



MAPPING THE NEW ANTI-WHITE RACISM IN TODAY'S LIBRARY WORLD

- Book review by Ron Kelley

TOPOGRAPHIES OF WHITENESS: MAPPING WHITENESS IN LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, Schlesselman-Tarango, Gina, Ed., Library Juice Press, 2017.

*“Suddenly whiteness studies are everywhere. The rapid proliferation of a genre that appears to have come out of nowhere is little short of astonishing: a recent keyword search on my university library’s electronic catalog yielded fifty-one books containing the word “whiteness” in their titles, almost all published in the past decade and most published in the past five years. All around us, American historians and scholars in related disciplines from sociology to law to cultural studies and education are writing titles such as *The White Scourge*, *How the Irish Became White*, *Making Whiteness*, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness*, and *Critical White Studies* ... [V]irtually all whiteness authors seek to confront white privilege – that is, racism – and virtually all identify at some level with the political Left.”* – Peter Kolchin, [Whiteness Studies: The New History of Race in America](#), *Journal of American History*, V. 89, No. 1, June 2002, pp. 154-173

An elementary school child I know had a strange response when I, kiddingly, started singing “I’m dreaming of white Christmas” last Easter. “That sounds racist,” she dryly observed. I was startled. It was a peculiar assessment from a 10-year old white kid, who, one might naively presume, would be more narrowly focused on chocolate candies and the Easter Bunny. What did she know about

accusations of racism? And where did such socialization come from? I later discovered that this innocent white child had eagerly asked her mother if she had any minority ancestry (she doesn't), had suggested that her mom get her an "Africa" T-shirt to wear to school, and was worried that a T-shirt I had earlier purchased for her as a gift (a St. Patrick's Day novelty that said "Irish" in bold letters across the front) could be construed as, yes, racist.

Where, I wondered, was all this neurotically self-destructive hypersensitivity to "racism" coming from? Alas, one doesn't have to look very far these days to recognize that the idea of "whiteness" (a nebulous "social construct" term for what is widely considered to be dreadful white people and their sinister culture) is systematically devalued -- and often grossly defamed -- these days. Schools, the media, governmental policies, and pop culture at-large are already making this little kid ashamed of the color of her skin, preparing her for a life as a new kind of second-class citizen in a race-based society: albeit a lowly white one. (A week after I was fired from the Flagstaff Public Library, an email was sent to all employees announcing a new "anti-racism" discussion group.) Throughout pop culture, and society at-large, today's "politically correct" onslaught doesn't aim for an actual racial equality. We are witnessing a racial *inversion* -- compensation for the past -- wherein Black celebrities and culture are relentlessly heralded and placed on a sacred pedestal. In the pop culture realm, I was stunned to discover that *Rotten Tomatoes* lists a run-of-the-mill superhero movie, "Black Panther" (with its all-Black cast), as [the "best" movie of all time](#) (!), including a 96% positive review rate from professional film reviewers. Likewise, it's star, Michael B. Jordan, is widely championed by media sources to be the "[sexiest man alive](#)," and the likes of Rihanna and A\$AP Rocky are proclaimed to be the "[World's Hottest Couple](#)." Celebrity basketball stars like LeBron James are suddenly held to be astute political pundits and their opinions are given enormous credibility. Note also, for instance, the recurring "[magical negro](#)" phenomenon in Hollywood movies and current fiction, wherein a noble Black character -- sometimes even superhuman -- guides errant whites on ethical quests.

Pop culture has always reflected inane fads and trends, but this racial dimension -- including the worshipping of "Blackness," and the parallel demotion of

“Whiteness” -- is a relatively new phenomenon.

Surprisingly (maybe not?), one of the many foundational metastasizing propaganda factories in this regard is the modern library: the traditionally respected source for knowledge and information. A fairly recent book, *Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Science*, inadvertently highlights the glaring pitfalls of one dimension of the growing “social justice” movement: how white culture – and its individual people – are under increasing attack, accused of collective guilt for virtually all and every evil. At core, this anti-white movement (including the expanding excesses of the “diversity/inclusion” octopus) has been steadily morphing its barely veiled hatred for “whiteness” into a blatant anti-white racism. Its broader hostile package, of course, also despises Christianity, males, heterosexuals, conservatives, and traditionalists of many kinds, which is a net that captures many races and ideological strains. Book contributor Katrina Spencer highlights the broad inclusivity of this strangling web with this “interpretation” of the white bane: “*In the United States, whiteness is regularly interpreted as default, normal, invisible, and unquestioned. It is also frequently implicit code for male, Christian, heteronormative, cisgender, US born, and able-bodied.*” [p. 239]

Hence, “whiteness” is “code” for a broad range of “normal” world views that activists like Spencer hate and are Hell-bent to destroy. Whiteness is the default oppressive boogeyman *for anyone who despises convention.*

This *I Hate Whitey* volume includes the efforts of 29 authors, scholars (including white self-haters) in the library “sciences,” and other “progressive” librarians. A hallowed “People of Color” college professor, Todd Honma, nakedly defines the undergirding premise of this new anti-whiteness ideology in his preface to the volume. Honma encourages readers to engage in what he expressly calls a *ruthless activism* to achieve his comrades’ aims, using, of all the people in human history, the following quote from Karl Marx to frame this book and its anti-whiteness crusade:

*“If we have no business with the construction of the future or organizing it for all time, there can still be no doubt about the task confronting us at present: the **ruthless criticism of the existing order** [emphasized with italics in Honma’s text], ruthless in that it will shrink neither from its own discoveries, nor from conflict with the powers that be.” [p. xi-xii]*

In the same paragraph as the above quote, Honma explicitly underscores that this overtly Marxist admonition informs the very essence of “critical librarianship,” that recently coined and fast-growing “social justice” activism Honma and his fellow ideologues champion, an ideology that, as one of its stated principles, aims to subvert any notion of social and political neutrality in even our long venerated repositories of information: the library. Its central thesis is that there is no such thing as impartiality, and anti-whiteness political activists need to subvert and overthrow the “whiteness” workplace norms towards propagandizing the broader public to “oppressed by whiteness” sympathies.

There are many kinds of criticism, but Honma insists upon a *ruthless* version, one in which the logical extension of Marxism’s “*ruthless criticism of the existing order*” is the many tens of millions of people who were murdered for not kissing the ring of Honma-style proclamations under Russian communism, Chinese communism, Pol Pot’s Cambodia, and on and on. In my own past readings of the Holy Father Karl Marx’s Greatest Hits, I don’t recall any categorical denunciations of white people as an oppressive class, or a trans-global, generic “whiteness” culture itself as the undergirding definition of capitalism. Marx’s own Jewish heritage, however, is severely indicted by his own attacks against the Jewish socio-economic role in the formation of capitalism. See, for instance, his notorious essay and general perspective – guaranteed to make [committed Marxists squirm](#) – about “[the Jewish Question](#).” This accusatory “the Jews” all-*inclusive* essay, written by the communist master, is taboo in leftist/Marxist circles. Marx, whose maternal grandfather was a rabbi, famously denounced religion as the “opiate of the masses,” but an obsessive secularly-based anti-white “justice” fanaticism is no less a numbing narcotic to rally around. Hating the “Other” has always had a solid base and “whiteness” is the new scapegoat for the sins of the world.

In fact, such a broadly denigrating brush of any class of people is forbidden today in our political universe as definitive expressions of heinous bigotry -- and worse. There is an *exception* to this prohibition, however, as Susan Sontag evidences below, and this “topographies” book underscores. And that is the routinely generic denunciation of “the white race,” or today framed as “whiteness,” which remains, as always -- in contradistinction to all other enforced protections of races and ethnicities -- fair game for debasement and defamation.

All such alleged white supremacist oppression in western culture earns Marxist champion Honma a very *ruthless* salary upwards of [\\$100,000 a year](#) as an associate professor in the heart of suffocating “whiteness” at [Pitzer College](#), one of the *elite* Claremont Colleges in metropolitan Los Angeles. (However inconvenient to Honma’s thesis, the Pew Research Center [notes that](#) “*Asian Americans are the highest-income, best-educated and fastest-growing racial group in the United States.*” Pushing such “oppression” absurdities further, a 2018 “[White Privilege Conference – Global](#)” at Canada’s Ryerson University featured African-American speaker John Powell (who holds the “Chancellor’s Chair in Equity and Inclusion” at the University of California-Berkeley). This oppressed individual’s 2017 income at that college, alone, totaled [\\$450,540](#)! Anti-“whiteness” as a grotesquely lucrative cottage industry, anyone?)

