, but all sub-organizations linked to the Nazi Party.

Central planning, price controls, wage controls, a welfare state, accusing the Jews of inventing capitalism...and Democrats want you to think that's "right-wing!"

Nazis Weren't Social Conservatives: They Hated Christianity and the Deathcamps Were Based on Eugenics Which is Based on [distortions of] Darwin

Nazis weren't social conservatives, but revolutionaries, not just by self-declaration, but in fact. Their proposed society wasn't "reactionary," as Marxists claim, because by definition a "reactionary" proposes to restore something that actually existed. No historic German precedent exists for their platform--their invocations of the Teutonic Knights and Frederick the Great were more aspirational than directional--but precedent exists in socialist thought for their deeds. Indeed, it's hard to find eugenics supporters who weren't self-described socialists or progressives, on either side of the Atlantic.

Conservatives in general doubted the Darwin that eugenicists built upon; insofar as any Republicans believed eugenics, they were progressive Republicans. Academics, short on Republicans even then, led the trend of fawning over eugenics, the very eugenics which the American Eugenics Society once called "the self-direction of human evolution." The strongest opposition arose from conservative Christians. Eugenics also assumes human perfectibility, notions dubious to

conservatives then or now. (While Eugenics has its roots in Charles Darwin's nephew Francis Galton, I don't claim anyone can draw a straight line from Darwin to the Holocaust).

The Nazis' Lebensborn project let SS men impregnate as many German girls as they wanted, at government expense. The Left draws parallels between the Nazis and the Religious Right, yet it's hard to imagine Moral Majority supporting that.

The Nazis knew old-time religion doubted eugenics. They schemed to undercut it. Planned Nazi Wehrbauer settlements in Eastern Europe didn't include churches, and Himmler warned he'd destroy them if built: "Unlike Medieval farming villages, the Wehrbauer communities were planned to not have any churches. Himmler stated that if the clergy were to acquire money to construct churches on their own in these settlements, the SS would later take the buildings over and transform them into 'Germanic holy places'" (from Wikipedia "Wehrbauer," citing Felix Kersten, *The Kersten Memoirs, 1940-1945*. Hutchinson(1957), 136)

The Nazis Hated Christianity and Planned to Exterminate It. The Marxists Leave This Part Out To Pretend Nazis Are Social Conservatives

If Hitler was a Christian, why did the National SOCIALIST Party plan to wipe out German Christianity? "The outline, "The Persecution of the Christian Churches," summarizes the Nazi plan to subvert and destroy German Christianity, which it calls 'an integral part of the National Socialist scheme of world conquest.'"

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/01/13/weekinreview/word-for-word-case-against-nazis-hitler-s-forces-planned-destroy-german.html>

Hitler was not a Christian, much less a conservative one. This is a ridiculous lie invented by communists and contradicted by the historical record. For example, how can Hitler have been a Christian when his endgame planned the destruction of the churches in Germany?

It's all outlined in the Nuremberg Project, a website presented by the Rutgers Journal of Law and Religion. It includes the papers one William J. "Wild Bill" Donovan, "special assistant to the US Chief Prosecutor at the Nuremberg Trials. His collections contain a document from July 6, 1945, titled "The Nazi Master Plan: The Persecution of the Christian Churches," summarizing the Nazi plan to subvert and destroy German Christianity, an aim which it calls "an integral part of the National Socialist scheme of world conquest." "

Puzzling only those who thought Hitler was Christian, Hitler said Christianity "systematically cultivated...human failure." "Pure Christianity...leads quite simply to the annihilation of mankind; it is...wholehearted Bolshevism under a tinsel of metaphysics." (Adolf Hitler, *Table Talk 1941-1944: His Private Conversations* trans. by Norman Cameron and R.H. Stevens, ed., by H.R. Trevor-Roper (London, 2000), 51, 146)

Hitler wanted to annihilate Christianity, and had a plan for that. "The best thing is to let Christianity die a natural death," Hitler told Himmler, early in the war. "The dogma of Christianity gets worn away before the advances of science. Religion will have to make more and more concessions. Gradually, the myths crumble. All that's left is to prove that in nature there is no frontier between the organic and the inorganic. When understanding of the universe has become widespread, when the majority of men know that the stars are not sources of light but worlds, perhaps inhabited worlds like ours, then the Christian doctrine will be convicted of absurdity." (Adolf Hitler, *Table Talk 1941-1944: His Private Conversations* trans. by Norman Cameron and R.H. Stevens, ed., by

H.R. Trevor-Roper (London, 2000), 59-60)

Leftists quote Hitler's *Mein Kampf* endorsing Christianity, as though *pre-election Hitler* is a credible witness, as though pre-election Hitler isn't *contradicted by what Hitler actually did with power!* For more, look up: "Mit brennender Sorge," "Kirchenkampf," or "Positive Christianity" and tell me with a straight face that Hitler's a "Christian." Whereas Hitler made a Concordat with the Catholic Church, he broke it almost immediately, preventing their private schools from functioning, then muzzling priests. A dismayed Pope issued *Mit Brennender Sorge*, to be read from the pulpits, critiquing Nazism. The Nazis didn't take it well. (Ian Kershaw, *Hitler: 1889-1936: Hubris* (New York, 1999), 474-475, 478) The National *Socialists* incessantly subverted the churches, from melting down their church bells to closing the churches under spurious wartime pretexts such as being too far from bomb shelters.

Nazis concocted their own knock-off version of the faith called "positive Christianity," which declared Jesus a Nordic hero who'd led a revolt against the local Jewry, whose message was subsequently diluted by the Jewish "Paul of Tarsus." (Needless to say, you won't find any of that in the Bible.)

Several Nazis were convicted at Nuremberg of "encouraging and promoting" abortions in Eastern Europe, obliterating the analogies to abortion opponents in the United States. (

<http://www.ewtn.com/library/prolife/nazipopu.txt>,

http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1047&context=lusol_fac_pubs)

Hitler's antisemitism was based on Eugenics, not Christianity or Luther (as some fools suggest). You know, Eugenics, the "self-direction of human evolution?"

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Eugenics_Conference#/media/File:Eugenics_congress_log_o.png

The world's protagonists, in Hitler's vision, were not the Christians, but the Aryans. The Bible says nothing of Aryans or Furchers, and "Bible Thumpers" vehemently opposed eugenics, for it directly contradicts all things Christianity ever taught. But the Nazis built their worldview around it. Nazism doesn't focus on saving people from their sins, but on jettisoning the very morality that calls anything "sin" at all, because it stands in the way of the master race. As Goebbels said, "National Socialism is applied biology."

Hitler's eugenics led to the Lebensborn program, to let the best SS men impregnate as many young German women as possible--allegedly to raise German genetic quality (I suspect it doubled as a payoff for being Party toughs). In any case I can't picture Jerry Falwell or James Dobson getting behind that.

Then there's Jurgen Stroop. Surely a Christian movement would expel him, not task him with suppressing the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. For those unfamiliar with who Jurgen Stroop is, he's the guy in this iconic picture.

(http://www.gettyimages.com/detail/news-photo/reich-persecution-of-jews-poland-1939-45-warsaw-ghetto-news-photo/545734225?esource=SEO_GIS_CDN_Redirect) "During the early 1920s, Stroop joined the *Tannenbergbund* and embraced Germanic neo-paganism under the influence of General Erich Ludendorff and his wife Mathilde. He later recalled that Mathilde Ludendorff "revealed the truth about the Catholic Church in Germany and returned us to the true Germanic gods. By recalling the pure, pre-Germanic ways, she pointed out the rottenness of the Judeo-Christian ethic and showed

how the organized Church had been strangling the Reich for twelve hundred years." Stroop further recalled, "It was thanks to what I was lucky enough to learn from her books that I was able to rid myself of religious prejudice and mark *Gottglaubig* [a] in the column concerning belief." [b] In another conversation with Moczarski, Stroop called Catholicism, "a catch-all of religions, infected with Judaism." [c] He further claimed that Christianity was created as a Jewish conspiracy for "the weakening and debasement of man through guilt." [d]"

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J%C3%BCrgen_Stroop#Paganism [a] translates literally as "God-believing," in a more practical sense, a "theist" or "deist," believing a deity but rejecting organized religion. [b] Kazimierz Moczarski (1981), *Conversations with an Executioner*, Prentice Hall, pages 33-34; [c] Kazimierz Moczarski (1981), *Conversations with an Executioner*, Prentice Hall, pages 57-58; [d] Kazimierz Moczarski (1981), *Conversations with an Executioner*, Prentice Hall, page 58)

All told, the "Hitler as conservative Christian" trope seems to have become widespread to serve the presentist needs of George W. Bush-era Democrats, and rests on next-to-nothing in real, first-hand, primary sources.

How the "Nazis Are Right-Wing" Hoax Was Begun, And What Rhetorical and Framing Tricks Does it Rest Upon?

Three communists started the Nazis-are-right-wing hoax. The first, Richard Hofstadter, wrote *Social Darwinism in America* (1944), in which he redefined social Darwinism as *laissez faire*, never mind Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776) predates Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859) by 83 years. Taking Herbert Spencer's phrase "survival of the fittest," and citing basically the one guy to defend capitalism that way (William Graham Sumner), Hofstadter began the hoax, obfuscating social Darwinism's links to eugenics, Progressivism, and the political Left. Others would soon complete the task by distorting the political science of what comprises Fascism.

The second communist hoaxer, Herbert Marcuse, was hired postwar by the US government for insights in combatting Nazism. Marxist Marcuse quickly poisoned our discourse, spinning Nazism as a form of conservatism, spinning it as capitalism plus moral traditionalism. In his later essay "Repressive Tolerance," he says anyone he defines as "fascist" can be denied free speech, a pretext for deplatforming and thuggery today.

Theodore Adorno, the third communist hoaxer, created the fraudulent F-scale, a measurement still included in many psychology textbooks...which omit that Adorno was a Marxist with an ax to grind. The F-scale, which scores all right-wingers as latent fascists by using slanted questions to get slanted results, is 1) *not based on anything fascists actually said or did*, 2) can't explain why fascism arose in Italy or Germany instead of England or France, and 3) actual Fascists wouldn't score particularly high on his test, which omits what best defines Fascism: support for centralized state control of everything and disdain for both individualism and limited government.

Plus, branding traditional morality as latent fascism implies perversion fights fascism, which explains the 1960s. This (and Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization*) drives liberals' belief that traditional morality represses freedom, as they repress the real freedom of their less wanton opponents. The kicker is Nazis and Fascists were pretty licentious themselves, from the Lebensborn Project to Hitler's live-in girlfriend he married only days before the end. Himmler had a mistress, Goebbels had rampant affairs, and Mussolini was, well, Mussolini.

Politically, Democrats buried past problems. FDR, who corresponded with Mussolini, spun

hard, saying Fascism was "ownership of government by an individual, group, or by any other controlling private power." (Franklin D. Roosevelt, "Message to Congress on the Concentration of Economic Power," (Speech, April 29, 1938)

That would be news to Giovanni Gentile and Mussolini. Portraying fascism as right wing relies on hiding the details that define fascism. We're told its traits: authoritarianism, militarism, extreme nationalism, etc, but not its contents or inventors. Adam Smith defines capitalist thought, Karl Marx defines socialist thought, but who defines fascist thought?

Giovanni Gentile does, but he swooned over the centralized state too much to be spun as "right-wing," so the Left buries him from view, calling others "fascist" so viciously that most cower instead of demanding definitions. An honest person would first understand a group's goals on its own terms, and *only then* decide where on the political spectrum to classify them. The Left instead goes *criteria shopping*, crafting *fake definitions* to make their "Fascism is right wing" claim become "true" by playing games with words, fake definitions centered on dictatorship, authoritarianism, nostalgia, or nationalism.

But Fascism is a *specific philosophy*, with *specific philosophical content*, not some term for generic dictatorship, generic authoritarianism, generic nostalgia, or generic nationalism.

One common lie diagnoses Fascism as simply intense nationalism. Yet Fascism is *not* simply "nationalism." Joan of Arc, George Washington, Charles De Gaulle, and Gandhi were nationalists, yet none of them were fascists. The 19th Century revolutions ousting monarchs and creating democracies were nationalist too, debunking the neoliberal corporate media's talking point that "it's nationalism and authoritarianism vs open borders/lots of immigration and democracy." If anything it's "national autonomy and democracy vs. unelected anti-democratic bureaucrats of the European Union and United Nations and their allied human trafficking NGOs," but who's asking?

Fascism is *not* simply militarism. Many leaders for millennia have been militarists without being fascists.

Fascism is *not* simply authoritarianism. Just like militarism, many leaders, from the god-kings of Sumeria, to the Caesars of old Rome to the absolute monarchs of Europe have certainly been authoritarian, yet none of them were fascist.

Nor is Fascism a combination of all of the above. Such a combination would prove unpleasant to live under, but not necessarily Fascist.