Following Honma’s prologue, editor Gina Schlesselman-Tarango (henceforth GST, for brevity’s sake) introduces the theme of this book: the “geographical” contours of this volume and its concept of socio-political “topographies” with a quote from scholar Edward Said:

“Just as none of us is outside or beyond geography, none of us is completely free from the struggle over geography. That struggle is complex and interesting because it is not only about soldiers and cannons but also about ideas, about forms, about images and imaginings.” [p. 1]

Professor Said was, of course, a Palestinian scholar of Christian heritage whose lifelong nemesis – and endless source of “geography” angst, quite literally, was the Jewish state of Israel. His central political battle was against what he believed

to be a colonial Zionism and the enforced displacement of Arabs from their (his) homeland. This is not highlighted in the Said quote GST chooses, nor is it mentioned. And it is important to note that Said, however embittered about the Zionist Jews of Israel and its supporters beyond, largely refrained from taking broad swipes at any alleged innate evils of “Jewishness” the way GST and her ideological clan categorically defame a proposed toxic “whiteness.” He avoided doing this despite the fact that Israel still remains, from its inception, a canonized *Jewish* state. So what of this book’s (and the widespread movement that informs it) agitation against the alleged malady of “whiteness?” We’ve seen this sort of thing in history before, have we not? “*Jewishness poisons – and defines -- German society*” is probably the best known example. Said recognized a slippery slope when he saw it.

On the other hand, here's what prominent, and influential, Left-wing intellectual [Susan Sontag once said](#) about “the white race”:

“The white race is the cancer of human history; it is the white race and it alone — its ideologies and inventions — which eradicates autonomous civilizations wherever it spreads, which has upset the ecological balance of the planet, which now threatens the very existence of life itself.” – author [Susan Sontag](#)

[Sontag](#), prominent in influential New York intellectual and literary circles, was Jewish. She should have known better than to make such ridiculously sweeping smears of an entire genre of human beings. Imagine if someone today pronounced a similar indictment of Jews, that “*the Jewish race is the cancer of human history ...*” and onward through the rest of her above sentence. Of course, there *are* people who already have spewed such inflammatory charges about Jews, and today their words are forbidden from popular discourse (except in an archives context), as the invectives of racist and anti-Semitic maniacs. Presaging Sontag’s embittered vitriol, Aryan-obsessed Adolf Hitler [had closely parallel indictments of her own people](#):

“In the political field [the Jew] refuses the state the means for its self-preservation, destroys the foundations of all national self-maintenance and defense, destroys faith in the leadership, scoffs at its history and past, and drags everything that is truly great into the gutter. Culturally, he contaminates art, literature, the theater,

makes a mockery of natural feeling, overthrows all concepts of beauty and sublimity, of the noble and the good, and instead drags men down into the sphere of his own base nature."

What's the difference, at core, between today's popular categorical indictment of "whiteness" and this, of whatever "Jewishness" might be?

Hence, in expanding an Edward Said text as a foundation for investigating the "topographies" of racial socio-political issues, this book heralds a curious double moral standard. Said never trashed ALL Jews glued to an ideology of "Jewishness" (or Judaism, the historical core of "Jewishness," as did even Honma's hero Marx) the way this book staples whites to their "whiteness." Collective blame for anything leveled against the Jewish community is in fact widely policed throughout western culture by the accusation of anti-Semitism, which is roughly parallel in popular culture to the charge of racism, and equally punishable. On the other hand, shared blame and assessed guilt for all and every injustice in the universe alleged against the "whiteness" community – and every individual within it – is dangerously unrestrained and entirely fair game.

Such a blame-centered invention of the term "whiteness" is, of course, a dishonest sleight-of-hand. It hides its own racist bigotries behind a wall of straw props. Imagine someone declaring as true – in the same oblique anti-"whiteness" manner -- the old stereotype, say, that ALL blacks are guilty of laziness, i.e., a carefully crafted "blackness" critique wouldn't be addressed to individualized blacks per se (and therefore not *overtly* an expression of racism), but towards an abstract and nebulous racial/cultural "blackness" blanket – *an ideology* -- within which all people with dark skin are unfortunately imprisoned. The Righteous merely want to help blacks rid themselves of a detrimental blackness, don't you see? Many blacks, it would be proclaimed, may even be oblivious to their laziness dilemma. And, following this claim, it behooves everyone on the planet that each black eventually throws – as an act of moral deference to all other people -- their "blackness" down the toilet so that the entire world can be liberated from the curse of oppressive blackness, which would be rendered, like "whiteness," as a vague, unethical smog -- *mute, invisible, often hidden, normalized, terrorizing*, etc. (each a term GST and her kindred categorically assign to "whiteness.")

Or, again, who would dare today to collectively toss all Jews – in a parallel aversion to whites and their “whiteness” -- into a toxic vat of “Jewishness” (a la even Karl Marx) that pollutes, as it has been decreed by popular icons of hatred in the past, everything it touches?

So begins this volume as it outlines itself – and such is its “topographical” sinkhole: in all other cases except for an exempted “whiteness,” the political Left indicts any generic criticism of any people/race/ethnicity as an act of irrational bigotry and prejudice -- an immoral act of hatred.

But not here.

So to Hell with white people – ALL white people, every one of them -- and their stupid, greedy culture that continues to ruin the world. Who gives a damn about them and their wavering majority culture that incongruously continues to allow – and even sanction -- such slander and offense, towards systemic self-destruction of “whiteness” culture itself?

Editor GST quickly declares that “*in insisting that whiteness exists and that it is oppressive, we can also understand mapping as an act of resistance.*” [p. 2] But, bizarrely, astonishingly, she is at a loss to actually define the evil term: “whiteness.” For all her fellow social justice activists trying to resist, *transform*, and kill the thing, there is no consensus about what exactly whiteness is – except that it is central to the world of white people and harms everybody in the solar system who isn’t white. However ironic, this ambiguous idea of whiteness is held to somehow even define whites and their notions of themselves-- and it must be destroyed. Its nemeses are at least certain that whiteness is an elusive, suffocating blob. It is also *invisible*. [p. 7-8] It is alternatively described as “*often hidden.*” [p. ix] It is also *ubiquitous* (p. 2). Part of its fundamental essence is that it even “*terrorizes.*” [p. 3] Like a festering disease, most people don’t know they even have it. Like Original Sin, all white people, by birth default, have this malicious malaise, a birth *defect*, but so, unknowingly, can nonwhites: it can be a parasite ideology absorbed by innocent hosts. As contributor Jessica Macias notes

in her experience, “*monitoring and policing* [to conform to “*White standards*”] *often came from other minorities.*” [p. 116]

“Whiteness” is a Super Bug: it can do all and everything, even make zombies out of people, including People of Color, who then fail to act in their own best interests.

But all this doesn’t cover enough bases to encompass such a foundational evil. There’s more. GST goes on. She frames humankind’s Ultimate Nemesis – whiteness – against All Things Good as such a mightily mysterious and all-encompassing (yet incomprehensible) entity that – except perhaps for the last parenthesis -- she might be mistaking “whiteness” for the very omnipotence of a cruel God, or at least the downhill signpost of a festering Lucifer:

“[W]hiteness, alone, is mute, meaningless, unfathomable, pointless, frozen, veiled, curtained, dreaded, senseless, implacable. This insight – that whiteness is somehow veiled – is considered a key contribution to race studies, and there is general consensus that whiteness seeks invisibility (even while it is not always successful and can also be understood as hypervisible to those who do not benefit from it).” [p. 7-8]

Bear in mind that, for the editor of such a book, whiteness “*alone*” exudes all these lordly, sinister Mordor attributes, a villain unsurpassed, an evil that has no parallel. And its paradoxical dualism is profound in scope: consummate magician, whiteness can be Janus-faced, both invisible and its opposite (visible on steroids) at the same time, depending upon which prism the viewer chooses to gaze. (And, of course, there is the RIGHT prism and the WRONG prism, as this volume dictates: check your privilege -- *to choose* -- at the door).

Outrageously, GST confesses that she can’t even actually pinpoint the subject of this book (i.e., *she literally doesn’t know* – confesses that she *can’t* know -- *what she is talking about*). “Whiteness,” conveniently, to take in all and everything, is undefinable. She explains her unusual editorial dilemma like this:

“Even a cursory review of the literature reveals a dozen or more definitions [of whiteness]: an identity or self-understanding, an ideology or set of group beliefs, a concept, a form of property, an experience, a number of social practices, a system of power, that which terrorizes – to name but a few. It appears that whiteness, in its ubiquity and with its claims to normalcy, resists definition, consequently rendering it particularly tricky thing to theorize.” [p. 2]

This kind of outrageously mindless and ungrounded ambiguity, functioning as ideological nets to collect even germs with whales (actually ANYTHING to fit a preconceived narrative), surfaces everywhere in Leftist Library treatises. For further example, an American Library Association document entitled “[Hateful Conduct in Libraries](#)” notes that

“Visible diversity is generally those attributes or characteristics that are external. However, diversity goes beyond the external to internal characteristics that we choose to define as ‘invisible’ diversity.”

Likewise, in the same “hate” document, we are informed that *“hate speech doesn’t have a legal definition under U.S. law,”* so there is of course an open door for “progressive” groupies to smear whatever they don’t like hearing as “hate.” What is definable as “hate” then? No joke, an answer is pulled at the ALA “hate” document from something called [Free Speech and the Development of Liberal Virtues](#). (!) In essence, “hate” is defined as whatever is antithetical to “liberal virtues.”