A rejection of both conservative industrial capitalism and hyper-left Bolshevik Communism, Fascism was invented in Europe after World War 1 as a "third way," one that restrained capitalism while rejecting Marxism, one that imposed government control while retaining private property (which does not alone capitalism make).

Marxists call Nazis the tools of big business. Yet Nazis were primarily funded by their own members. Business got on board *after* Nazis already had power. (Stanley Payne, *A History of Fascism* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), 168)

Other canards fail too. Privatization existed, but was "applied within a framework of increasing control of the state over the whole economy through regulation and political interference", for example, the 1933 Act for the Formation of Compulsory Cartels, put the state in control, ending a largely self-regulatory 1923-1933 that the Weimar Cartel Act of 1923 had made.

Tirades against "plutocrats" joined central planning, as "Fascists opposed both international

for white people."

Nor are they right-wing 'extremists,' because an 'extremist' believes in a *more extreme version of the SAME views* (for instance, anarcho-capitalists are *laissez faire* extremists), not in divergent views regarding where values come from, their opinion of the American Founders, individualism, collectivism, the rule of law, or free market economics.

Ponder also their left-wing origins. Jason Kessler of Charlottesville infamy once supported Obama and Occupy Wall Street. ("Jason Kessler," Southern Poverty Law Center profile, splcenter.org) His ex-girlfriend Laura Kleiner, who dated him in 2013, says Kessler was very liberal. "He broke up with me, and a lot of it was because I was not liberal enough...I am a very progressive Democrat, but he didn't like that I ate fish and that I'm a Christian." (Chris Suarez, "Kessler Described as One-Time Wannabe Liberal Activist," August 17, 2017, dailyprogress.com) Such a transition seems newsworthy, yet few cover it. It's like he's a plant and the press knows it. (Sarcastic speculation! Don't "fact-check" me on that.)

Jewish genes present on both sides of his family, Andrew Aurenheimer coedits the *Daily Stormer*. And Andrew Anglin, a onetime vegan atheist rainforest activist who dated Filipina women and wore a hoodie saying "F*CK RACISM" on it, who railed against Christian missionaries, and said the white race should be bred out...now also coedits the *Daily Stormer*. No one knows how, and few seem interested.

Other strange groups include the World Church of the Creator, which despite the name, is an atheist organization. Most white nationalist groups are. Only Jared Taylor seems even vaguely conservative in any traditional sense. Polite and well-spoken even if wrong, it's hard to picture him leading a mob.

First the Matter of Abortion

The alt-right is not conservative, and that's according to the alt-right. Their position on abortion, for example, amounts to "it's only bad if white people have them," and they view white families who adopt as race traitors. But don't take it from me, take it from Richard Spencer:

"I think that some people who are...in the alt-right want to believe that the anti-abortion crusade is just inherently traditionalist, that it is about making women take responsibility for their children, that it's going to make women become mothers whether they like it or not...I am a bit skeptical of this view that abortion would have inherently traditionalist consequences....And so the anti-abortion crusade becomes this 'human rights' crusade. And if you look at the writing of people like Ramesh Ponnuru (of National Review) it is directly associated with this...that every being that is human has a right to life and so on. Well that's not how we think as identitarians, to be honest. You are part of a community, you're part of a family, you're part of a collective. You do not have some human right, some abstract thing given to you by God or by the world or something like that. You're part of a community and that's where you gain your meaning or your rights. The anti-abortion crusade is often associated with family, the traditional family, but to be honest it's descended into not just a human rights dogma but a kind of dysgenic "we are the world" dogma...The most popular propaganda line for the pro-life movement is about "black genocide," how this is "destroying black communities" and indeed is a racist plot by Margaret Sanger and so on. This gets to something that I think is a bigger point, and that is the alt-right or identitarians, we can't think about these issues in this

kind of good or evil binary. We actually have to think about an issue like abortion...in a complicated manner, something that the issue deserves." "I would say that it is the unintelligent and blacks and Hispanics who use abortion as birth control, as a kind of late-term birth control...We should recognize that the pro-life movement--this is not the alt-right, this has nothing in common with identitarians, and I think we should be genuinely suspicious of people who think in terms of human rights and who are interested in adopting African children and bringing them to this country and who get caught up on this issue. We want to be a movement about families, about life in a deep sense, not just "rights" but truly great life, and greatness, and beautiful, flourishing productive families. We want to be eugenic in the deepest sense of the word. Pro-lifers want to be radically dysgenic, egalitarian, multi-racial human rights thumpers--and they're not us."

Alymer Fisher wrote a column for fellow alt-righters against "the pro-life temptation" as well. Returning to Spencer, he also had a tweet, at 3:36PM, March 8, 2019: "Trumpism was the fantasy that America can we [sic] saved. Yangism is the awareness that it can't." Aside from the bizarro world in which he'd endorse someone like Yang, since when does a real conservative give up on America? Likewise, @NickJFuentes, 8:55PM, March 12, 2019: "Understanding Yang Gang: 1. The country is doomed 2. The rules don't matter 3. We might as well get \$1,000 a month."

Then the Matter of Their Governmental Philosophy

Dinesh D'Souza interviewed Richard Spencer in his film *Death of a Nation*, and his same-named book has parts of the interview on pages 268-270. Mr. Spencer's theory of government differs from both the Founders and Republicans. The latter two believe in God-given rights, individualism and limited government, but Mr. Spencer declares that God-given rights are false, that rights come from the collective, whose will manifests in the state, and he wants a white-ethnostate with a powerful government. *Only* in favoring immigration limitations does he overlap with Republicans.

Far from unusual, online alt-righters dismiss public policy explanations of continued Black lag, retorting that socialism can't ail urban Blacks because it works in Scandinavia, therefore genetics. Yet their socialism is arguably not "socialist" (Denmark's prime minister in 2015 denied this, blasting Bernie Sanders for claiming it) and their lavish social spending only "works" because the US military pulls most of the weight in NATO.

Prioritizing genes over culture (when not declaring culture a proxy for race), the alt-right echoes the leftist smear that conservatives saying "culture" secretly mean "race," as though values resonate in our pigment rather than our minds. In contrast, conservatives believe cultures arise from, and rest upon, values, and that these values often have underpinnings in traditional religion.

Factual issues also plague such claims. Germans, primitive in Roman times, produced our future moon rocket designers at NASA. Europeans in general dominated invention, yet who would have predicted this as recently as 1400 A.D., as they lagged Arabs and Chinese? Or take the Japanese, once startled at the technology introduced by Commodore Perry's expedition, yet tech leaders today. Genetic explanations explain neither; inherently superior groups would never have lagged. Only political, legal, and cultural explanations work.

Long story short, your results are better if you're 1) English-speaking/former English colony, 2) Christian, especially Protestant, 3) Capitalist. For instance, compare African countries that are Christian against those that are Muslim, and as for comparatively being behind Christian Europe,

Christianity's introduction beyond the African coast is only about a century or so old, give it time.

In another, semi-related note, the supposed Kalergi Plan is a hoax: the UN and internationalists despise the West because they hate freedom and individualism, not because they hate whites *per se* (though for them, whites are a proxy for the hated ideals themselves). Also, with regard to the two Kalergi quotes the Alt-Righters throw out: *it's not a plan, just a prediction*. Read the quotes again, more carefully.

Dubious Citations of Irrelevant Endorsements

If it's election time, prepare to see David Duke, the only recognizable name provably associated with both Republicans and the Klan. The liberal media ignores much of his past. Duke was an American Nazi before 1975, a Democrat 1975-1988, in the Populist Party 1988-1989, a Republican 1989-1999, in the Reform Party 1999-2011, again Republican 2016-present. A dabbler in five different parties, it strains credulity to say he "defines" any of them, least of all a Republican party that rejects him.

Yet if we must play this game, Duke was a Democrat when he was in the Klan (1974-1980), running in several Democrat primaries in the 70s and 80s...which always gets omitted, can't imagine why. Let's also speculate some: Duke's gambling problems led to a 15-month federal prison sentence for defrauding backers. Maybe his problems endure and he's a useful idiot for cash? After all, he plays along when mentioned at election time, there must be a reason.

And who endorsed who? Unless Trump endorsed Duke, it's a nothingburger. Yet if we must play this game, Nazi papers praised FDR's New Deal, communist dictator ("democratic socialist") Hugo Chavez praised Obama's campaign, and the Castro regime endorsed Hillary Clinton. At home, Lester Maddox and George Wallace (who stayed Democrats) endorsed Jimmy Carter. Who asked him to disavow? Plus Duke never had Maddox- or Wallace-level influence, making it a far more meaningful question.

More broadly, the Klan at large is a pathetic group, with a few thousand members nationally--at most. No evidence exists they voted for Trump, and if one reads their postings (I did so you don't have to), Klansman and associated acts say Trump was compromised by Zionists and NeoCons, and by Ivanka's Jewish husband Jared Kushner. What is more, *actual* white supremacists increasingly embrace the doctrine, pilfered from Marxists, of *accelerationism*, or the belief that the system they oppose can be made to collapse under the weight of its contradictions, if only the extremists violently chip away at it. Thusly, said hooligans believe Trump or any other right-wing populists can't reform the "Jewish" system, and that right-wing political *failure* is necessary for whites to see their plight and join the racists' side.

Ultimately, the endorsements of the confused are irrelevant: If Neo-Nazis really wanted to hurt Blacks, they'd vote for Democrats, whose pro-abortion, gun banning, and school voucher opposition disproportionately damage Blacks. But those are the kind of disparate impacts liberals don't care about, because it doesn't fit the prepackaged narrative.

In closing, the key import of THE "NAZIS" NARRATIVE is the idea that 1) Nazis are right-wing and 2) that the right-wing, if Leftist institutions are curtailed in any way, will install Nazism or equivalent. Yet, what the Left actually fears is democracy, with an *unherded electorate*, a *real* democracy, as opposed to their *media-directed democracy*.

*

*

*

META-NARRATIVE #3: THE "FREE MARKETS BAD"

NARRATIVE

Capitalism Cures Poverty: Poverty Reduction, Income Growth, Consumption Growth, Workweek Shortened

Capitalism Cures Poverty: More People Have Been Lifted Out of Poverty by Capitalism Than Any Other System

Capitalism lifted more people from poverty than any other system in history. Poverty fell, incomes grew, consumption grew, all as workweeks shortened; the pre-*laissez faire* world failed to achieve this.

Some blame capitalism for poverty, but poverty is the default condition of humanity from prehistoric times. The real question is why anyone is NOT poor. If capitalism caused poverty, the countries with the most capitalism would have the most poverty. But the opposite is true. Capitalism cures poverty. The countries with the freest markets have the richest average citizens. The countries with the most government control of the economy--or a recent enough history of it--have less affluent citizenries. If the rich being rich caused the poor to be poor, the nations with the most millionaires would have the poorest workers. Yet the United States has the most millionaires and the highest average living standards in the world. Free market capitalism unleashes human potential by protecting peoples' right to keep what they work for.

80% of the world lived on less than \$1 per day in 1820. Now, that figure is a mere 20%. 200 years of capitalism did more for humanity than thousands of years of big government in the form of emperors, lords, kings, bureaucrats, central planners and social justice warriors. *Capitalism even rebuilt the West after two World Wars and still left people ahead of where they started in 1820.* Improvement was unrelenting. The global rate of extreme poverty (\$1.90 a day) fell by half from 1990 (1.85B) to 2010 (767M).

The same story prevailed within the USA: "Real GNP per capita advanced at an average rate of 2 percent per year, and on the eve of World War I it stood at about three times the 1865 level. Total output expanded even more astoundingly: real GNP grew at an average rate of more than 4 percent per year, increasing about eightfold over the period." (Robert Higgs, *The Transformation of the American Economy* (1971), p. 19) Nor did this solely benefit the rich. "The average annual income (after inflation) of non-farm workers grew by 75% from 1865 to 1900, and then grew another 33% by 1918." (U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States* (1976), series D726 and D736 pp 164-5.) This data uses constant 1914 dollars, eliminating inflation/deflation, also factoring in unemployment. Straight per capita income doubled in this period. The United States by 1895 became the world leader in manufacturing output, surpassing Great Britain. (Fareed Zakaria. *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role*: Princeton University Press, 1999, p. 46)

Mass production and resulting economies of scale lowered prices for consumer goods, while rapidly developing rail networks diminished transportation costs. The average American's living standards skyrocketed, access increased to modern conveniences from automobiles to record players to telephones, all as workweeks shortened and the number of man-hours to earn basic necessities plummeted.

This all occurs before the Federal Reserve, before the New Deal, before the World Wars gutted

our rivals, before the Great Society, before any of the 3-letter agencies that we're told the sky will fall if we try to cut their budgets, before any of that. Free markets and sound money created Americans' longer lives and a rising middle class.