Of course, with no absolutes to guide anyone, and only scattered subjective “theories” from disgruntled, self-promotive advocates of what the “whiteness” enemy actually IS, social justice consensus is to merely define “whiteness” as an all-pervading hydra monster that must be slain. (Or, the righteous must “*fissure*” it, [p. 2 and p. 55] “*undo white supremacist structures that control and police library spaces,*” (p. 137) “*attempt to change the landscape and narrative of our profession,*” (p. 246) or, simply, struggle to “*dismantle white supremacy.*”) [p. 129] [Emphases added]

In layman's terms, this anti-whiteness bandwagon (that can't exactly define its other-worldly enemy) echoes an attack upon some presumably all-powerful, amorphous space alien that is viewed by pea-brained humans as intending – by its very inexplicable nature -- mean-spirited havoc: *Let's kill it first and then we'll figure out later what the Hell it is.*

Meanwhile, however, undefinable whiteness must be relentlessly *challenged* and *interrogated*. [p. ix] Although whiteness is mysteriously elusive, ever morphing, and mist-like, it must nonetheless be constantly confronted and made to be *"troubled."* [p. 2] Efforts toward *"mapping whiteness"* are praised as *"act[s] of resistance,"* [p. 2] wherein merely to investigate it is decreed to be an expressly *"political project."* [p. 7] And although no one can agree exactly what the many Whiteness Killers are glaring at, all justice seekers need to get out their cartography guides and GPS units to at least find out where whiteness tends to hang out and what horrors it is conjuring. Map it, map it, map it -- hence the *"topographies"* allusion in this book's title. Then all good people can start twisting whiteness's red-scaled tail and maybe some insightful researcher will one day be able to trace whiteness to its sinister controls at Satan Central.

There and then, presumably, this future investigative hero might finally define *"whiteness"* clearly, that there might be popular consensus about what exactly social justice warriors actually hate and GST alludes to: that whiteness *"stand[s] for all that is presumed to be right and normal."* [p. 8] Of course. Whatever else it may or may not be, whiteness is a fake normal. And it follows, after all: who likes to be slaves to convention, to be told to put the stupid lipstick on your lips and not up one of your eight imagined assholes? Bottom line is the old (whiteness?) adage: when contesting sets of lunatics overthrow the existing system and take over the insane asylum, who gets to decide what is post-whiteness *"normal?"* And here we have the chaotic legacy of an experimental multiculturalism running berserk: moral and cultural relativism, i.e., there is no absolute truth about anything and no single value system or cultural legacy is really any better than another -- with the important Politically Correct exception that, despite the foundational PC inclusion dictate of absolute cultural equality, *white culture sucks and must be destroyed.*

Important to the elimination of “whiteness” is the genre of “*ally*,” weak-kneed whites who are hustled to feel guilt-ridden enough for all the sins in the world to dedicate their energies to slay this Beast from inside the hallowed whiteness corridors (“*dismantling whiteness from within*” [p. 79] But even these kinds of well-meaning (?) people cannot escape their Original Sin of being white. Indeed, even pioneer white anti-whiteness fanatics are guilty of this, because

“... *critical whiteness studies started to be taken seriously only when white scholars took it up.*” [p. 9]

Translation: In classical Catch 22 style, even any “white scholar” involved in the groundbreaking anti-white hatred effort is, ironically, by virtue of being such a social justice *forerunner*, a prime example of the suffocating power of whiteness and its implicit oppression of the Dispossessed. The truth-knowing Wretched of the Earth Insight Champions were elbowed out of the way while pioneer anti-white haters got acclaim and accompanying gravy because, of course, they are white and themselves prime examples of “white supremacy,” “white privilege,” et al. This scenario isn’t permissible when whites are, by authoritarian edict, a despised – and, henceforth, *banned* – class of thinkers. What, GST and other anti-whiteness ideologues wonder, is to be done about this? How does the noble white self-hater reasonably express his/her/its/etc. hatred for being white without usurping nonwhite white-haters who are sick of following white people’s lead and are entitled to lead the crusade? Yes, anti-white hatred from guilt-ridden, propagandized whites is much encouraged, and it is probably necessary in the arsenal to destroy the Monster’s vastness, but TOO much anti-white hatred from gung-ho whites runs the risk of the implicit powers of “whiteness” taking over through them and rendering people of color second fiddle in the very war against whiteness. Such a paradox. Even ardent white champions of anti-white hatred are also, by their very insights, “interrogated” too as—themselves --an expression of whiteness. (See, for example, pioneer white anti-white academic heroine [Peggy McIntosh](#) who is also guilty of this sin). Hence, the politically pure social justice warrior must constantly weigh such knotty implications of who gets to throw the principal Death Blow in the war against the omnipotence of whiteness, and whether each and every thought a white person has is, at root, a

default expression of racial oppression.

What about brainwashed white anti-white fanatics who engage in public confessionals about “white privilege,” accept a collective white responsibility for all the sins of the world, and emphatically reject “whiteness” (and the decreed corollaries of “white supremacy,” etc.) in a desperate effort to absolve a conjured personal guilt and wounded soul? Nice try, but the Social Justice Warrior Tribunal emphatically vetoes that as a serious no-no, because it is, of course, too white-centered (as is, apparently, everything), and therefore yet another poignant expression of the unholy *omnipresence* of “whiteness.” As GST explains it:

“[I]n utilizing personal testimony as a strategy to explore and examine privilege, a number of scholars and activists have pointed out that narratives often devolve into grandiose displays that promote a suffering and pity-inducing white subject. The white individual, riddled by guilt and the burden of penance, thus becomes the subject of investigation and functions as the site of emotional connection for the audience. Lopez writes: ‘White liberal guilt at its most performative has the ... effect of diverting attention from the facts of white racism and oppression to how badly the Enlightened White Liberal feels about it.’” [p. 17-18]

There are even some Social Justice Warriors who argue that whites who make “public disclosures [i.e., admissions] of [white] privilege are in result ‘assaulting’ for people of color who are reminded ‘about their lack of privilege’ and further ‘reinforce those [white] privileges when it stays at the level of confessionals.’” [p. 18]

Such white displays are too “*self-congratulatory*.” [p. 18] Hence, in publicly succumbing to white self-mutilation, confession, and taking psychological refuge in performing a public exorcism, it is not enough. With such an act of personal shaming, penance, and surrender, a white individual nonetheless risks – in this pitiful groveling – another accusation of whiteness “*assault*” from those who already relentlessly assail him!

So maybe you wish to help the nonwhite Oppressed expressly as a white person, exploiting your “privilege” and “supremacy” on behalf of raising the oppressed? Use your whiteness as a tool to kill whiteness? Don’t even think about it. You may

qualify more deeply as a certified “whiteness” scumbag for even considering this: “*imagine a white anti-racist saying, ‘I’m going to use my white supremacy to help people of color.’*” [p. 19] God forbid. Too condescending. Too paternal. Too racist.

GST’s commentary about all this sounds like an examination (“interrogation?”) of shell games at the Mad Hatter’s Tea Party. GST even proclaims that there is an outlandish dilemma, i.e., the

“outstanding debate about what well-meaning white people are to DO with their whiteness. One camp, a group often referred to as the ‘abolitionists,’ aims to simply get rid of whiteness altogether.” [p. 10]

Of course. Peel their hideous identity off like a snake skin and burn it in the sacrificial flames. These “*abolitionists*” (who are white) also refer to themselves as “*race traitors.*” [p. 11] But the ham-handed riddance of races, ethnicities, and counter-perspectives has already been well explored throughout history. Would not industrial ovens best eliminate the intractable whiteness problem? Otherwise, how do you easily stamp out hundreds of millions of people’s very concept of themselves? It’s a staggering problem for the anti-white racists who insist upon the erasure of white identity, whatever it is.

Another wing in the anti-white movement, “*reconstructionists,*” suggests reinventing “whiteness” into something more palatable to anti-white sensibilities, strained through the appropriate censorial filters to eliminate alleged racism and supremacy, and even pride in one’s heritage and a love of white clouds. The problem here, according to Zeus Leonardo (real sarcastic “whiteness” name, cartoon character, or a front name for a revolutionary reggae band?) is that white pride needs to be *stamped out*, and a mere reinvention/recalibration of whiteness might allow it to linger. [p. 12] After all, the anti-whiteness movement is hell-bent upon spreading a legacy of white shame, not pride, a la *Black Is Beautiful*.

Some Social Justice Warriors even argue that whites “resisting” whiteness may itself be too self-empowering, too white-centered, and that white people are

better left to take their rightful place in the world somewhere in the shadows with piles of dirty laundry.