These facts contradict Leftist teachers, and explain why America never had a late-1800s Marxist revolution--no one revolts against higher wages and more stuff. In fact, the very existence of a middle class debunks Karl Marx, who said the rich would get richer and the poor would get poorer as capitalism dragged on. The Left hides this, starting the story in the middle, claiming the New Deal created the middle class, ignoring pre-1930s wage rises, or that the USA surpassed Britain as the world's richest nation by 1905, long before Progressives even showed up to claim credit.

Laissez faire drove rising prosperity; the know-it-all played no role. Income per capita starts its rise as capitalism starts (1790s-ish onward), outpacing even the record population growth. (http://stevereads.com/img/per_capita_income_great_divergence_from_farewell_to_alms.png) It so happens, when producers can keep the fruits of their labors, lo and behold, they produce! Many Europeans liked this more than confiscatory taxation and overbearing European governments, coming here in droves (leaving only the authoritarians behind by the looks of it). Even today, the average American lives better than the average European; our freer markets got us richer in 200 years than thousands of years of know-it-all-ism ever got Europe. (Daniel J. Mitchell, "International Data on Living Standards Show that the United States Should Not Become More Like Europe") (<https://www.cato.org/blog/international-data-living-standards-show-united-states-should-not-become-more-europe> , citing National Accounts of OECD Countries, Volume 2012 Issue 1, Table 18 - Actual individual consumption per head at current prices and current PPPs, index; the USA also has the highest net adjusted disposable income per capita, highest average household net wealth in OECD (<https://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/countries/united-states/>)

Marxists commonly retort per capita statistics can be distorted by the rich. But consumption statistics, which a few rich people cannot distort, affirm the same story: Free markets lifted average people from poverty. Consumption of goods and services dramatically grew. And confirming all the above, note which way the immigration traffic flowed, and still flows. People flee socialism to capitalism for a reason.

The Raw Wage Numbers Have Not Recently Stalled

Wages did not stagnate, though mass immigration stymied wage growth (if it's not so, why's the Chamber of Commerce for unlimited immigration?) and rising taxes at all levels of government combined with bracket creep (inflation pushing people into higher tax brackets), creating the impression of decline. Also, those saying wages flatlined since the 70s aren't counting benefits as part of their wage math. Harvard economist Robert Lawrence analyzed this, defining benefits as part of "wages," and finding no divergence 1970-2000. (Divergence begins in 2003, when China entered the World Trade Organization.)

The Left uses "median household income" to deem wages stagnant, posing a problem: "Income comparisons using household statistics are far less reliable indicators of standards of living than are individual income data because households vary in size while an individual always means one person. Studies of what people actually consume—that is, their standard of living—show substantial increases over the years, even among the poor, which is more in keeping with a 51 percent increase in real per capita income than with a 6 percent increase in real household income. But household

income statistics present golden opportunities for fallacies to flourish, and those opportunities have been seized by many in the media, in politics, and in academia." (Thomas Sowell, *Economic Facts and Fallacies*, Second Edition, 2011, in Chapter 5)

The narrative pushers know exactly what they're doing: "Sometimes such conclusions arise from statistical naivete but sometimes the inconsistency with which the data are cited suggests a bias. Long-time *New York Times* columnist Tom Wicker, for example, used per capita income statistics when he depicted success for the Lyndon Johnson administration's economic policies and family income statistics when he depicted failure for the policies of Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush. Families, like households, vary in size over time, from one group to another, and from one income bracket to another."

Long story short, per capita incomes show a sizeable rise, consumption statistics prove a sizeable rise, most strugglers ought to blame bad government policy, not markets. Other scapegoats make little sense; oft-blamed Reaganomics didn't long outlast Reagan, who never managed to get Congress to abolish any agencies. But stalling government growth did help average people; contra *The Narrative*, income per capita (even for minorities) rose during the Reagan years. (

<http://www.russellsage.org/sites/all/files/chartbook/real-median-individual-income-by-race-med.jpg>)

*
*
*

The Counter Explanations All Fail: Not Technology, Not Natural Resources, Not Colonial Plunder, Not Slavery

Technology Fails As An Explanation, Free Market Capitalism Made Us Rich

Thousands of

years of improving tech caused no serious rise in average living standards until about 1800, the *Laissez Faire* era, an insurmountable fact. That, and tech improves without government funding.

Humanity's most significant inventions--like cars and airplanes--were private sector developments.

Natural Resources Fail As An Explanation, Free Market Capitalism Made Us Rich

Free

market capitalism built America's wealth, not natural resources, nor Indian land, which never made The Indians rich. And if natural resources caused wealth, Russia would be the richest country and Africa, the richest continent.

Dishonest government thwarts prosperity even where natural resources abound--Russia, for example. Per John Stuart Mill: "The universal venality ascribed to Russian functionaries, must be an immense drag on the capabilities of economical improvement possessed so abundantly by the Russian empire: since the emoluments of public officers must depend on the success with which they can multiply vexations, for the purpose of being bought off by bribes." (John Stuart Mill, *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Volume III: *Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), 882)

Colonial Plunder Fails As An Explanation, Free Market Capitalism Made Us Rich

Plunder

didn't make capitalist societies rich. Plunder can't cause lasting wealth, only productivity does that.

Lenin tried to explain capitalism's non-collapse by saying rich nations got their wealth from poor countries. Yet most rich countries' international investments were, and are, made in other rich

countries.

A society's cultural, legal, and political norms determine its success. If natural resources caused wealth, Russia would be the richest country and Africa, the richest continent. If exploitation and conquest explained wealth and poverty, Spain and Mongolia would lead the world in GDP. The third world was poor both before, and after, European imperialism, which thus explains nothing.

No connection exists between which European nations had the most extensive empires and which ones are richest today. Spain began earlier and built a larger empire than other European countries, and looted so much gold and silver from the New World that it caused inflation in Spain, yet it lags much of Europe today. Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland never had overseas empires, yet they dwarf Spain's wealth, and equal typical leading European economies. Germany, a comparative latecomer to colonialism, and decimated by two world wars, today has Europe's highest GDP

Broadly, it is an error to assume a finite amount of wealth, or that plunder explains the wealth of rich nations. Mongolia plundered far and wide, with little to show for it. Lasting wealth has internal, cultural causes. Thus, former British colonies outperform former Spanish colonies the world over, just as Britain outperforms Spain itself. Some blame the USA for Latin American poverty, yet we see the same gaps in wealth, freedom, and government corruption when comparing New Zealand to Guatemala, Canada to Mexico, Australia to Columbia, and so forth, even though these never intervened in Latin American politics.

Slavery Fails As An Explanation, Free Market Capitalism Made Us Rich

The Free North was richer than the Slave South, producing more of nearly everything besides cotton, from railroads to firearms to edible crops. The US economy grew faster *after slavery* than during it. American wealth surpasses that of nations with far more slaves; Latin America's more extensive slavery--and poverty--disproves the claim that historical slavery causes present national wealth.

By 1860, the North had 110K manufacturing establishments, the South just 18K. The North produced 94% of the iron, 97% of the coal, 97% of the firearms, laid 22K miles of railroads to the South's 8.5K, held 75% of the farm acreage, 60% of the livestock, grew 67% of the corn, 81% of the wheat, and held 75% of America's wealth. Slavery *didn't* built America, and were slavery an economic juggernaut, the South's economy would have powered it to victory. It did not. If slave-grown cotton drove the Northern economy, Southern secession would have collapsed the Northern economy. It did not.

Quack historians, like Cornell's Ed Baptist, inflate slavery's economic value to push narratives. In *The Half Has Never Been Told* (2014), he calculates a supposed value of cotton-related activity and commits an accounting error, double and sometimes triple counting intermediate transactions, arriving at a figure of \$600 million, or about 50% of the antebellum US economy. The correct figure? \$77 million, or about 5% of the GDP in 1836. Baptiste erred because he, like many historians, knows not economics or how economic statistics get calculated, thus he knows not that GDP numbers tally only the final value of the goods and services; the final price *already includes* the costs of intermediate transactions. Slavery enriched planters only, not the South at large, and certainly not the North, amounting to 5% of the GDP, not 50% as the "New Historians of Capitalism" claim.

Whippings ("calibrated torture") didn't boost cotton yield 1800-1860. Whippings can't boost production 300% unless whippings produce three-fold increases exertions from the same body, which

is, of course, impossible. Stanford economic historian Gavin Wright dismisses these capitalist-efficiency-whipmeister canards too, noting "the apparent efficiency of slave labor [was due to the] extraordinary growth of world demand for cotton between 1820-1860." Alan Olmstead and Paul Rhode also destroy this "whippings caused a 300% efficiency increase" canard. Their combined work, "Slave Productivity in Cotton Picking" demonstrates that improvements in seeds caused the increase; the picking process itself barely changed, and in any case, cotton production approaches peak prewar levels 5 years after the Civil War, and by 1891, it doubled the highest prewar level.

Government Investment Fails As An Explanation, Free Market Capitalism Made Us Rich

Government investment fails as an explanation, free market capitalism made us rich. The United States of America became a wealthy, modern country, the wealthiest in the world by 1905, long before the supposedly crucial New Deal. Wealth precedes the administrative state; thus wealth can exist without it, and the growth of American wealth materialized *despite* the administrative burden, due to *technological advancement that the government did not cause*. Meanwhile, nations with more expansive governments trail us economically (if you don't believe me, then believe the migration patterns). Hardly surprising: Government is not the font of all improvement. People invent and refine and improve the world even without government orders. No one commanded "supermarket X shall provide food," yet your local food store exists.

Leftist look at government programs and bureaucracies today, the poverty of centuries past, and conclude the first ended the second. But rich nations made bureaucracies, not the reverse; they're the trappings of wealth, not its cause. Taxes, levied on the private sector, fuel the public sector. Wealth causes government spending, not the reverse; if not, North Korea and Cuba would be powerhouses, outperforming South Korea and Florida.

Hardly surprising. Private investment works best because failures pay the price for failure, not the successful and responsible. Private investments produce sound, lasting, permanent growth at no one's involuntary expense. Government taxing and spending comes at the involuntary expense of many, and leads to bubbles, not growth. It looks like growth at first, but government officials--who pay no price for being wrong--don't know a good investment from a bad one. The market quickly removes private investors making mistakes, it costs only those who wish to risk their own money, and leads to sounder decisions and better growth of existing wealth. Government involuntary investment, in which the decision-makers personally pay no price for being wrong, leads to GM bailouts, AIG bailouts, no-bid contracts to Halliburton, and grants to Solyndra. We were told that absent the bailouts and stimulus bills, the economy would collapse. Yet rewarding failure doesn't stimulate, and long-term, a society that punishes success and rewards failure is what *really* faces collapse, even if rewarding well-connected failures pays off politically at the time.

Beyond the moral impropriety of rewarding failures, "stimulus" and "bailouts" are graft writ large, and crisis-enabled corruption so that well-connected failures become well-rewarded failures; immoral, and preposterous. Success doesn't need to be subsidized, failure doesn't deserve to be subsidized. Our government takes your money and does both, the inevitable result of a government so big, powerful, and inclined to meddle in the economy. It's unavoidable. Either the market allocates money based on products and services, or politicians allocate money based on politics. No unicorn third way exists.

The imperfect market gets it right more than politicians, due to better incentives. Private actors pay a price for being wrong. Government officials seldom do. Installing new politicians does less good than installing new incentives, or at least removing power from those with bad incentives.

When private investors, their own money at risk, think what the government spends on is worthless (ex. toxic assets), why should the government take our money and buy just that? No moral case exists for spending "compelled contributions" of other peoples' money on what everyone knows is worthless. Also, when the costs are public and the profits are private, isn't that called "Fascism?" Looks like our label-slapping Establishment hacks are ones to talk. Imagine my shock.

GDP Is An Invalid, Phony Statistic That Includes Government Spending to Help Liberals Fudge the Numbers

Unable to defend the cronyism they call "investment," the technocratic Left deploys a statistic called Gross Domestic Product, or GDP. GDP growth is a phony number liberals use to pretend tax-and-spend liberal policies "work." They omit that *GDP includes government spending!*

They omit this because assertions that "liberal policies under Democrat President X caused more GDP growth than conservative policies under Republican President Z" rely on voters not knowing GDP includes government spending. You mean a figure that includes government spending is higher when the party that believes in government spending holds power? Why yes, it is, and they expect you to be amazed by that.

GDP growth means spending growth, something only tenuously connected to national prosperity, a manipulable statistic not reflective of average well-being, and possibly reflective of an impending bubble. And spending disposes of wealth; it doesn't create it, making deficit spending to "create" wealth or prosperity an absurdity.

GDP measures economic activity, not economic growth, economic size, or economic soundness. Wealth and growth cause spending, not vice versa. All who dispute this are invited to spend every dollar they have and see if their bank account grows as a result.

Growing spending won't mean economic growth if it comes at the expense of savings, or if it comes by spending borrowed money. GDP calculations include government spending, but don't deduct for government borrowing to sustain the spending. A private firm that kept its books that way would see its executives get put in handcuffs. Why accept such math as valid in debates over public policy?