As GST frames it:

“Margaret L. Andersen also questions the invitation to white people to call upon their particular histories, experiences, and cultures as sites of defiance, noting that here, it is again white subjects that do the resisting, reflecting, and empowering – from positions of whiteness.” [p. 12]

Bingo! Catch-22 again. *Even a white expression of anti-whiteness is actually an endorsement of it.* GST goes hyper-Orwellian doublethink on this one, adding that *“whiteness can sully even the strategies meant to challenge it.”* [p. 14] Why, pitiful white ping-pong ball, cut the tentacles yourself and personally reject the omnipotent scourge of whiteness, when you could entirely subsume your integrity and independence to a certified person of color (POC) who could more righteously do the hacking off of your old identity for you?

But there’s still more: another subdivision in the anti-white hatred movement. It’s the *“white trash school,”* of course. You think I joke? This term alludes to the genre of impoverished, uneducated, low-class (albeit “white privileged”) whites who fit the acceptable stereotype of *white trash*. Here GST cites Richard Dyer as a theorist of this “school”:

“If we are to see the historical, cultural, and political limitations (to put it mildly) of white world domination, it is important to see similarities, typicalities, within the seemingly infinite variety of white representation.” [p. 12]

So what does Bill Gates and Warren Buffett have to do with the white No-Name living in a cardboard box in the alley off Main Street? Whiteness, of course: *“world domination”* and all of its splendid privileges. Mr. Homeless No Name doesn’t get off the “whiteness” privilege hook, because

“in positioning white subjects as disadvantaged, minoritized, injured, racialized, or as ‘prewhite’ ethnics, we risk creating space for such subjects to ‘avoid critical confrontations with contemporary U.S. race relations in order to exempt

themselves personally from complicity or responsibility.” [p. 13]

Read this totalitarian dictate closely: if you are white, you are guilty. There is no escape. GST and her minions can't even allow any moral wiggle room for dispossessed white people. Thus, the homeless white guy living in a cardboard box and any dispossessed white children have to face their *“complicity or responsibility”* and get in line for the routine shakedown about his white supremacy. After all, whatever else he might be, the homeless white guy is categorically a racist by virtue of causing public offense in sleeping on the street with his telltale white skin. His whiteness exposes the innate scam that he is. For the anti-white Race Warriors, in this one important respect Bill Gates and Mr. No Name are fraternal twins. Conversely, merely being black – *rich or poor*– is the automatic ticket to victimhood gravy: Bill Crosby, Michael Jordan, Oprah, black CEOs, you name it. As Sarah Hannah Gomez frames the Oppressed Minority advancing up the college education system:

“[S]tudents of color ... essentially start one rung lower on the ladder, regardless of their socioeconomic status.” [p. 107]

The ideology of anti-whiteness is totalitarian. The consummate monster, whiteness is decreed to be undefinable, omnipresent, and inescapable. If white, there is no permanent refuge, and no escape, from condemnation, no matter what one says, does, or believes. Even for hard-core anti-whiteness ideologues like GST, who spend so much time exorcizing themselves, this genetic Original Sin must haunt ALL white people, sooner or later, like a cattle brand across the face:

“This means that we not only entertain the possibility that our dedication to, or aspiration towards, anti-racism and anti-white supremacy positions us as part of the solution, but also that, in other contexts, it might mean that we are always already part of the problem.” [p. 21]

Beyond their actions, even white peoples' thoughts (that they may have mistakenly imagined were independent) are wired to Whiteness Central and there is absolutely no escape from their “whiteness” selves. And this is the central

thesis of the new anti-white racism, however its advocates dissimulate and attempt to distance themselves from its hard-racist essence: “whiteness” (whatever it is) and white people are viewed as inseparable. And whiteness is hated.

Even in the ideal race-less utopia, the minority Other will always see the crime of “whiteness” when they gaze upon any white face. Ideological (and perhaps more) servitude to the nonwhite “oppressed” is the only atonement for every person unfortunate enough to have been born white, and even that, at best, can only be partial, and could be more likely just a convoluted expression – and *confirmation* - of the omnipotent whiteness problem itself. For a white individual to simply express an opinion about all this too powerfully— either resistant to, *or even endorsing*, the anti-white Party Line -- is still only another expression of “whiteness” and could further oppress the Oppressed who, in true Orwellian form, are the ones who need to take charge and make the decisions to evade the eternal yoke of whiteness, i.e., *they must be dominant in the chain of Social Justice Warrior command to truly become equals.*

How totalitarian does this all get? Because it is a “*permeative norm*,” GST fitfully wonders “*can we ever see it for what it is?*” [p. 15] There are even those who argue that a white’s total submission to the accusation of “white privilege” is largely folly anyway because the entire known world is saturated with it so profoundly that a personal struggle to rid oneself of the whiteness scourge (typically “*an exercise in expunging guilt*” [p. 15]) “*could never attain completion.*”) [p. 15] It is more than a life’s work: it is a transcendent task, eternal. In fact, the effort may be hopeless, because whiteness in whites sticks at the backbone, in the marrow, in the DNA, in the brain, in cultural identity, in the very filtration system of whites’ (and the nonwhite brainwashed) perception of the world. Ultimately, as white “allies” fervently try to shake off who they are (including any heritage baggage), white identity (“white privilege,” etc.) adheres to white people no matter what they do to get rid of it. Hence, they remain perpetually ripe for condemnation NO MATTER WHAT THEY THINK OR DO. [p. 15-16] As Megan Watson states it, particularly in “*resisting white feminism*”... “*good intentions are not good enough.*” [p. 166]

What is the depth of this Thought Police despotism? For those mired neck deep in the anti-white world, even the term “diversity” is considered to be, at core, *itself* a white supremacist slight, a scheming manipulation. Apparently, the term “diversity” is too all-encompassing (*inclusive*), or flattening, for the myriad Peoples of Color who demand to be respectively celebrated, and the concept of racial, ethnic, and cultural multiplicity somehow emanates from the dark soul of whiteness culture, a condition which therefore screams for denunciation. Embrace the “diversity” notion and its attendant politic and you are *still* spreading the treacherous manure of whiteness. As contributor David James Hudson decrees:

“In its inscription of these familiar racial dynamics, the recurrence of the figure of the DIVERSE LIBRARIAN [italicized in the original] might well be said to represent a microaggression, a matter of interpersonal impropriety. [p. 219]

Here the “recurrence” of “the figure” of the “diverse librarian” (i.e, the standard affirmative action People of Color librarian, who may have been awarded his/her job because of race politics and not of competence alone) is considered to be an insult. The offended Identity Politic vacuum cleaner demands, demands, and demands more. Better, perhaps, to simply get rid of the white librarians?

Hudson continues:

“Like the figure of the DIVERSE LIBRARIAN [italicized emphasis in the original], diversity discourse more broadly extends contemporary white supremacist dynamics (if inadvertently) while obscuring the complex operations of such dynamics behind generally accepted and innocuous (or even progressive) conceptual frameworks. Diversity is the common-sense language of racial liberalism, the ready-to-wear, one-size-fits-all analytic available for the presumably simple, utilitarian task of transmitting anti-racism in the library world.” [p. 221]

Hudson’s essay in this book is perhaps the most ponderous and pompous of the weighty lot. It is entitled *The Whiteness of Practicality*. [p. 203] After plodding through it, I still don’t know what it is about, but it seems to claim that even being

practical (like being rational, as we shall see) is an expression of white racism.

Hudson asserts that

“the whiteness of practicality suggests that the exalted status of the practical in our field reproduces conditions through which whiteness sustains its dominative power by foreclosing spaces of critique in which the complex, ever-shifting dynamics of white supremacy might be confronted.” [p. 223]

Got that? It’s a writer in narcissistic love with his own confusion. There will be a quiz on Monday. “Practicality” hereby sustains whiteness’s “dominative power.” And despite the clue in the title, here’s what the article says it is:

“This chapter explores the implications of such hegemonic dynamics for anti-racist work in the library world. Where does the imperative that we be first and foremost practical in our library work intersect with the interests and violences [sic] of white supremacy? How could such a seemingly liberatory [sic] discourse – that we remain practical, focused on getting information to users with efficiency, committed to universalizing access – possibly be implicated in the dispossessive [sic] work of whiteness? Drawing on stories of theory and practice, of the world of libraries and beyond, of academia and beyond, of diversity and justice, of the normative and the unintelligible, of plain prose and deceptive violence, I suggest that there are answers to be found in the examination of whiteness’s operations as an aggressively unmarked locus of power. Its self-effacing claims to self-evidence – and our fields’ perpetuation of its structures of material and epistemological violence – are left unchallenged as exaltations of practicality work to foreclose spaces in which we might confront white supremacy through interrogations of its complexities, practices of critique that do not always produce.” [p. 205-206]

This is classic. There is a grotesque amount of verbosity in this introduction, and plenty of wild word slinging, but it really doesn’t say very much. It could have been a lot more readable if the author cut to the quick with the simple summary “I hate white people” and not waste the reader’s time and energy to decipher this man’s tedious thesaurus pounding and clumsy wordsmith gymnastics. It’s also the

kind of writing that scrapes the rusty engine bottom with politically correct platitudes, slamming strings of cumbersome words together in a desperate attempt to sound smart. The entire essay slogs on like this. He offers no mercy, no chance to surface for air. Incredibly, as if self-satirizing, Hudson even gets around to saying this:

“[P]lain language so often operates to sustain white supremacy by rhetorical sanitization.” [p. 217]

He’s not kidding, it’s not satire, and I’m not making this up. It’s my favorite line in the book. *Absolutely* Alice in Wonderland. Hence, even an attempt at simplicity and clarity in communication is invariably an act of “white supremacy.” What else could raw intelligibility be? Better to muddle the waters and blind your audience with sludge, dense fog, and newly conjured cant from secreted orifices lest readers spot something grotesque that you’re trying to hide. If something is too obvious (like the fact that this entire book is founded on nonsense), it must certainly be a sinister manipulation by white racism.