By definition, GDP doesn't distinguish between deficit spending and non-deficit spending. GDP includes all government spending, deficit and non-deficit. "GDP = C + G + I + NX." "G" is the sum of government spending, (<http://www.investopedia.com/terms/g/gdp.asp#axzz1ryaZzmKx>) Accurately measuring economic well-being requires subtracting government spending, not adding it. Government is society's overhead, paid for by the private sector. No one budgets by *adding* expenses to income, or computes net worth by *adding* liabilities to assets. Neither should government. GDP is a fake indicator.

GDP, a measure of spending alone, includes the government spending money that, in private hands, might not have been spent. Plus, much of what politicians spend follows political incentives, not efficiency; thus, more corrupt, wasteful projects goose the GDP numbers, boosting an unwarranted impression of soundness.

ADDENDUM: The Brookings Institution inadvertently undercuts the credibility of GDP measurements in other ways. They gauge counties in the 2016 and 2020 elections by 1) who they supported and 2) GDP, deeming Trump country "low-output," for generating 29% of the GDP (2020) and 36% of the GDP (2016). A nonsense conclusion. Trump enjoyed huge support among farmers (85%), truck drivers (75%), factory workers, construction workers, and miners.

Agriculture-forestry-fishing-hunting adds 0.8% of America's 2020 GDP, manufacturing adds 10.8%, construction adds 4.3%, transportation and warehousing adds 2.8%, and mining adds 0.9%, for a total of about 19.6% of the GDP.

(<https://www.statista.com/statistics/248004/percentage-added-to-the-us-gdp-by-industry>) The Brookings Institution presents a *fake analysis*, using invalid measures to understate and dismiss invaluable contributions of (heavily rural) Trump country to the US economy. Or do they contend their highfalutin' cities don't need food, lights, heat, or gas? And, the "finance-insurance-real estate-rental and leasing" (heavily anti-Trump) generates 22.3% of the GDP, to say nothing of the heavily anti-Trump professional and business services (12.8%) and Government (12.6%)...yet how can they function without food, lights, or heat? Trump country provides the truly important things in such quantities as to render it inexpensive, hence unimpressive in GDP statistics, which conceal rather than illustrate underlying realities.

An Assortment of Leftist-Inspired Misconceptions About Capitalism and Government Policy Debunked, Along With Much Marxist-Style Class Warfare Rhetoric, and Sloppy Keynesian-Style Analysis, Debunked

The Rich Man's Riches Didn't Make the Poor Man Poor

Anti-capitalists believe that the riches of the rich cause the poverty of the poor, in turn assuming the world contains a fixed amount of wealth, incapable of increase. If the rich man's riches caused the poor man's poverty, then the nation with the most millionaires would have the poorest workers. Yet the USA has *both* the most millionaires, and the world's highest living standards.

More people are alive today than in the Middle Ages, all or nearly all enjoy higher living standards than in the Middle Ages. More people, each with more stuff, means more wealth was created. The redistribution-obsessed Left has no idea how this occurred.

Appeals to envy win votes. But government causing business profits to shrink doesn't benefit average people. Profits get reinvested to expand and hire more workers to make more goods for customers. Curiously, businessmen creating jobs, goods and services get called "exploiters," while politicians producing none of these things--indeed impeding them--get called "public servants." Businessmen making money selling people what they want are "greedy," yet politicians compelling you to give up your money are somehow "not greedy."

Besides, what defines poverty in a rich country? Most poor Americans have air conditioning, microwaves, televisions and automobiles: "As for stagnation, by 2001 most people defined as poor had possessions once considered part of a middle class lifestyle. Three-quarters of them had air conditioning, which only a third of all Americans had in 1971. Ninety-seven percent had color television, which less than half of all Americans had in 1971. Seventy-three percent owned a microwave, which less than one percent of Americans owned in 1971, and 98 percent of "the poor" had

either a videocassette recorder or a DVD player, which no one had in 1971. In addition, 72 percent of "the poor" owned a car or truck. Yet the rhetoric of the "haves" and the "have nots" continues, even in a society where it might be more accurate to refer to the "haves" and the "have lots." (Thomas Sowell, *Economic Facts and Fallacies*, Second Edition, 2011, in Chapter 5)

Poor and average people today have things that even past rich people never did, as everything gets better and cheaper (except what the government involves itself in, aka education and healthcare.) And yet, the availability of these goods means more to average and poor people than to the rich. For example, record players meant little to the rich, who could hire musicians; cars meant little to the rich, who could have horse-drawn carriages. Capitalism's greatest beneficiaries were the poor.

"Tax the Rich!" and the "Trickle-Down" Strawman Attack

Those demanding the rich "pay their fair share," may be surprised to learn *they already do*. While 45.3% (77.5 million) households pay no federal income tax, the Richest 1% pay 39% of federal income revenues, the Top 10% pay 69%, the Top 20% pay 87%. The Top 40% pay about 95% of the bill. The Middle 20% pays 4.2%, and The Bottom 40% are net tax recipients. This data can also be presented in quintiles. As a percentage all total revenues, the Richest 20% pay 69% of the revenues, with the next 20% chipping in another 17.5%. The middle income quintile pays 9.2%. The bottom 40% pay a combined 4.2% of the total federal revenues.

The Left avoids who pays what percent of the bill by discussing tax *rates*, as though the rich don't avoid high rates by stashing money in overseas accounts or by purchasing bonds. "But my secretary pays a higher tax rate than me," says Warren Buffet, as if anyone is stopping him from just writing the IRS a check. And if the poor are taxed worse than the rich, *that proves would should cut their taxes, not raise someone else's*. And if that causes budgetary problems, *cut the government*.

One could argue that *even so*, wealth disparities remain unfair, and that rates on the rich, benefitting from automation, outsourcing, and hiring those who entered the country illegally, ought to be raised anyways, *as a moral, social, and political statement*. However, it is factually incorrect to deny the rich pay a disproportionately big share.

The Left calls tax cuts for all Americans "tax cuts for the rich" and calls tax hikes on the middle class "making the rich pay their fair share." Perhaps greedy politicians just go rich-baiting as a smokescreen. Or perhaps the politicians know more about math than they let on. If they took every penny from the millionaires and billionaires, every cent of income and accumulated wealth too, it only funds the government for 3 or 4 years. Taxes must inevitably hit average folks. "The rich" simply don't have as much money as the politicians promise to extract from them.

Democrats blend Tammany-style redistribution with modern Keynesian cover stories, mixing in older anti-capitalists attacks, such as the "trickle down" strawman." They accuse enemies of belief in "trickle-down economics" that the wealthy's riches will "trickle down" upon a tax cut, deeming this the central idea of right-wing economic policies. Yet no right-winger of any significance (no, Steve Stockman is not significant, cite an actual economist please) ever said such a thing. Nor is "trickle-down" another name for supply-side economics, because the term "trickle-down" precedes supply-side thinking by at least several decades, as seen when segregationist Democrat John Sparkman spoke at the 1955 Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, accusing Eisenhower of favoring "trickle down" economics.

But the Right never said tax cuts made money "trickle down"; scour the works of Art Laffer or the Heritage Foundation in vain for the phrase. They said *the rising tide lifts all boats*, a different claim, which happens to be true. Indeed, free market economics doesn't assume anything trickles down (which still sounds better than liberal *shakedown economics*). If anything, wealth trickles up: workers have to be paid now, capital goods must be paid for now, and the fees to use/build facilities must be paid now, often on borrowed money. Only after years of productive operation does any excess debt-free money exist to trickle up to the bosses.

Economist Arthur Laffer posited that cutting tax *rates* could increase tax *revenues* on account of greater economic activity. And on multiple occasions, tax *rates* have been cut and tax *revenue* increased: after Coolidge's tax cuts in the 1920s, after JFK's tax cuts in the 1960s, after Reagan's tax cuts in the 1980s, after Bush II's tax cuts of 2003, and after Trump's tax cuts. "But the deficit exploded!" Well yes...*because spending increased faster than the tax revenues!* But Leftists never simply show a line graph over time of 1) tax revenues and 2) government spending. That would give the con away. Refusing to "take the L," Leftists call tax cuts a failure because revenues fell short of what their *hypothetical* model says revenues would have been without the cuts. Yet the government never collected such numbers, prior to the *rate* cuts. Finally, they can't justify their assumption (without which their point fails regardless) that tax rates don't affect business behavior.

Though revenues increased, Laffer's theory proved only half-right. Tax cuts in a vacuum accomplish less than promised because there's still too many regulations; 70,000 pages of new regulations get added every year, per the Federal Register's own website. (http://www.federalregister.gov/uploads/2011/01/fr_facts.pdf) Minus the twin maladies of overtaxation and overregulation, hiring and economic growth would be greater. Nor is this mere theory: the US averaged 6% GDP growth annually from 1865-1914, a rate not paralleled since.

Leftists posit that employers react to tax cuts by pocketing the cash they saved and doing nothing with it, *but this only holds true in overregulated environments*. Employers won't lose money hiring more people, *provided each worker produces more than they cost*. When thousands of pages of new rules annually impede that, fewer people get hired, especially in industries running on tiny margins. Such industries disproportionately hire the poor; overtaxation and overregulation, merely noxious to businessmen, prove tragic to low-wage workers and the poor in general, hurting them earliest and worst.

In closing, welfare is what trickles down, after overtaxing and overregulating makes jobs trickle out of liberal areas.

Quintiles Prove Little to Nothing Because Statistical Categories Are Not Flesh and Blood People

The famous "quintiles" used to examine inequality have limitations, like conflating statistical categories with flesh and blood people. Studies like the Treasury Department's "Income Mobility in the US from 1996 to 2005" followed flesh-and-blood people over their lifetimes, finding most people rose up from whatever quintile they started in. True, few went from the bottom 20% to the top 20%, yet most did not stagnate or fall lower. This partly reflects upward mobility, some of it is age-based; peoples' earnings peak in their late 40s and early 50s, meaning much of the claimed inequality is just an age-based phenomenon.

Also, government quintile-based stats omit transfer payments, thus some people are credited

with fewer resources than they truly possess. The bottom 40%, as a group, are net tax recipients, yet none of their redistributive payments, in cash or in-kind (housing), count in quintile statistics: "Since people in the bottom 20 percent of income recipients receive more than two-thirds of their income from transfer payments, leaving those cash payments out of the statistics greatly exaggerates their poverty—and leaving out in-kind transfers as well, such as subsidized housing, distorts their economic situation even more. In 2001, for example, cash and in-kind payments together accounted for 77.8 percent of the economic resources of people in the bottom 20 percent. In other words, the alarming statistics on their incomes so often cited in the media and by politicians count only 22 percent of the actual economic resources at their disposal." Further, "Given such disparities between the economic reality and the alarming statistics, it is much easier to understand such apparent anomalies as the fact that Americans living below the official poverty level spend far more money than their incomes—as their income is defined in statistical studies." (Thomas Sowell, *Economic Facts and Fallacies*, Second Edition, 2011, in Chapter 5)

Overarching Points About Inequality and Welfare In Theory

Societies in practice are either unequally rich or equally poor. More meaningful: Are people basically getting better off or not? Free markets pass this test; exceptional cases prove the general rule. If market distribution of wealth is unfair, name a system that's fairer. (No, not Socialism, don't make me laugh).

The ability to create wealth is unequal, hence wealth is unequal. That some get rich faster is not inherently wrong, *provided all get richer*, provided everyone's income is outpaces their costs of living. Free markets are good because they, absent meddling, achieve this.

Wealth belongs to those producing it. No one else has a better claim, not even "society" (whoever that is). No one else is entitled to it for free on account of who they vote for. "Social justice" just means taxing people who are *not* your voters to pay people who *are* your voters.

The best safety net is a functioning economy. Imposing 70,000 pages of rules annually doesn't achieve this. No welfare state or fancy financial tricks or pension system will save people from a failing economy. Only increasing wealth decreases poverty. Shifting around wealth does not increase wealth.

Disparity is not necessarily an economic problem, *provided that the least among us do well*, but it *is* a political problem, especially when unelected corporations and tech companies tell the working class what it is allowed to say. Corporations were created to serve their shareholders, not engage in mind control or bully elected governments, and this whole situation *represents a perversion of why limited liability status exists in the first place*.

Capitalism Is More Moral, Democratic, and Egalitarian Than Socialism, Which Has A Built-In Anti-Democratic and Elitist Temperament

The Morality of Laissez-Faire: It Opposed Classism, Promoted Meritocracy, and Generated Prosperity for the Masses

In 1776, Adam Smith wrote a 900-page book called *The Wealth of Nations*, arguing for *Laissez faire* economics. Free market capitalism didn't exist before Smith's ideas were adopted, in Britain and America, and to a degree in France; thus, prosperity for the masses arose in this same era. A man does not write a 900-page book *unless something is bugging him*, so what

impelled Smith to write the book? Government control of everybody and everything, mercantilism, hyper-regulation, the granting of monopolies to royal favorites, and the imposition of impediments to honest people without political connections bettering themselves.