Hudson’s text is exemplary of the Wall of Obfuscation that the leftist intelligentsia, self-prescribed, hustles. As bonus in such a paradoxically highbrow volume, the hapless reader must suffer through various authors who toss out elitist, careerist, and incestuous verbal roadblocks, replete with in-house, ideological gang insignia/jargon like “*hegemony*” [standard Marxist red flag, pun intended], “*hegemonic privilege and power,*” “*praxis,*” “*race conscientization,*” “*critical race theory,*” “*conscious-preneurs and praxticioners,*” “*intersectionality,*” “*biomythography,*” “*microaggressions,*” “*racialization,*” “*attributional ambiguity,*” “*liberatory discourse,*” “*antiredistributive formation,*” “*vectors of oppression,*” “*microactivism,*” etc. These are merely a few of the passwords for the “deconstructive” political mafia and their aim with this usage is in part to mystify and make as nebulous as possible their Sacred Teachings. (See, for example, the notorious Peter Boghossian and James Lindsay [essay hoax](#). These co-authors constructed “[3,000 words of utter nonsense posing as academic scholarship](#)” that was rife with leftist gibberish in the field of “gender studies.” The piece essentially asserted that the male organ drives climate change. It was peer-reviewed and accepted for publication in an academic journal, *Cogent Social*

Sciences).

This kind of arrogance and exclusivist verbiage, including its stillbirth of newly obscurest terms and categories, is largely self-anointed as *profundity* and scornful of simple language, wherein a logjam of would-be prophets unite to conjure the secular Holy Treatises. As evidenced throughout this volume, in copious footnotes, in a virtual satire of the (whiteness?) norms of argumentative academe, revered politically correct seers are cited as evidential grounding for a broad range of problematic assertions. (The paradox here is, of course, that the common man, the proletariat, the multicultural “oppressed,” or even the average transgender Haitian voodoo practitioner, won’t have a clue what some of this text is supposedly championing and will need to set down their placards and march on the dreaded “whiteness” libraries to consult an activist subculture dictionary, bible, or thesaurus.)

Like this *I Hate Whitey* book.

And what of the commentary of other authors whose work GST introduces? We are imprisoned by more Catch 22-paradoxes. Shaundra Walker introduces us to “critical race theory” (“CRT”) and decrees that “[w]hile white philanthropy has the potential to do enormous good, because such donations often reflect the values and interests of the benefactor, it also has the potential to do harm.” [p. 33]

Translation: Money = good. White people, especially attached to money = bad.

Walker also adds this startling fact:

“CRT posits that the dominant group, in this case Whites, only permits racial progress when such progress also results in benefits for Whites.” [p. 35]

Aside from this absolutist assertion being itself debatable (how, for instance, does this “permitted” book benefit “Whites?”), we all know, as corollary, certainly in the last half century, that all social groups in Africa and the Asian world – as a human standard -- routinely prioritize their collective actions to singularly benefit the hostile *Other*? And the widely “permitted” -- and even *encouraged* and

bankrolled -- rise of anti-white racism in America, as manifest by the extremes of “critical race theory,” has multiple “benefits” to “Whites?”

Comrades, who can deny it?

Another essay, co-authored by a Committee of three, partially titled as “interrogating whiteness” (like pestering a criminal under an intense lamp in an FBI office?), defines “whiteness” solely as “*the right to exclude.*” [p. 55] Among this piece’s foundations are the claims of a co-author, Katherine Crowe, “*who identifies as white,*” about her work as an archivist with a goal of “*creating a more inclusive, compositionally diverse, and actively anti-racist university archives at the University of Denver.*” [p. 56]

Inclusion? Compositionally diverse? This is a rather curious assertion for a volume that later in its pages features “Person of Color” Sarah Hannah Gomez’s celebration of an explicit *exclusion* of white culture in her work place:

“I tried to make all of my active and passive book-related services about ‘diverse books’ to the exclusion of stories of comparable quality that starred characters from dominant social groups, which I felt sold themselves.” [p. 107]

Gomez explicitly uses the term “exclusion” as foundation for her hypocritical “divers[ity]”/inclusion ideology. She also declares that the reason she went to library school was her hatred of (whiteness) libraries and her apparent paranoia in them:

*“I have always been a library user, but I never particularly liked being in a library ... I saw the value in libraries, and not just in the services I used ... But I didn’t LIKE the library. From the time I was old enough to spend time in the library alone, I felt like I didn’t belong. I felt **WATCHED** constantly, but I never felt **SEEN**. [Italicized in original] I may never have been chased out of a library with pitchforks, but I feel that my persistent use of libraries over the course of my life has largely been out of a stubborn desire to spite the library for what it didn’t give me, not because of what it did. But then, I can be dramatic. That dramatic attitude is what led me to library school.”* [Italicized emphasis in the original] (p. 105)

Gomez's overtly exclusionary, double-standard, anti-white theme is echoed by fellow contributor Jorge R. Lopez-McKnight (who taught a college course called "*Introduction to Information Studies*"), blatantly framing his own racist treatise with

"Who is my librarianship for? Understand that my librarianship is not for White folks." [p. 261]

This spit-in-your-face preface stems from an accusatory article he entitles "*My Librarianship Is Not for You.*" [p. 261] Nothing vague here. And, no, I surely don't "understand" it to the writer's satisfaction. The author's (as this volume's) prejudice is explicit. In what twisted rationale is his posture not discriminatory, which is (except when it is "whiteness"-directed) otherwise a crime for the political Left? And how does one reconcile a generic people of color "inclusion" ideology and anti-white "exclusion" ideology under a supposed Social Justice umbrella in the same volume? How does any editor go blind to a contributor's nakedly stated bigotry, as an employee at taxpayer-supported educational institutions (University of New Mexico/University of Indiana) that is supposed to serve everybody equally as a matter of ethical – and legal -- principle? It is merely yet another example of today's typically racist anti-white double standard. "People of color" are aligned upon golden, exclusionary pedestals and "whiteness" is sentenced to all manner of *diversity* maligning. The editor of this book consciously defers, as core to her political platform, to anti-white bigotry. (Reality check: imagine the Hell that would befall a parallel *white* librarian stating, in the public record -- as a foundation of his/her career – that, say, "my librarianship is not for Black folks" (or Latino, or Sikh, or Muslim, or whatever.)

Lopez, a supposed educator, is so obsessed by his anti-white racism and identity politics that, in teaching a college class in "information literacy" at the University of Indiana,

"Always I was aware of my existence as a Person of Color, my identities were amplified because I was the authority in the classroom, up front and center. In those days, before class started, I used to write my full name on the board. I didn't write my name just so that students would know it, I wrote it as an act of resistance." [p. 266]

Resistance to what? Resistance to “*classes full of [innocent] White students*” [p. 265] who took his “*information literacy*” course in good faith? It wasn’t enough that in our oppressive “whiteness” educational culture he was the “*authority*” in the classroom and every white student in the room was totally at his mercy, per grades, the premises of fact-gathering, and an obviously enforced and propagandized *ideological* “literacy?” For such a racist ideologue, simply Lopez’s name on a chalkboard seemed aimed as another kind spit in their faces. And this is merely his *introduction* for a course about (presumably objective?) information gathering and assessment?

Objective? But wait. Is even the quest for objectivity also racist? Deep in this anti-white volume, from author Ian Beilin we hear that

“whiteness is often discursively hidden within concepts like neutrality and universality.” [p. 84]

This is an extraordinary claim, common in the fast-growing “critical librarianship” realm, that an insistence upon impartiality and the commonality of all people is ALSO merely, at root, the twelve billionth expression of ubiquitous white supremacy, privilege, and racism. These damnable attributes include, for Beilin, the very *architecture* of the library in which he works, where likenesses of icons from the “*Greco-Roman West European tradition*” (Socrates? Aristotle?) and “*the names of famous white male writers, ancient and modern,*” [p. 90] (*Chaucer? Shakespeare?*) “*seem to promote (or imply) patriarchy, elitism, classism, and racism.*” [p. 89] Of course, the evil white scumbags who built the building decades ago should have had the clairvoyant foresight to transcend their ethnocentrism to build statues that herald nonwhite wisdom and the god of *diversity*, the way the Third World, Japan, China, etc., have always built statues to Homer and Benjamin Franklin. (Taking Beilin’s line of sleuthing in other directions with the accelerator down, was the UCLA library’s memorial plaque to Hugh G. Dick outside its administration offices that I used to pass when I worked there actually a wry code – or slap in the face to uptight Christians -- for the many male homosexuals who worked in its system? Or was it put up with no such political subversion because he was part of the history of this library and that was the guy’s name?)