Against this, Smith made not just a functional case, but a moral case; that it was wrong for government to play favorites, that meritocracy must prevail, via preservation of free markets and property rights. Smith argued the useful people should be set free, not shackled to the dictates of the useless ruling class ("class warfare" *originated* as a *laissez faire* argument, *inverted* by Karl Marx, whose ridiculous imagination recast the producers as "exploiters" and the heirs to the aristocrats--let's claim it back!)

The USA embraced Adam Smith's ideas more than any other country, and became more prosperous as a result. The Founding Fathers agreed with Adam Smith's economic outlook. Take Jefferson: "To take from one, because it is thought his own industry and that of his fathers has acquired too much, in order to spare others, who, or whose fathers, have not exercised equal industry and skill, is to violate arbitrarily the first principle of association, the guarantee to everyone the free exercise of his industry and the fruits acquired by it." (Thomas Jefferson, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Washington, D.C.: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1904), p. 466). See also Abraham Lincoln, who, *debunking progressive attempts to claim him*, uttered: "The man who labored for another last year, this year labors for himself, and next year he will hire others to labor for him." "Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and built one of his own." (Abraham Lincoln, cited in Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 20, 30)

Socialists say "human rights before property rights" and "people before profits." Pure sophistry. Property rights ARE human rights, and companies make profits selling people what they want to buy.

Socialism is immoral because it rests upon theft and coercion, and leads to the politicization of society itself, which is bad for wealth creation (among other downsides). When the government runs everything, everyone plays politics to avoid getting screwed--which befalls many of them anyway. In capitalism (at least the non "woke" version), useless people don't get to run things, no matter how proficient they are with *postmodern word games*, because there's a bottom line. In socialism, the politically clever make others pay the price for them, and when the know-it-alls get it wrong, ordinary workers suffer, those who produce, create, and innovate get less than the politickers, looters, and exploiters.

Socialist politicians justify this by concocting innovative definitions of "exploit." Companies are termed exploiters. They can be, but aren't inherently so. They provide jobs to people who need money and goods and services to people who want goods and services. If that's "exploitation," most people would gladly sign up.

Marxists say owners "exploit" workers, yet how can raising the average living standard be reasonably called "exploitation?" No dictionary so defines "exploitation"...though 2020 saw political pressure compel one dictionary to distort the meaning of "racism," so this may not prove a stable standard long-term.

That aside, the person who starts a company borrows the money and incurs the liability for business failure. It's not inherently wrong for him to earn more, though we can ask if his earnings

outstrip his contribution of figuring out how to make an endeavor pay, not just for himself, but well enough to gainfully employ others.

Worker collectives and like schemes enjoy more favor from those with an axe to grind than from those with bills to pay. Worker ownership of enterprises means workers assume all the risks and costs of it failing. Most workers would decline that tradeoff.

Socialism takes many forms; some don't end private property, but reduce it to meaninglessness by putting under control of unelected hacks. The latest *en vogue* model is borrowed from the National Socialists, which preserves private ownership while centralizing actual control; government gives the orders, but citizens pay the price for policy failure (2008 bailouts anyone?)

Those wanting "economic democracy" ought to note that the free market already is one. Producers who ignore the public suffer losses. It's inaccurate to call our setup a profit system, because what we have (had?) is a profit *and loss* system, and the losses serve to get ill-managed resources out of the hands of those who've failed to use them to serve the public. When regulators replace the market, they replace economic democracy, and the public's say over the economy. Anything that removes the market itself is removing democracy.

Socialism Versus Democracy

Socialists promise "democracy" and deliver the Stalinist Soviet Union, Maoist China, PolPot's Cambodia, Castro's Cuba, the Kim Dynasty in North Korea, and the Chavez/Maduro dictatorship of Venezuela. Soviet Russia saw 20 million murdered by their own government. Maoist China saw 65 million murdered by their own government. By the way, both of these surpass Hitler's death toll. PolPot's Cambodia saw 3.3 million (about 1/3 of the population) murdered by their own government. Kim's Korea saw 1.5 million murdered by their own government. Millions murdered, shattered lives, crushed economies and abject poverty typify every self-described socialist regime's real world results.

If socialism has nothing to do with dictatorship, why do people who install socialists keep getting dictatorships? Because socialism isn't "democratic." It pursues hegemony, not democracy. Capitalism is democracy; you vote with your dollars what you want. Under socialism, bureaucrats tell you to do what they want.

There are only two kinds of economies: ones where the consumers decide what to produce, and the ones where planners decide what to produce. Socialism means controlling the economy and you can't control the economy without controlling people, meaning unelected planners overrule the people, belying anything socialists babble about "democracy."

"Democratic" socialism is still socialism, never staying democratic; centralized economies mean concentrated political power. Socialist reasoning assumes government equals society, and that government alone speaks for society hence the shrieking that children will starve and people will be homeless every time anyone proposes cutting government programs: a government-centered view blinds them to how goods can be, and always are, provided elsewhere.

Capitalism has a better link to democracy. Frederick Hayek and Milton Friedman claimed as much. Subsequent reality largely, if not completely, bears them out. One study looking at data on 123 nations as far back as 1970 found relatively few cases of societies combining relatively high levels political freedom without relatively high levels of economic freedom. (Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, Vol. 74, Issue 3, June 2010, pages 230-239, "Examining the Hayek-Friedman hypothesis

on economic and political freedom," Robert A Lawson, J.R. Clark). Cases exist of dictatorships becoming more free market, and then becoming democracies (Chile for example). Cases exist of one despotism being overthrown by socialists and becoming a socialist despotism. Cases exist of free societies becoming socialist, and losing both the free market and their political freedom. But *zero cases* exist of socialists increasing the amount of political freedom of the average person while restricting economic freedom.

The worst always get on top in socialism. Potential possession of total power incites the worst of humanity to take interest in government work. Thus, in the *real world*, it is not "socialism and democracy." It is socialism **VERSUS** democracy.

Ever notice that the migration is always one way? Always Cuba to Florida, never the reverse. Always North Korea to South Korea, always East Germany to West Germany...kind of like antebellum America didn't see Black migration Southward, just escapes northward. People flee oppression, and socialism *is* oppression. Ever notice that everyone who's lived under socialism thinks it's horrible? Heed their warnings. And then support the Party of Lincoln, against the Party of Lenin.

Socialism Failed Everywhere, Foreign and Domestic, and No One Said "That's Not Real Socialism" Before the Soviet Union Collapsed

Socialists only invented the "that's not real communism" canard *after the USSR collapsed*, proving it is a fraudulent argument. Also fraudulent, calling failed socialism "state capitalism": confronted with their record, which they denied for as long as the USSR remained standing, the Marxists have resorted to *word games* and *slick labelling*.

Socialism fails wherever tried, always for the same reason: 1) central planners can't determine what people want (and how much of it) without prices, but allowing market pricing eliminates the need for central planners, and 2) eventually you run out of other peoples' money. All "successful examples of socialism" are either 1) not successful--they're spending tomorrow's money today and look successful, but just wait a few years (ex, Bolivia, Venezuela), or 2) not actually socialism (Denmark, Sweden, Norway)

For further examples of failed socialism, see your nearest Indian Reservation. Embarrassed by this record, today's socialists lay claim to Scandinavia. One small problem: Scandinavia isn't socialist.

Scandinavia Is Not Socialist

Socialists now cite Scandinavia to avoid their long record of failure and mass murder. Yet Scandinavians are social democrats, not democratic socialists, a *non-semantic difference*--at least for those who prefer eating. Scandinavians aren't socialist, but capitalist economies with hefty welfare states, which they can only afford because: 1) they're capitalist and, 2) the USA covers their defense bills by paying for most of NATO. *Scandinavian countries don't meet the Democratic Socialists of America's own definition of socialism*. Denmark is the 10th Freest in the Heritage Foundation's rankings, with Sweden 15th and Norway 23rd. Denmark lacks a minimum wage, Sweden privatized much of what its government once ran (school vouchers) while cutting welfare and tax rates, and Norway funds itself with the very oil that Authoritarian Ocasio-Cortez (AOC) wants severely restricted here. Finally, Scandinavians *themselves* deny that they are socialists:

"I know that some people in the US associate the Nordic model with some sort of socialism.

Therefore I would like to make one thing clear. Denmark is far from a socialist planned economy. Denmark is a market economy," declared Lars Lokke Rasmussen, Danish Prime Minister in 2015, addressing Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. PM Rasmussen also added, "The Nordic model is an expanded welfare state which provides a high level of security for its citizens, but it is also a successful market economy with much freedom to pursue your dreams and live your life as you wish." Listing Denmark's many programs, he made the caveat Bernie's fans omitted. "So, what is the catch you might ask. The most obvious one, of course, is the high taxes. The top income tax in Denmark is almost 60 percent. We have a 25 percent sales tax and on cars the incise duties are up to 180 percent. In total, Danish taxes come to almost half of our national income compared to around 25 percent in the US. Quite a substantial difference."

Counterclaims Against Capitalism Being repeatedly flattened by reality is demoralizing, and that affects socialists too. Socialists counterattack, blaming capitalism for all defects within the borders of capitalist societies, whether crime, poverty or disease, whether capitalism caused the problem or not.

The Black Book of Communism enrages them; it's like a label on a poison bottle. They vitriolically accuse the book of fabricating statistics even though, for example, Chinese authors like Yang Jisheng, Yu Xiguang, and Chen Yizi, ***who spent time in the CCP archives***, reach equally startling death figures for the Great Leap Famine (36 million, 55 million, and 43 million, respectively).

Socialists, the phony populists, imagine themselves as liberators, and capitalism as enslaving. This leaves them unable to explain why everyone tries to get *out* of socialist countries, rather than *in*. If capitalist "propaganda" caused this, why don't they return upon learning the "truth?" If this results from capitalist "propaganda," why does it work in spite of socialists being allowed to speak inside capitalist countries, while socialist propaganda fails in socialist countries that bar capitalists from speaking?

Their claim fails. Socialists counterclaim, pinning deaths from contaminated drinking water, hunger or disease on capitalism. Some even blame India's 1960s famines on capitalism.

Except that *Socialist* Jewel Nehru ran India at the time. Except that all these defects, from dirty water to famine to disease, are *rarest in the most economically free societies*. Likewise, crime, alleged to be the result of capitalist inequality--even within the United States, crime is greatest where regulations most restrict markets: ghettos and Indian reservations. Except that the *Black Book of Communism* specifically documents *state-committed crimes*, not including deaths from disease and malnutrition, though if it did, it would boost the Marxist death toll higher. Marxist shills aren't using the same denominator for their comparison!

In general, economic freedom strongly correlates with higher living standards. Higher income per capita, economic growth, lower poverty rates, higher life expectancy, and more political rights and civil liberties. Deaths from unclean drinking water are lower where economic freedom is higher. Ditto, hunger; ditto, high deaths rates from preventable diseases. Unsafe drinking water, hunger, disease correlate with a *lack of capitalism*.

And just remember: No one has ever been shot for failing to meet a quota in a free market economy.

The DSA, Millennials, and Socialism

Polls show Democrats and millennials like socialism, but polls also show most millennials (and many people in general) don't know what socialism is. Socialist candidates rely on branding and posturing, and can't survive the public understanding what their platform is. The Democratic Socialists of America that Authoritarian Ocasio-Cortez (AOC) comes from does not promise "life today, but fairer," they promise wholesale change and for the worse.

The Democratic Socialists of America demand capitalism be destroyed, not merely modified. They won't give you Sweden, which has no property tax or inheritance tax, and a corporate tax rate of 23.5%. In Sweden, middle class and poor people pay lots of taxes, much of it in value-added taxes. And they have school choice, adopted in the 1990s.

On the contrary, the Democratic Socialists of America possess the exact same goals as Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao & Castro. Only the veneer has been changed, to fool millennial voters, who aren't old enough to remember Soviet Communism. Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Castro, and Chavez never promised mass murder and starvation. They, like DSA, promised affordable food, housing, healthcare, and education. But history guides us to reject the hollow feel-good rhetoric and empty promises that no self-described socialist before Authoritarian Ocasio-Cortez (AOC) ever fulfilled either.

The Working Class Has Rejected Socialism, Because Socialism Is Elitist

Bernie enjoys more support on college campuses than on a factory floor. The working class has rejected socialism. That's why socialism became more popular at Yale than in Youngstown, at Harvard than in Harrisburg, at Princeton than in Pittsburgh, at Cornell than Columbus, at Dartmouth than Detroit. Thus, today's socialism in America turns to identity politics to fuel it, enraged that the white working class specifically (and the working class in general) rejected socialism.

Karl Marx is a failed prophet. He predicted the rich would get richer and the poor would get poorer until a class-based political revolution occurred (Marx's "increasing misery" doctrine). Later Marxists asserted a general strike would precede any such revolution, hence their calls for a general strike. This never happened.