And here, again, if we are to dismiss such allegedly bankrupt human equations as neutrality and human universality as fundamentally fraudulent, and the truly moral individual need not even feign an attempt at a bogus social, cultural, and political neutrality, future racial and interethnic possibilities are all reduced to one of proclaimed absolutes and the mere dominance of one group over another. And the logical extension of this Politically Correct proclamation is quite simple then: Who gets to come out on top? Who gets to lord over all others – evil whites, or a contesting racial construct which will lord over *them*, and others who fail to seize the reins of power? After all, by anti-“whiteness” exhortation, there cannot be a just semblance of “*neutrality and universality*,” which by anti-white diktat, inherently – and ONLY -- favors white people. Think about the implications of such a deconstructionist/*destructive* ideology. Absent neutrality and universality, or even the *attempt* at these perspectives, what do you actually have?

In microcosm, you have this, from contributor white librarian Katie Dover-Taylor, whose anti-whiteness activist role is ultimately fulfilled as an aid, a servant, a female yes-man, a kind of paleface *house nigger*, completely subservient to the dominant “people of color” in the anti-white movement:

“As a white librarian, I initially debated whether it made sense for me to be involved in a panel that was designed to center the lived experiences of librarians of color. After consulting with panelists and my co-moderator, we decided it was important to find a way for me to participate and show my solidarity without centering myself or my whiteness, and I thus took on an assistant role, modeling what it means to listen to and support people of color.” [p. 308]

In a free society, *anyone* has a right to have an opinion – a *strong* opinion -- about *anything*. Only in totalitarian frameworks do they not. Useful politically, Ms. Dover-Taylor’s burdensome white identity nonetheless precludes (and censors) her from any decision-making or status in the anti-white movement, starting with a panel discussion. Like a good 1950s housewife, she is afforded the role of a kind of whiteness *shadow*: her sole purpose is to “listen” and “support.” She accepts fully the notion that she has no right to venture a judgement that differs even slightly from that of the Party Line, i.e., the perspective of “people of color,” who are regarded here as her unquestioned superiors. And hallowed “People of Color” are, of course, beyond critical inquiry. In Leftist discourse, they are the new elites,

the moral nobility, before whom fellow comrades must subserviently bow. Dover-Taylor even embraces a mannequin-like role of *“modeling”* to show off today’s sanctioned ideological fashion.

At root, Dover-Taylor’s *“race traitor”* activism probably finds familiarity with the experience of Kristyn Caragher, a self-described *“white, queer woman,”* who admits that her world as a white, anti-white advocate is to be *living in fear and paranoia*. And more:

“I was afraid of making a mistake, of messing up, and being judged for it ... By working through the anxiety, resistance, and fear, it became clear to me that the only way we – and by we I mean white people – are going to develop the stamina to do anti-racist work is by actually doing the work.” [p. 300-301]

In the broader picture, this volume argues, it isn’t only the idea of neutrality and universality that is inspired by white racism. The anti-white sycophants pose the broadest question possible: in the *“topographies”* of knowledge, *what is there in the negative sense that isn’t an expression of white racism?* As Rafia Mirza and Maura Seale proclaim,

“[N]otions of objectivity, rationality, and Enlightenment are at their foundation racialized, and since the eighteenth century have been consistently associated with and solely attributed to white, Western men.” [p. 176]

In case you were wondering then, *rationality itself is therefore a racist enterprise*, as are all the principles of the Enlightenment, which (is it racist to say?) laid the foundation for all these anti-white haters to even have a forum for their bizarrely totalitarian feeding frenzy of Anti-White Negation. One contributor to this volume, the aforementioned Hudson, rails that even *“common sense”* cannot be trusted because it may harbor white racism:

“Critical writing on race teaches us to be suspicious of claims to common sense.” [p. 212]

Meanwhile, Beilin’s dismissal of political evenhandedness goes deeper with this:

“The close association of whiteness and neutrality should be a red flag [author’s note: politically appropriate imagery to anti-whiteness aficionados] for anyone

who works in critical librarianship and critical library pedagogy, as neutrality endures as one of the values of librarianship that we challenge and question in our work, and which continues to be defended vigorously by many of our colleagues.” [p. 84]

And the alternative to a formerly presumed good faith aimed at neutrality in the workplace, and beyond, is what? Submission to the Correct Edict from Thought Police Central. Or chaos and war, literally and figuratively, lest the totalitarian Social Justice warriors expect their “whiteness” neighbors (and “whiteness” allies, and conservatives and traditionalists of all racial and ethnic stripes) to always serenely acquiesce to their irrefutable Absolute Truths. Beneficiaries of “whiteness” must continue to be sufficiently drugged in kneeling to appease the hordes of complainants around them, anesthetized, to be trampled upon by a relentless socio-political Force that refuses to comprehend the merits of impartiality and its addenda, including free thought, negotiation, and open debate. Rather, their allegiance is only to their single-minded self-righteousness in homage to the gods of anti-white hatred and dictatorial submission. And pride in oneself and one’s heritage (*only if white*) is an emphatic taboo.

The anti-whiteness assault goes on. From Katie Dover-Taylor, we are also told that “*behavior policies*” at libraries “*disproportionately target youth of color for ‘rowdy’ behavior and ban them from the library.*” [p. 307] Really? Signs are everywhere posted in libraries that EXPRESSLY, DISPROPORTIONATELY, “target youth of color” for “rowdy behavior?” There are not. Or are routine *conventions of civility* simply yet another example of systemic “whiteness” racism? Which do you think fellow contributor Sarah Hannah Gomez believes? Here’s a clue, in her comments about why she even decided to become a librarian:

*“Magnanimously, I thought maybe I could be the librarian I didn’t have as a teenager, and then kids like me wouldn’t **hate the library** the way I had.* [p. 106; emphasis added]

Magnanimously? The subtext, in the book’s context, is clear. “Hate” is a strong word, an intemperate emotion, and being a hater isn’t a posture the Left typically sanctions. On the contrary. “Haters” of all sorts are categorically tarred and

feathered for censure and condemned to Leftist Hell. Except, as always, if the object of hatred is “whiteness” and the people that obviously inform it: whites. Subtext: Gomez *hates* “whiteness” and, inevitably, whiteness’s very foundation: white people. Of course, hating “whiteness” (the thinly veiled sub code for the entire world and operation of white people) is, despite its intrinsic racist undergirding, roundly endorsed and championed these days, as evidenced by this volume.

Gomez doesn’t really “hate” libraries. (What’s to hate about having access to free materials and services, whatever they are?) She uses subterfuge here, lest she risks too much in stating her complaint’s actual spine. Her intense animosity is actually aimed at the white culture and society that built the library system, mainly because white culture wasn’t created in Gomez’s “people of color” image. But what cultural and/or racial *Other* has Gomez’s own “people of color” heritage – whatever she decides it to be -- heralded in its own illustrious history? Was/is Gomez Society modeled in homage to the Chinese? Samoans? Zambians? Or some subculture at the margins of the ethnocentric Gomez world?

In such a venomous volume, the convergence of “I hate libraries” and “I hate whiteness” and “I hate white people” is really the expression of bare branches from the trunk of the same winter tree, however cautiously shaped for seasonal dormancy.

From contributor Jessica Macias, we are afforded a wailing and whining about how whiteness libraries throw up “barriers” to “*minority LIS professionals ... that are created by White standards of appearance.*” [p. 114] Who, in virtually any work environment, isn’t subjected to “standards of appearance?” “White” standards? Perhaps Ms. Macias prefers to work at a reference stark naked, juggling a penis gourd, or with a “Whites Suck” stamp on her forehead? Maybe she’d like to dress in ragged pajamas, dangle a shrunken head, or carry a Zulu shield at the reference desk? As she bemoans,

“For library professionals confident or brave enough to display traditional ethnic styles, it is not long before the policing of our bodies begins.” [p. 114]

How many white people don't have their bodies "policed" in a work environment? When was the last time you saw a white reference librarian wearing a leprechaun outfit or a folklore costume from the Swiss Alps? Perhaps Ms. Macias wants to swing from the library rafters by Lakota eagle talons to make her point? Distracting to library patrons? Who cares! The point of the oppression must be made, above all other considerations. Macias clearly dances to a different prima donna bongo drum and she must be afforded a stage as the Center of the Universe. She even complains that a white superior wasn't comfortable with Macias' tattoos at a library reference desk, which, Macias announces, were presumed (by the allegedly bigoted white moron) to possibly have gang associations. As a Latina, Macias takes offense:

"The implicit take-away message was that a Latina with tattoos should not be seen at the library circulation desk." [p. 115]

Yes, it's just more suffocating "whiteness" at play here.