No socialist revolution ever arose from the working class. Every socialist revolution originated with a highly-organized cadre of overeducated professional revolutionaries, the "vanguard of the proletariat," as Lenin put it. Yet other revolutions Lenin hoped would follow outside Russia (like Hungary and Germany) suffered crushing defeat, while revolutions in many other nations simply failed to materialize. Not only that, Karl Marx predicted a revolutionary workers' wave led by industrialized countries like Britain or France, yet primitive Russia led the wave of uprisings, Britain and France did not follow, and the most industrialized of all, the USA, demonstrated the *least* interest in Marxist revolution of them all! Marx's theory needed rescuing.

Enter the Marxists of the Frankfurt School, theorizing culture held the answer. Marxism got no traction because capitalists exercised cultural hegemony, spreading their capitalist ideology to the masses, also employing religion to keep the people they employed contented with what should never content them. Therefore, Marxists should infiltrate institutions, especially those controlling the spread of information, such as the school system and the press, and flood the zone with their own Marxist message, to create a Marxist cultural hegemony.

"Cultural Marxism," which Wikipedia's liberal-slanted contributors call a "conspiracy theory" in spite of Antonio Gramsci's "Prison Notebooks" explicitly stating this was the plan!!! (Fools!), has been the

Far Left's playbook ever since. Later cultural Marxists of the Frankfurt School, such as Theodore Adorno and Herbert Marcuse (who also started the "Nazis are right wing" hoax) realized the American working class was no revolutionary vanguard. So they instead aimed to create a coalition of college students and minorities, fueling their "identity socialism," inventing politically useful conspiracy theories about American history as they went. But college graduates enter our professional and managerial jobs, and thus, a bastardized version of Marxism ironically became the animating belief of our *cultural upper class*.

At this point, let's tally up the major failed predictions of Karl Marx: 1) The poor got richer under capitalism. 2) The working class rejected socialism, and the "movement of the working class" enjoys its greatest success among rich college students (EMBARASSING!) 3) The revolutions required professional revolutionaries (and thus weren't scientifically inevitable) and didn't result from a general strike. 4) The most industrialized had no successful revolutions, which took over only the more primitive places. 5) Marx's Frankfurt School successors had to rescue the movement by abandoning economics (Marx's focus) and focusing on culture, creating the bizarro world where the rich believe in identity Marxism and the working class is a conservative force

*
*
*

Democrat Vote-Getters: Creating and Exploiting Disinformation About Housing Crash and Great Depression

No, Capitalism Didn't Cause the Housing Crash and the Great Depression

Democrats

benefit from popular misreadings of the Great Depression and the 2008 Housing Crash blaming both on free markets, crediting big government nonsense as "solutions," and lauding meddlers as "heroes." Thus FDR's failed record somehow "got us out of the Depression," while hagiographies of President Obama as FDR 2.0 promised the same (in passing, Mr. Obama is less "socialist" than super-Tammany-on-the-Potomac boss who came from the Chicago machine). Fake "experts" support the whole racket. For example, practically everyone except Paul Krugman, Ben Bernanke, and other establishment cheerleaders saw the derivatives collapse coming. Yet who must we take seriously? Krugman and Bernanke, who spin Keynesian failures as successes, and all Keynesian-originated problems as *laissez faire* in origin.

Deregulation Is Not Happening, Overregulation Is Happening

Krugman, and

establishment company, blame imaginary "deregulation" for downturns, including that in 2008 (and 1929 for that matter). Democrats and their shells dismiss all evils as caused by insufficient government control.

Most regulation is unnecessary. Contrary to popular belief, we don't suffer from an insufficient quantity of regulation. The U.S. Code spans 200,000 pages and the Federal Register adds 70,000 pages of new rules annually. No market is unregulated. Any market where force, theft, and fraud are illegal is "regulated," but why forbid anything more than force, theft, or fraud? Rules mirroring the effect of the market are redundant. Rules negating the effect of the market are picking winners and losers...likely the intended effect of those making the rules. Unintended consequences

of overregulation compound the intended ones. The Left, via its pet media, exploits this by blaming free markets, and the cycle repeats. These unintended consequences include problems never seen before the regulations (ex. a nationwide housing bubble never occurred before government meddled in housing markets).

Markets always receive blame for problems politicians and regulators create, because politicians and government agencies have PR departments, and free markets do not.

Progressives didn't crack down on big business. They cracked down on free markets. Voluminous laws ensnare the little guy, who lacks the army of lawyers needed to navigate them. Rhetorical flourishes aside, the Left loves big business. An insurance lobbyist named Liz Fowler wrote the Obamacare bill, while Democrat-Big Tech Collusion removes inconvenient truths (which they first smear as "misinformation") from the internet. *Actual* misinformation like "Russian Collusion" conspiracy theories go untouched, of course.

The fake experts and fake fact checkers disseminate narratives in service of the Left's pivot from class to race, a pivot assisted by conspiracy theories that disparities "proved" racial discrimination, leading to the 2008 housing crisis.

Capitalism didn't cause the Financial crisis of 2008

Financial Collapse. Capitalism is the scapegoat. The collapse began, in housing, igniting a crisis fueled specifically by *mortgage-backed securities*, not derivatives generally. Derivatives, a red herring, only mattered because the mortgages themselves were unsound; demands to lend to bad credit borrowers (or else it's "racism!") led to a housing crash, then a general financial collapse, in which derivatives merely spread worldwide the *effect* of government-induced bad-credit lending.

Despite claims to the contrary, banks *lost money on derivatives* in the end, as these derivatives rested on bad mortgages. Profits fell, two major banks went into the red, the rest only held up by their non-housing wings. Absent bailouts, they'd collapse, hence the begging for bailouts. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_trading_losses , <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=agaXlo6uloOU> , <http://www.thereformedbroker.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/banks.jpg>) Plus, if derivatives guaranteed profits, why couldn't Warren Buffet succeed with them? (http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/03/business/03berkshire.html?_r=0)

"Greed" doesn't explain why mortgages were unsound, or why banks pushed the subprime loans that largely drove the crisis, nor did "greed" ever cause a nationwide housing bubble at any previous time in world history. Banks lose money lending to people who default--a restraint on greed--and a disincentive to lowering lending standards. Plus, greedy people, unguided, make different mistakes at different times, yet lenders in different parts of the USA *committed the exact same mistakes at the exact same time*. This means they're *responding to the same incentives*, such as bogus discrimination claims compelling a reduction in their lending standards.

The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA), enacted in 1977, caused no harm until the Clinton DOJ applied the law in ways contrary to the text, while asserting, WITHOUT EVIDENCE (and in accordance with CRT logic), that statistical differences in lending patterns proved discrimination. "Credit scores by race" went unmentioned, as the Clinton administration sued, and lending patterns changed after the suits, from patterns based on credit histories, to patterns identity politicians

demanded, prompting the invention of subprime loans. (<http://archives.hud.gov/news/1999/pr99-10.html> "Today, President Clinton and Vice President Gore announced the largest lending discrimination settlement in American history -- \$6.5 billion in mortgages and special programs designed to help 78,000 minority and low - to moderate-income families become homeowners.")

Anyone who denies this needs to explain why there was no such thing as a subprime loan before the Clinton administration. Greedy bankers never "caused" a nationwide housing crash before the Clinton-era misapplication of the Community Reinvestment Act, and if gutting lending standards for easy profits was the lenders' idea, why didn't they think of it years ago? Were they "not greedy enough" then? (Worth noting: the people who think the world works this way can't even run a barbershop at a profit-- http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/national_world/2013/02/14/senates-barbershop-said-to-clip-taxpayers.html)

Some artful dodgers insist the CRA didn't apply to relevant actors. But the CRA applied to banks, and Clinton's SJW DOJ *misapplied* it to force banks to make bad loans. Some say the CRA didn't apply to derivatives, a red herring; sound mortgages, sound derivatives, unsound mortgages, unsound derivatives. And mortgage brokers were middlemen for the CRA -regulated lenders, so the CRA affected them too; everyone involved was subjected to the Clinton SJW DOJ misconstrual of the CRA. (<http://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/mortgage-company.asp> , <http://financial-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/mortgage+broker>)

So why did the banks plead guilty? Because defending lawsuits costs money, even if they "win," and many banks' "confessions" resulted from courtroom asymmetry whereby pleading guilty and paying out was cheaper than fighting the suit. That, and one "pled guilty to racism" headline hurts less than years of "is still being prosecuted for racism" headlines. In any case, the "confessions" contradict some known facts about race and lending:

Banks denied whites loans twice as often as Asians, but the Democrat-run media omits this, because it doesn't fit their prepackaged narrative of pointing to white-Black disparities and shouting "RACISM RACISM RACISM RACISM RACISM!!!!!!" (United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Civil Rights and the Mortgage Crisis*, 2009, pages 53, 61; Robert B. Avery and Glen B. Canner, "New Information Reported under HMDA and Its Application for Fair Lending Enforcement," *Federal Reserve Bulletin, Summer 2005*, p. 379) Comparing loan denial "at the same income" ignores the racial credit score gap. (Jim Wooten, "Answers to Credit Woes are Not in Black and White," *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, November 6, 2007, p. 12A) Only AFTER the Clinton administration started this, did any lender make risky mortgages, subprime mortgages, or fail to check applicants properly. Upholding their long-held lending standards would distribute loans and terms consistent with credit scores, where the true disparity lies, which would draw bogus accusations of racism. Adding insult to injury, the same lowered standards now let in whites with poor credit as a byproduct, amplifying the crisis.

Identity politicians promoted homeownership at any cost because they assumed homeownership generated wealth, when it actually *reflects* wealth. One error built on another; the government asserted lending disparities caused homeownership disparities (and thus a racial wealth gap), pointed to loan denial gaps, and shrieked "at the same income," thus "proving" lenders were

racist. This omits credit scores (differing by race), which is odd, because whether borrowers repay loans might be relevant to lenders. (Black-owned banks denied Black applicants loans at the same rates: it really is about creditworthiness--

<https://news.utk.edu/1997/07/01/black-loan-applicants-rejected-at-black-owned-banks-278/>, Harold A. Black, M. Cary Collins & Ken B. Cyree, "Do Black-Owned Banks Discriminate Against Black Borrowers?" *Journal of Financial Services Research*, 11, 189-204 (1997). There remains no evidence people with similar credit ratings received different treatment, and if any existed, it implies bankers disdain making money.

This all combined with another 1970s-originated root cause, that at first seems unrelated: quirky state laws in California. California, scarcely more expensive than the national average before the 1970s, passed a flurry of laws and regulations: environmental laws, open space laws, historical preservation laws, etc, and by the time they were done, do-gooders had all-but-banned building on roughly 1/3 of suitable land in California, spiking their housing costs, and dragging the national average with it. Democrats then cited the California-distorted average (which at one point hit 3x the national average) as proof of a nationwide "affordable housing crisis," mixing it with the aforementioned race-hustling to justify a federal quest to fix a largely imaginary crisis, thereby creating a real crisis. "Affordable housing," the pretext to demand lower lending standards, was not the crusade of the banks, but of the Democrats and the federal government. That, and housing never fails to be affordable, long-term, other than in areas with land restrictions and rent control laws. For example, Houston, which lacked even zoning laws, had the lowest housing prices in the country.

And regulation? We could have used *better* regulation, but we didn't suffer from an insufficient quantity of it. The financial sector is one of the most regulated, with more regulations and regulators added every year (Krugman calls this "deregulation.") The Left can't name one power the regulators needed in 2007 that they lacked at the time. (They can't meme either). No previous, less-regulated era witnessed a nationwide housing bubble, disproving the "deregulation and greedy banks did it" conspiracy theory. Indeed, when the crash hit, banks were doing EXACTLY what regulators wanted--easy lending to bad credit. Post-collapse, the PR-minded regulators pivoted to calling it "predatory lending" (the borrowers only accepted the loans under duress, doncha know?)

In closing, blame the real perpetrators: Identity Politicians and their effect on law. Identity politics controversialized lending money, then blamed the banks for the results (but you must bail them out--that's how much we hate evil banks) The only constant is that those responsible are still not blamed for it. It's time to blame them for it. Critical Race Theory-style logic ("disparities alone prove discrimination"), applied to lending, already crashed the economy once. Let's not give it another chance.

*
*
*

Great Depression Myths, New Deal Failures

Capitalism Didn't Cause The Depression

Ever hear of the Great 1921 Depression?

"What Great 1921 Depression?" you ask. That's right! There wasn't one! Because after a stock market downturn in 1921, the government stayed out of it and the crisis ended inside 18 months. Economies recover until and unless government know-it-alls constantly meddle, trying to "fix" it.

Meddling creates "regime uncertainty," where businesses hesitate to expand for fear the rules may all change tomorrow. Employers hate uncertainty. Governments picking winners and losers creates uncertainty.

The two biggest myths about the Great Depression are 1) that *Laissez Faire* caused it and 2) that the New Deal fixed it. In truth, 1) capitalism didn't fail, 2) the New Deal didn't work and 3) the New Deal was a political program, not an economic one, explaining why it didn't fix the problem. Indeed, the only "problem" it was designed to fix was the Democrats' inability to consistently get elected between the Civil War and 1932; the "problem" of Republican domination (and the national prosperity it generated) was thereby subdued until Ronald Reagan appeared.

The first myth relies on widespread belief that Herbert Hoover was a *laissez faire* noninterventionist. He was not. He placed a tax on writing checks, and engaged in massive public works projects to stimulate the economy, creating a result unseen in the 1921 slump.

Unemployment under Hoover peaked at 9%, then fell to 6%, then he began intervening, spiking unemployment to 25%. Liberals disguise this fact by showing unemployment rates by year, instead of by MONTH, which would crush the "Republican capitalism as problem, FDR big government as solution" narrative they rely on.

Hoover's administration saw the passage of the 1932 Revenue Act, which doubled income taxes for most Americans, hiked the top tax rate from 25% to 63%, lowered exemptions, stopped the earned income credit, spiked corporate and estate taxes, and created new gasoline and auto taxes. From 1930 to 1931, the federal government increased its share of the Gross National Product roughly one-third, much of it on subsidy and relief schemes. Hoover's administration gave hundreds of millions to cotton and wheat growers, and his Reconstruction Finance Corporation doled out subsidies to businesses by the billions.

In fact, this was so obvious that Rexford Guy Tugwell, a prominent member of FDR's "Brains Trust," later admitted everything they did was extrapolated from Hoover: "We didn't admit it at the time, but practically the whole New Deal was extrapolated from programs that Hoover started." (Source: Paul Johnson, *A History of the American People* -- New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1997, p. 741)

Many other nations avoided the US government's approach, and avoided prolonging the downturn. For example, Britain avoided big spending interventionism, and didn't spend a decade in stagnation like the US.

Branch Banking: An Outlawed Solution

The Left blames business for failures of government. Many states had "unit banking laws," forbidding banks to open multiple branches, which led to undercapitalized, under-diversified banks. Over 6,000 banks failed in the USA between 1929-1933. ZERO banks failed in Canada between 1929-1933, because Canada allowed branch banking. Canada also had no central bank at the time, disproving claims that the Federal Reserve is necessary to prevent economic disasters; if downturns occur both with and without the Fed, why have one?

In any case, banks manage risk, unless forbidden to do. Diversifying between different branch locations is a way to manage risk, a way forbidden by politicians worried financiers would run amok. Even the Federal Reserve's own economists have conceded the point. (

<http://www.stlouisfed.org/great-depression/qa.html>) "Lots of small banks got wiped out. In that era, they didn't have branch banking. If your local banker was gone, there was no source of funds in the local community. That was a severe impediment to the financial system." (St. Louis Fed economist Dave Wheelock answers several questions about the Great Depression as it relates to the great recession of 2007-09.)

Other Non-Causes: Buying Stocks on Margins, Concentration of Wealth In the fall of 1928, margin requirements were on the rise; that, and "buying on margins" never caused a stock market crash before 1929, thus it fails as an explanation.

Concentration of wealth does not cause economic collapses, though it does animate political movements whose platforms cause economic collapses. The belief that consumer spending alone drives growth fuels the "inequality causes collapses" narrative. True, the rich only can consume so much, yet spending alone can't sustain economies, which also require savings and investments. An economy where nobody defers consumption has no long term future.

The New Deal Failed The New Deal did not end the Depression. The Left pretends otherwise. Early in President Obama's first term, *Time* Magazine featured Obama's face superimposed over a photo of FDR riding in a car, captioned "The New New Deal." More recently, AOC (Authoritarian Ocasio-Cortez) called her bizarre plan the "Green New Deal."

Obama's "recovery" was anything but, a statistical gimmick, as expiring unemployment benefits counted as "declining unemployment," with many of the "employed" actually underemployed, and most new jobs part-time rather than full-time, as employers wished to avoid Obamacare requirements to pay for full-time workers' health insurance. In contrast, the Trump economy featured full time jobs, the same or greater growth despite an actual interest rate. (Obama's slump persisted despite having zero interest rates for much of his term, and without 2010 Republican victories containing him, it would have been worse). Add 1970s stagflation, as Jimmy Carter also failed to tax and spend and stimulate our way out of a slump, and it opens the door to doubting liberal historiography (or more accurately, *mythology*) of the 1930s.

FDR's Treasury Secretary Admitted the New Deal Failed The New Deal failed. Even Roosevelt's own Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau Jr., thought so, and said so, saying: "No, gentlemen, we have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before and it does not work. And I have just one interest, and if I am wrong, as far as I am concerned, somebody else can have my job. I want to see this country prosperous. I want to see people get a job. I want to see people get enough to eat. We have never made good on our promises...I say after eight years of this Administration we have just as much unemployment as when we started." (Transcript of private meeting at the Treasury Department, May 9, 1939, F.D. Roosevelt Presidential Library. Horwitz, Steven. "Great Apprehensions, Prolonged Depression: Gaulti Eggertsson on the 1930s." *Econ Journal Watch* 6.3 (2009): 313-36. Web. 10 Aug 2010.)

Reading between the lines, FDR himself knew it failed. No one needs scapegoats for successful policies, yet FDR blamed businessmen and bankers all the time, anticipating how modern

urban machine identity politics Democrats blame suburban whites for their own failed policies today.

1937 Tax Hikes Killed the Recovery, Not Supposedly Tight Fiscal Policy

Liberals deny

Morgenthau's admission, claiming tight fiscal policy and spending cuts caused the 1937 downturn. *The actual numbers obliterate this obfuscation.* Spending fell from \$8.2B to \$7.6B from 1936 to 1937, but federal tax revenues spiked from \$3.9B to \$5.4B (and to \$6.75B in 1938). So, a \$0.6B spending cut, a \$1.5B tax hike, and liberals call it... "tight fiscal policy" and "spending cuts?" The downturn arose from HOW the deficit was reduced, not from THAT the deficit was reduced. Balanced budgets in themselves don't cause slumps; balancing the budget by raising taxes on a depressed economy causes slumps. You don't lose money by saving it, and you can't achieve prosperity by maxing out your credit cards. Neither can the government.

Liberals then draw equally absurd parallels to recent "austerity" in Europe, yet what is "austere" about what European governments did? There is no objective, factual measure by which the European governments are "austere." Leftists point to declining deficits, ignoring that spending remains higher than 2007 in nearly every European country. (For more detail see <http://mises.org/daily/6451> "Is 'Austerity' Responsible for the Crisis in Europe?")

How Liberals Pretend the New Deal Worked

Morgenthau was right. The New Deal

failed. Liberals conceal this using several tricks. The first trick: show annual unemployment stats, rather than monthly. Monthly unemployment numbers reveal that post-crash unemployment under Hoover peaked first at 9%, fell to 6%, then Hoover intervened and it rose to 25%. Displaying annual unemployment numbers hides this, portraying (purported) *laissez faire* Hoover as the problem and big spender FDR as the answer.

Next, dubious unemployment rate calculations. Government jobs and make-work gigs come at the expense of private sector jobs. Government, aka "society's overhead" taxes the private sector to hire its workers. Hopefully we get something for it, though some of these silly make-work programs arouse skepticism.

Next, the New Deal's ridiculous make-work programs: did recovery really arise by paying people to chase tumbleweeds, research the history of the safety pin, patrol Washington with balloons to scare away starlings from public buildings, or catalogue 350 ways to cook spinach, as Kentucky WPA workers were paid to do? Before calling the New Deal a success, *ask whether the jobs did anything useful.* Or, as FDR cabinet member Harry Hopkins put it, "I've got four million at work but for God's sake, don't ask me what they are doing"

As explained earlier ("GDP Is An Invalid, Phony Statistic That Includes Government Spending to Help Liberals Fudge the Numbers"), GDP numbers can't "prove" the New Deal worked because *GDP includes government spending without subtracting for government borrowing*, and makes no consideration of whether the spending did anything useful. (In passing, this also explains the disconnect between Obama-era economic numbers and what many a reader experienced).

Private sector production and investment stagnated, aka, anyone betting their own money knew it was a failure. "Liquidity trap" excuses aside, the diminished private investment proves people risking *their own money* didn't buy FDR's hype, and the verdict of those risking *their own money* outweighs that of politicians, who merely risk *other peoples' money*.

Other annoying questions for New Dealers: How does throwing tailors in jail for pressing pants for 5 cents less than their competition help the economy recover? (http://mises.org/pdf/tailor_imprisoned.pdf) That's right, New Jersey tailor Jack Magid was arrested for pressing a suit for 35 cents instead of the NRA-mandated 40 cents, for which he served 30 days in jail.

The National Recovery Act cartelized many major industries while raising the cost of doing business roughly 40%, all while production declined to well-under 1929 levels on the NRA's watch. How does this help the economy recovery?

FDR's Agricultural Adjustment Act paid farmers to *destroy food*! How does destroying food make the economy recover? But it gets even better: Henry Wallace, then Department of Agriculture Secretary, issued a report saying the US was not growing enough food---issued while the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) was in full force, which paid farmers to *destroy crops*. Epic fail! (John T. Flynn, *The Roosevelt Myth*, 48-49).

Fortunately, the Supreme Court struck it down as unconstitutional. FDR responded by...trying to pack the court! How does attempting to pack the Court help the economy recover? It gets even better! After the Supreme Court struck down the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Roosevelt administration set up a fake "soil conservation" scheme to do what the Court had just ruled illegal! (and which to this day continues to subsidize non-production!)

How does confiscating gold make the economy recover? And then just consider how they set the price of gold: "Thereafter each day Morgenthau and Roosevelt met, with Jesse Jones, head of the RFC present, to fix the price of gold. They gathered around Roosevelt's bed in the morning as he ate his eggs. Then "Henny Penny" and Roosevelt settled the point. Make it 21 cents, he ruled. That is a lucky number--three times seven. And so it was done. That night Morgenthau wrote in his diary: "*If people knew how we fixed the price of gold they would be frightened.*" (19, "Excerpts from the Morgenthau Diaries; *Colliers' Magazine*, September 27 to November 1, 1947)

But returning to the National Recovery Administration, how does this thuggery make the economy recover: "The NRA was discovering it could not enforce its rules. Black markets grew up. Only the most violent police methods could procure enforcement. In Sidney Hillmans' garment industry the code authority employed enforcement police. They roamed through the garment district like storm troopers. They could enter a man's factory, send him out, line up his employees, subject them to minute interrogation, take over his books on the instant. Night work was forbidden. Flying squadrons of these private coat-and-suit police went through the district at night battering down doors with axes looking for men who were committing the crime of sewing together a pair of pants at night. But without these harsh methods many code authorities said there could be no enforcement because the public was not back of it." (John T. Flynn, "The Code Chisel" *Collier's Magazine*, Nov. 3, 1934)

It makes no sense, even in theory, how this would cause recovery, even before we examine the data, or ask why rationing need occur in peacetime, or why black markets thrived throughout this supposed "recovery." In a crisis, many call for the government to "do something." But "doing something" often is just the Broken Window Fallacy in action, and whether government "doing something" is advisable *depends greatly on what the government actually does*.

The Broken Window Fallacy That The New Deal's Fanclub Bases Their Whole Case On,

Debunked

Spending to "Stimulate" the Economy is The Broken Window Fallacy

All talk of "putting

money in people's pockets" and "stimulus" is mountebankery, and was exposed as such long ago.

Frederic Bastiat elaborated in *The Parable of the Broken Window*, in which a local hoodlum smashed the window of a shopkeeper, who then paid a glazier for a new window, and the glazier spent the money on his own wants. In the story, the town concludes the hoodlum "stimulated" the economy, citing the business generated. Yet minus the hoodlum, the shopkeeper had his money *and his window*. The Democrats' Keynesian economics (talk of "stimulus spending" or "multipliers" indicates the presence of Keynesians) is one giant Broken Window Fallacy.

When Democrats and their academic bodyguards say "putting money in peoples' pockets," ask "*money from where?*" Those three words will slay them. The money to "stimulate" comes from taxes, taxing money consumers would spend their own way if permitted. Democrats claim that giving your own money back, minus the bureaucracy's cut, does you a favor. They begin the story in the middle. Some politicians lure voters with the con man's pitch of soaking the rich. Yet confiscating every penny the rich have in income *and* accumulated wealth would only fund the government for three or four years. The Democrats' wish list inevitably requires taxing working people. Even other enablers of spending fail long term. Borrowed money must be repaid, lest lenders stop lending. Money printing eventually debases and destroys currencies. *There is no free lunch, anyone promising one is a con man, and part of being a grown-up is understanding this.*

Cleverer politicians assert roads, bridges, and public utilities projects "stimulate" the economy, but this compares the seen benefit versus the unseen cost, or "opportunity cost." The road might be paved cheaper, more useful if built elsewhere; the money could have done the same, or better, in private hands, and it might all be an excuse to give tax-funded make work projects to cronies. Catchy phrases explain nothing.