Or is it?

Consider: I once bought a Subway meal at a tourist town in Wyoming. The young, WHITE man making my sandwich had tattoos all over his face, arms, and the rest of his body. It was more visual noise, at that point in my life, than I had ever seen on one body. Sure, I made presumptions about him and I didn't like the idea that such a guy was making my meal. Drug addict? Ex-con? Transient low-life? Diseased? If he was that anti-convention to deface his body in such a rigorous manner, what was his attitude about my dripping lunch in his hands? Someone handing me my tuna concoction while carrying a Zulu shield and sporting a conventional African headdress of some kind would be eminently preferable.

How about this for an article title: *"WHO KILLED THE WORLD? WHITE MASCULINITY AND THE TECHNOCRATIC LIBRARY OF THE FUTURE."* [p. 175]

Inviting, yes? In the holy name of Inclusivity? Such a heading exists in this volume, wherein white males – as a despised category -- aren't only an absolute blight on the planet; they are guilty for the murder of EVERYTHING ("the world"). And this author's argument rests, no less, upon flotsam from pop culture: the screenplay for a 2015 Hollywood *Mad Max* movie. Within the framework of an apocalyptic

fantasy that includes a band of women forming their own tribe, “viewers are prompted to consider not only the destructive consequences of patriarchy, but also the way in which emancipatory, resistant spaces might be carved out.” [p. 190] (By the way, this female emancipatory (?) screenplay was, alas, written by the usual anti-liberation culprits – generically oppressive white males: in this case George Miller, Brendan McCarthy, and Nico Lathouris, a fact that no doubt severely impugns the anti-male author’s ideological purity amidst her male-hating peers.)

But wait. We need to be inclusive. *ALL* whites need defamation. White women? They’re scumbags too, even – perhaps *especially* --those in the feminist movement. [p. 142] Racists all, with the Left here furiously devouring its own. There is also a subsection entitled “*Resisting White Feminism*,” [p. 158] which anyone with an ounce of morality must be prepared to do. So, sordid white feminists, be prepared to suffer:

“To effectively transcend white feminism, then, is to proactively relinquish power that’s been unjustly disbursed, an act that, though focused on institutional change, demands individual sacrifice.” [p. 165]

In my own screenplay for the Mad Max sequel, I’d recommend that the “sacrifice” be crucifixion, preferably figuratively (you know, die for all whites’ sins and all that), but I don’t want to force any religious connotations upon those who dance around goalposts of nihilism. And too much religious faith might sputter at the box office.

At root, any white feminist call to collective female “sisterhood” (i.e., universality) is of course itself an expression of white supremacism and domination:

‘[T]he contemporary feminist call for sisterhood, the radical white woman’s appeal to black women and all women of color to join the feminist movement, is seen by many black women as yet another expression of white female denial of the reality of racist domination, of their complicity in the exploitation and oppression of black women and black people.’ [p. 151]

Let's sludge on through the book. Repentant white sinner and college teacher Nicole A. Cooke's book contribution is largely testimonials from students who regurgitate Cooke's anti-whiteness ideology, stemming from her *"suite of courses related to diversity and social justice"* [p. 237] in the information science profession. Here one learns, if white, to walk on eggshells around anti-white ideologues, learning to *"embrace the idea of being uncomfortable"* [p. 238] when discussing the self-righteous Identity Politics assault. Of course, the precondition for *"working with diverse communities"* is to function in *"an emphatic and humble manner"* towards *"working against whiteness and its manifestations."* [p. 238] *Humble*. In other words, the white library worker is expected to categorically defer to anti-white assault and complaint. Not as equals, but as one bowing to -- as innately decreed -- Moral Royalty.

Among Cooke's classes, says student devotee Katrina Spencer, was a *"crash course on sensitively navigating mental illness in the workplace."* [p. 240] This may be an extraordinarily fertile area, especially for mental illnesses' political extensions, but not for the reasons Ms. Spencer or Cooke would presume. More critical attention is being turned towards the suggestion that many on the Left are trying to bend their own personal psychological problems and failures into a collective movement [note, for example, feminist icon [Kate Millet](#)], a new community bonded in mutual hatred against norms (categorically prescribed to fall within the vast oppressive net of "whiteness") that reframes the aberrant individual as a citizen of anti-"whiteness" normalcy. In other words, if whiteness and Christianity and heterosexuality and such are the generic "normal," somehow all part of the same sinister root, it is those characterizations, by definition, that the Collective aims for assault in pursuit of their respective heavens.

How about this similarly obsessive whine, from Sarah Hannah Gomez:

"In social science, the feeling I experienced is called 'attributional ambiguity,' which is a state of being chronically stressed by microaggressions or other workplace occurrences brought about by uncertainty about the motivation behind anyone's actions or inaction." [p. 109]

There is probably a simpler term for "attributional ambiguity." Say,

preoccupation. Obsession. Paranoia. Illness. Projection. Neurosis. Sitting around, brooding, “*chronically stressed,*” wondering with intense fixation if peoples’ intentions are intended to slight you or not? Or, that their actions or equally unjust *inactions* were designed to offend?

The totalitarian, dictatorial vision of the newly poisoned anti-white library world is championed by Cass Mabbott, whose foundation as a future information science “professor” seems to be centered upon nakedly exploiting her influential role as a teacher to force vulnerable students NOT into an open investigation of variant subjects, but welding them to her personal ideology:

“As a future LIS professor who will educate aspiring librarians ... My white students will learn to speak up and act as an ALLY to nonwhites, making sure not to speak FOR them. As a way of combating my own white privilege and the complacency that often comes with it, I will be a social justice advocate no matter what the topic is that I am teaching.” [p. 243]

Likewise, fellow student clone Chloe Collins proclaims that

“In my daily life and as a library student who aspires to work in museums, I prioritize incorporating anti-racist and queer approaches into my critical practice because I believe that we cannot adequately serve all of our users and patrons if we alienate them.” [p. 244]

Prioritize? What of all the white or Christian or conservative or heterosexual “users and patrons” of a museum who are going to get maximally alienated by Collins’ subculture dictates as a future museum administrator? Who cares? Such complainers are scumbags, the nemeses of All Things Righteous, and no one should dare care about their own senses of “alienation.”

There’s more, much more. On one hand, library minority Social Justice Dictators demand greater numbers of library workers that reflect their race and culture, because they’re more comfortable with that scenario. Anything less is, minimally, an insulting “microaggression.” Conversely, African-American authors April Hathcock (the *Library Journal*’s “[Mover and Shaker](#)” for March 2018) and

Stephanie Sendaula (“reviews editor” for the same magazine) complain that

“many white patrons still prefer to be assisted by someone who looks like them, still prefer and expect to see someone who looks like them behind a reference desk.” [p. 252]

This, of course, is supposed to be a subtly racist “whiteness” moral crime, UNLESS it is a sacred Person of Color asking for the same exact thing: someone behind a reference desk who “looks like them” with whom they can more comfortably relate. In this case, the authors call this a benevolent “*ethnic identity sharing*” [p. 257] when the patron and reference librarian are of same *nonwhite* background. But what, according to these authors, happens when reference desks are stocked with “nonwhite librarians” to fulfill the Diversity Mandate? Such librarians’ hostility to the “whiteness” world apparently passes along with any information help they offer to the public:

“Nonwhite librarians doing reference work can often find themselves called out by supervisors for a lack of ‘approachability’ or ‘niceness,’ standards that are steeped in racialized expectations and constructs.” [p. 255]

Hence, “approachability” and “niceness” (and we might add politeness and civility?) are clearly sinister – and conventional -- *whiteness* workplace “standards” that anti-whiteness malcontents don’t feel they should have to follow. As always, however, there are brainwashed People of Color who dismally fail to understand that “approachability” and “niceness” are racist traits indigenous to white people; they are apparently minority “race traitors” who don’t mind talking to a nice, approachable white librarian. As these black authors explain

“Moreover, these types of racial microaggressions can come not only from white patrons, but from patrons of color as well. Whiteness on the reference desk is a phenomenon that affects all library users, just as whiteness in general stands rooted in the whole of American society.” [p. 256]

Likewise,

“This [whiteness] system is invisible because neither group is taught to recognize that the privileges of whites are unearned assets legitimized by this ‘myth of meritocracy.’ The result is hidden bias against and, surprisingly, within minorities.”
[p. 273]

This totalitarian, racist, anti-white book is not an anomaly in today’s library world. The morass is growing. Many of its fundamental theses (“[critical librarianship](#),” “[transforming](#)” the modern library into a Social Justice Warrior staging ground, leftist political [advocacy](#), exorcising “[racism](#)” from their own midst (while clandestinely heralding its anti-white version), killing workplace and information nonalignment (note this [article](#) -- in the American Library Association’s *American Libraries* magazine -- that rejects neutrality in the new “social justice” library, [resisting](#) the 2016 presidential election (and its tens of millions of associated ideological enemies, many of whom are also library visitors), etc.) are typically endorsed by the influential [American Library Association](#). In celebrating this “whiteness” book’s attendant boatload of paradoxes, inanities, and hypocrisies, *rationality is really an expression of white racism, as is a claim to human universality, neutrality, common sense, approachability, niceness, and simple intelligibility*. If you don’t accept these sorts of indisputable dictates, you have a commonly pathetic, self-defensive, in-denial psychological disease called “[white fragility](#),” curable only by a kind of anti-racist lobotomy session, a remedy that will be the loving subject of white scholar Robin DiAngelo’s anti-whiteness [keynote address](#) at the American Library Association’s midwinter conference in Seattle. DiAngelo’s [little cottage industry](#) can rake in \$12,000 per lecture, a quarter of the median income for Black families). And the Party Line dictates that all these despicable “whiteness” attributes are widely parroted by many brainwashed minorities who don’t realize they’re being scammed by them.