Democrat Keynesian theories assume government spending creates greater outputs than inputs because of dubious theoretical concepts like "multipliers" (which somehow don't "multiply" the harms of taxation on consumers). Living beyond one's means is imprudent. Living beyond one's means with other peoples' money and calling it "stimulating the economy" is preposterous. It "stimulates" the national debt, but little else. Government spending doesn't "rev up" economies, because government distributes money based on politics; clout, not productivity, gets rewarded. This produces bubbles, Keynesians proclaim prosperity, then the bubble bursts (*which always surprises Keynesians*), then comes the crash (like the Housing bubble), at which point Keynesians blame non-existent "deregulation," as if adding more regulators and regulations annually is somehow "deregulating."

Talk of "stimulating demand" is nonsense. Demand doesn't need to be stimulated. People want to go buy things just fine without the government prodding them! If money in their hands "stimulates spending," they can spend it just the same without politicians touching it first. And "liquidity traps?" More nonsense! If investors risking *their own money* find the economy unsound, which should politicians get to risk *other peoples' money*? In an unsound economy, government money fares no better than private money. Government money can't do magic, "multipliers" are nonsense, as shown by the assumption that taxing and borrowing don't produce a similar, chain-reaction of bad effects.

Neither the public nor its demand are stimulated by giving their money to the well-connected. If government spends to "stimulate," ask *who is being stimulated?* Not everyone gets the politically-allocated money, only a subset of people does.

"World War 2 Got Us Out of the Depression" = The Ultimate Broken Window Fallacy

Defeating National *Socialists* was good in itself, but World War 2 didn't end the Depression. The Depression ended because FDR died and Truman met a Congress with a few more Republicans in it, meaning that, for a few crucial postwar years, government expansion slowed. That, and the repeal of wartime price controls, as price controls cause shortages.

War-as-economic-recovery makes no sense. Wealth is stuff. War destroys stuff and kills the people who make it. How does that enrich a country? Taxing the average man to produce goods that are useless to consumers and destroyed on foreign battlefields enriches us how exactly? Hence, no one can name a single time protracted war enriched a nation. And I mean the whole nation, not just the military-industrial complex. The production of machines--then destroyed--accompanied by rationing and shortages at home, is not a gain to the consumer.

Aside from the disturbing idea that wars could cause prosperity, an unanswerable question remains: Why didn't the economy crash after World War 2, if cutting deficit spending really causes crashes? Why didn't releasing previously drafted men into the workforce cause mass unemployment as predicted by practically every major leftist of the era? Nor does one "rev up" the economy by taxing the population and then producing what they won't/can't buy (military hardware being non-consumer goods). How does military hardware used or destroyed overseas raise living standards at home? Try paying some people to produce a car, then smash it with sledgehammers, and persuade your neighbors this is "recovery." See if they buy it.

The New Deal Was a Political Project

The New Deal Was a Political Program, Not An Economic One: General Overview The New Deal was a political program, not an economic one, hence its failure as economics. The 1929 crash didn't convert Democrats to big government. They already adored big government; indeed, many of the members of FDR's "Brains Trust" (some of which visited Mussolini's Italy for policy ideas) were leftovers from Woodrow Wilson's administration. Some, like Brains Trustster Rexford Guy Tugwell, despaired that World War 1 ended because that meant their centralized control of the economy had to end, declaring, "We were on the verge of having an international industrial machine when peace broke," lamenting "Only the Armistice prevented a great experiment in control of production, control of prices, and control of consumption." (Rexford Guy Tugwell, "America's War-Time Socialism" *The Nation* (1927), pp. 364-365. Quoted in Leuchtenburg, "The New Deal," pp. 90-91.) When the Depression hit, the power-grabbing big government Democrats saw their chance and ruthlessly exploited it to create a national political machine which has exercised fake compassion and real power to the present day.

The New Deal, or should we say, "The New Tammany," replicated on the Potomac the very goodies-for-votes scheme that the Tammany Hall machine of New York City originated. Right from the Tammany playbook, FDR and company leveraged Works Progress Administration relief jobs both for votes and for political contributions. The New Deal was not a good idea fraught by corruption, but

a corrupt program that did *exactly what it was designed to do*: exploit misery and desperation to keep Democrats in power.

Kentucky, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, and Maryland saw schemes to use patronage to get votes and the cooperation of more local political machines with the DC political machine. (Robert J. Leupold (1975). "The Kentucky WPA: Relief and Politics, May-November 1935" *Filson Club History Quarterly*. 49 (2): 152-168.) In Pennsylvania, Democrat machine politicians were consulted over who to appoint as WPA administrators (Priscilla F. Clement (1971), "The Works Progress Administration In Pennsylvania: 1935-1940." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*. 95 (2): 244-260)

In Kentucky, FDR favorite (and future Truman VP) Alban Barkley enjoyed a great advantage when Democrats used Works Progress Administration job-holders as taxpayer-funded campaign workers to help him. (His opponent, popular then-governor A.B. "Happy" Chandler mirrored this, mobilizing state-level employees in a parallel manner). Scripps-Howard newspaper chain reporter Thomas Stokes interviewed many federal and state employees, getting to the bottom of it. For its part, a Senate committee did its own investigating and discovered the truth, leading to the Hatch Act. (Sean J. Savage, *Roosevelt: The Party Leader, 1932-1945* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1991), 140-143; Thomas L. Stokes, *Chip Off My Shoulder* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1940), 534-537) The Hatch Act forbade government employees from involvement in politics. But this didn't stop Democrats from disbursing goodies to the voters themselves. Nevertheless, furious at Democrat resistance (largely Southern Democrats) to his court packing, FDR attempted to purge them in the 1938 primaries, employing the same Federal patronage tactics against Senators Millard Tydings of Maryland, "Cotton Ed" Smith of South Carolina, and Walter George of Georgia. However, they were prepared, countering with their own armies of state and local workers, and survived.

The New Deal, AKA, Tammany-on-the-Potomac

The South, America's poorest region, still "received 75% less funding per capita than the West for federal relief and public works." (Bradford A. Lee, "The New Deal Reconsidered," in the Spring 1982 issue of *The Wilson Quarterly*. 6 (2): 62-76) The Solid South backed FDR more solidly than anywhere else in the country (remind me how that's "conservative" again), thus he spent other peoples' money winning the swing states. *A program that spends the least on poor states and the most on swing states is a political program, not an economic program.*

Roosevelt and his minions bought his reelections with other peoples' money, running a Tammany-on-the-Potomac, which is *The Swamp* that infests this nation to this day. And that's what *they said they were doing*. "We will tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect," declared Harry Hopkins, head of FDR's Works Progress Administration (Arthur Krock, November 9, 1938, "Win Back 10 States; Republicans Take Ohio, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Massachusetts," *New York Times*) But wait. It gets even better.

Emil Hurja, the deputy director of the Democratic National Committee, conducted polls on the political effects of patronage. He calculated which swing states and districts would flip if given federal money. (Melvin G. Holli, *The Wizard of Washington: Emil Hurja, Franklin Roosevelt, and the Birth of Public Opinion Polling* (New York: Palgrave 2002), 50-72) "Money, time and effort should not be wasted, but applied in those states close to the fifty percent line and carrying the largest possible electoral vote at the least expense." (Holli, *The Wizard of Washington*. 72)

Melvin Holli, who studied Hurja, described his methods thusly: "With notepad in hand, Hurja would tell the Democratic high command, "We have this state for sure--waste no effort on it. We are certainly to lose that state. Ignore it." And then, "Now here is a doubtful state that may be lost or won." With Hurja's advice, Postmaster General Farley, who directed the flow of funds for the Democrats, would signal the announcement of new WPA projects and relief programs or designate speakers and campaign materials for those states that Hurja's notebook indicated were doubtful." (Melvin G. Holli, *The Wizard of Washington: Emil Hurja, Franklin Roosevelt, and the Birth of Public Opinion Polling* (New York: Palgrave 2002), 72)

Democrats misused WPA job-holders as taxpayer-funded campaign workers, and as voters: four months before 1936 election, 300,000 men were added to WPA rolls, the month after the election, 300,000 men were promptly removed from WPA rolls...as if it was a trick to get 300,000 votes. (Thomas E. Dewey, *The Case Against the New Deal* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1940), 93)

Democrats also used Public Works Administration funds, among others, to buy the Black vote, to "Tammany-ify" them. The GOP's 1936 Presidential nominee Alf Landon called it in real time, noting that Democrats used "relief rolls as modern reservations on which the great colored race is to be confined forever, as a ward of the Federal government." (Raymond Wolters, "The New Deal and the Negro," in John Braeman et al., *The New Deal: The National Level* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1975), 210) Talk about undercutting the self-congratulatory preening of the race-hustlers, who obnoxiously cite their monopoly of the Black vote today as "social proof" to self-righteously pretend this must be about civil rights.

This federal slush fund helped FDR leverage congressmen to vote for more of it, keeping *The Swamp* running and growing. In FDR's first term, he identified sympathetic congressmen, waiting until late in the Congress' first session of his first term before deciding where to give out patronage jobs, rewarding supporters with increased reelection chances. The aforementioned pollster Emil Hujra even helped Democrat candidates with PR on this, giving the candidates charts showing "Federal appropriations segregated by department for your state. You can use this any way you like, in speeches, radio talks or newspaper interviews." (Holli, *The Wizard of Washington*. 62)

Democrat historians spent decades concealing the political motivations of the New Deal, burying then-well-known facts under piles of platitudes about FDR's "compassion" and "giving people hope." A combination of Henry Steele Commager, Richard B. Morris, Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. and William Leuchtenburg created the Roosevelt myth. Leuchtenburg proved especially prodigious, as he trained many historians himself, including Kevin M. Kruse, who smeared the suburbs as racist in his quack work *White Flight* (2005). Yet despite the airbrushing, the definite connection between FDR's "National Tammany" machine and Democrat vote share in 1936 were no secret at the time.

David Lawrence, author and editor, did a study comparing voting results with disbursements of Agricultural Adjustment Administration and Works Progress Administration money for every non-Southern county in America, discovering an overwhelming connection between the amount of Federal disbursements and Democratic vote share, *even in traditionally Republican areas*. FDR's bought his victories, a well-known fact at the time. (David Lawrence, *Who Were the Eleven Million?* (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1937; for even more, see Burton Folsom, *New Deal or Raw Deal*, especially Chapter 12--Patronage Transformed: The Elections of 1934 and 1936. This chapter alone annihilates the reputation of Roosevelt.)

FDR's Poor & Working Class Supporters Paid For the New Deal, Not the Rich: Propaganda & Patronage, Just Like Modern Democrats

Nor did the rich pay for it all. The New Deal not only thwarted recovery, it *burdened* the working class, relying heavily on excise taxes levied on alcohol, cigarettes, matches, candy, chewing gum, margarine, fruit juice, soft drinks, cars, tires, telephone calls, telegrams, bank checks, movie tickets, playing cards, electricity and radios. Propaganda vilified the rich, vowing that "the rich" were paying for it. But "the rich" just hid their money in bonds. Revenue from excise taxes rose from \$500 million in 1929 to \$1.36 billion in 1935, meaning New Deal programs were funded by taxes on working class people drinking, smoking, driving, and so forth. In other words, FDR's supporters voted against their own interests as a result of propaganda and patronage, serving as a model for today's Democrats.

And did unemployment really fall, or did productive people pay higher taxes to hire people to do useless things? "Roosevelt's Civil Works Administration hired actors to give free shows and librarians to catalog archives. It even paid researchers to study the history of the safety pin, hired 100 Washington workers to patrol the streets with balloons to frighten starlings away from public buildings, and put men on the public payroll to chase tumbleweeds on windy days" (<http://www.fee.org/articles/great-myths-of-the-great-depression/>)

Even worthwhile things got political. The Works Progress Administration built many roads, very very many in Democrat districts. Many got these jobs via appointment by the Democrat precinct chairman. Many roads were built so badly other WPA workers had to come redo them. But local Democrats voted with FDR and more money kept rolling in, as if it was just Tammany Hall on the Potomac, rather than a serious economic plan.

And now the clincher: FDR had the FCC threaten to yank broadcast licenses for stations that criticized the New Deal. People only heard that he planned to pack the court from the newspapers, notably the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, whose editor, Moses Annenberg, was rewarded by FDR sending the IRS after him, much like Obama did to the Tea Party after the 2010 midterms.

This only makes sense if the New Deal was a POLITICAL PROJECT to subjugate the country. It makes zero sense, if it truly was an economic recovery program, for FDR to use government agencies to intimidate the New Deal's critics. The matter is thus settled: The New Deal is Tammany-on-the-Potomac scheme with no moral authority behind it.

Save America. Send this work to everyone you know.

And pray.