Hence, in the name of Morality and Social Justice (defined vaguely as anything against the “norm,” which is, of course, the very spine of “whiteness”), ALL whites are to be held collectively guilty for the existence of an omnipresent, yet veiled and elusive, transcendent, “whiteness” Mind Meld, an amorphous wickedness that sucks away peoples’ brains and self-interests, a grotesque malevolence that deserves to be roundly hated and destroyed – despite the fact that no one can satisfactorily define exactly what it is. However ironic, the Lightness of Whiteness stakes camp at the Heart of Darkness, and festers and schemes, invisible, as it sits on your face. White people are warily invited to join the glorious *People of Color*

and Transgender, Etcetera, Inc. neo-Marxist crusade to destroy the hideous, “ubiquitous,” white Snow Monster. But, in the Holy Name of Justice and Equality, even whites who have dived into The Righteous Neurosis and surrendered their guilty personal identities to the Cause, and fully loathe whiteness (i.e., all-purpose Evil) with their groveling black hearts, must take their rightful places, even here, in humble servitude to the Sacred Blob of the Oppressed across all of human history ... *at the back of the line.*

Some inconvenient “whiteness” FACTS:

In 2016, reporting on an academic study, here’s how the *Atlantic* framed the demographic group most under defamation and siege in our current Inclusion Heaven. Beneath the subheading *The [Lonely Poverty of America’s White Working Class](#)*, it added: “*Problems of mental health and addiction have taken a terrible toll on whites in America—though seemingly not in other wealthy nations—and the least educated among them have fared the worst.*”

The National Center for Children in Poverty [notes](#) that “*by race, white children make up the biggest percentage of America’s poor.*” That translates to 4.2 million white kids. The head of NCCP at Columbia University, Jane Knitzer, noted that “*the notion held by many Americans that poverty is not a white problem is simply false.*”

Between 2007 and 2016, American society gained nine million more jobs. But in that time span, thanks to “diversity” and the rest of popular culture’s attack on “whiteness,” [700,000 white workers](#) *lost* their jobs. Meanwhile, as the *New York Times* [notes](#), “*despite accounting for less than 15 percent of the labor force, Hispanics got more than half of the net additional job. Blacks and Asians also gained millions of jobs more than they lost.*”

Meanwhile, by the way, all this easy, oppressive, racist, bending-over-to-slop-up-gravy “whiteness,” sure takes a toll on the most *openly despised* population in America: 7 out of 10 suicides these days are – you guessed it -- [white males](#). No doubt this fact excites satisfaction in some quarters.

But what about white women these days? How has feminism and Identity Politics improved their lives? And how great are they doing with their “white privilege” and all the “white supremacy” that catapults them to clouds of glory at the expense of everyone else? In 2016, the *Washington Post* examined their currently dire situation, as, [in that news outlet’s words](#), “white women between 25 and 55 die at spiking rates.” “White women between 25 and 55 have been dying at accelerating rates over the past decade,” continues the *Post*, “a spike in mortality not seen since the AIDS epidemic in the early 1980s. According to recent studies of death certificates, the trend is worse for women in the center of the United States, worse still in rural areas, and worst of all for those in the lower middle class. Drug and alcohol overdose rates for working-age white women have quadrupled. Suicides are up by as much as 50 percent.” Since 1990, [says another Post report](#), “death rates for rural white women in midlife have risen by nearly 50 percent.”

Such facts, suggests the *Washington Post* in another article, “may be fueling anger among white voters: [The Post last month found a correlation](#) between places with high white death rates and support for GOP presidential candidate Donald Trump.”

But we’re not done with the public neglect, collective defamation, and concurrent pounding to death of white people. How does popular culture often spin white misery, poverty, and despair? About 90% of the current opioid drug addiction epidemic [consists of white individuals](#), and as many as [half a million people](#) are expected to perish from these drugs in the next decade. What was my entre to this fact? Curious about all the recent news about the opioid concern, I did a google search, using the words “opioids” and “race.” The first result I investigated was [a 2017 article](#) entitled “Opioid Crisis Points to Racial Divide” by USA Today. To my disgust, the fundamental thesis of the article isn’t about the suffering of these people. Rather, the text examines the anti-black *racism* (!) that allegedly undergirds all the attention to opioids recently.

USA Today [declares it like this](#):

“Among African-Americans critical of the modern drug war launched four decades ago by President Richard Nixon, the fact that the opioid epidemic is primarily striking the majority race helps explain why it is largely being called an epidemic and treated as a public health crisis rather than a war.”

Translation: calling a struggle to eradicate drugs in (largely) minority communities by calling it a “war” was an expression of *white supremacy, white privilege, ad nauseum*, because using the wonderful word “epidemic” to address the current drug onslaught against whites is inherently *discriminatory*. Such is the anti-white nuthouse we live in.

Now place the following “white privilege” quote from Hillary Clinton with the facts above:

“We’ve [She and Bill Clinton] also been privileged, since moving into the [Arkansas] Governor’s mansion years ago, to have people helping ensure that we’re well fed and take care of. Neither of us has had to make an emergency run to the store to pick up milk in decades.” [CLINTON, p. 133]

So amidst all this verifiable white misery, and being constantly pummeled to abandon their horrible “whiteness” at the same time, who ranks as the [wealthiest ethnic group in America](#)? Euro-palefaces and their despicable “white privilege?” Some evidence points to people of Indian (India) descent. Their average median income was \$100,547 in 2013, nearly double the average of all other Americans. 87% of those of Indian-descent were even foreign-born. To blur the issue a bit, however, the Pew Research Center [notes that](#) *“Asian Americans are the highest-income, best-educated and fastest-growing racial group in the United States.”* Like those from India, birth in America has little to do with becoming affluent: *“Nearly three-quarters (74%) of Asian-American adults were born abroad; of these, about half say they speak English very well and half say they don’t.”*

Clearly, more white racism here when you don’t even have to speak English in America on the road to relative riches.

There are, of course, geographical variables. In Hawaii, for instance, [people of Japanese descent](#) are the wealthiest ethnic group. (Diversity Hypocrisy Alert: there are plenty of people out there [who object](#) to Asian-Americans being considered a “Model Minority,” and that there are many kinds of Asian-Americans, economically or otherwise. That may be true, but how often does

anyone apply similar standards of complaint in defense of the stereotypical “white” community, the evil paleface piñata that everyone else bashes as the eternally scapegoated Blob of Oppression, every individual within “whiteness” being a “white privilege” clone of the other?)

And here’s some more puzzling “white supremacy” for you, in the Asian-American context: As merely 12% of California’s population and 4% of the country’s, by 2008 [student enrollment](#) at the “two most selective campuses in the University of California system” included more Asian-Americans than any other ethnic group. They also dominated at UC Irvine and UC San Diego, at 50% and 54% respectively. NBC News [noted](#) that Asian-Americans “account for a remarkable 40 percent of all undergraduates” at all nine UC campuses, the top ethnic group throughout the whole prestigious system. This fact became national news because the University of California decided to adjust its admission policy (less reliance on SATs, etc., wherein Asian-Americans kick butt in that realm) and some Asian-Americans didn’t like its potential effect. Retired UC professor Ling-chi Wang was quoted as saying, “I like to call it affirmative action for whites. I think it's extremely unfair to Asian-Americans on the one hand and underrepresented minorities on the other.” One can understand Mr. Wang’s anti-white bigotry in throwing all the generic “supremacists” under the proverbial bus, but the dominant status quo for Asian-American UC students helps “underrepresented minorities?”

There are 12 [black billionaires](#) in the world. The richest, Nigerian “cement tycoon” Aliko Dangote, is worth over \$14 billion. There are even two black female billionaires: America’s Ophra Winfrey (worth \$3.1 billion) and an Angolan, Isabel dos Santos, the daughter of that country’s president. There are 29 American black individuals [worth over \\$200 million](#). This year’s Forbes international “richest list” also featured [more female billionaires](#) than ever, 227. Not all black people fit that standard? Neither do I – and millions of others -- fit any “whiteness” gold bar either.