



UNDERGROUND LIBRARY FREE THINKERS ASSOCIATION

From a book in progress:

The New Totalitarians: Diversity, Social Justice, Political Advocacy, Censorship, and the Death of the American Library as a Non-biased Source for Information

by Ron Kelley

THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

“What is regretfully over represented on ALA [American Library Association] Council is a narrow and often extremely liberal perspective on national and world affairs.”—[John Moorman](#), member of the American Library Association’s Executive Board, 2013

*“Librarianship slavishly follows political correctness and trendiness ...”
[Jeffrey Beall](#), librarian and professor at the University of Colorado –*

Denver, founder of the defunct *Scholarly Open Access*, which listed [“predatory publishers”](#)

“Fascism, properly understood, is not a phenomenon of the right at all. Instead, it is, and always has been a phenomenon of the left. This fact – an inconvenient truth if there ever was one – is obscured in our time by the equally mistaken belief that fascism and communism are opposites. In reality, they are closely related, historical competitors for the same constituents, seeking to dominate and control the same social space.” – Jonah Goldberg, *Liberal Fascism*, p. 7

PART 1: The American Library Association and “Fascism”

1. [FASCISM](#): “A tendency toward or actual exercise of strong autocratic or dictatorial control.” [Merriam-Webster dictionary]
2. [Synonyms for “fascism” include](#): **authoritarianism**, totalitarianism, absolutism, autocracy, bureaucracy, and **“one-party system,”** among other terms.
3. The results of a recent academic-based survey/study concerning **“left-wing authoritarianism”** [are being published](#), soon in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Findings include: academic/scholarly bias AGAINST investigation of left-wing authoritarianism, and “top-down censorship” that includes Leftwing authoritarians agreeing with statements such as *“I should have the right not to be exposed to offensive views”* and *“Getting*

rid of inequality is more important than protecting the so-called 'right' of free speech." According the study of 7,258 individuals, both right-wing and left-wing authoritarians have *"heightened levels of psychopathic meanness and boldness, dogmatism, disinhibition, conscientiousness, need for closure, fatalistic determinism beliefs, belief in conspiracy theories, and belief in a dangerous world."* Noteworthy, however, *"left-wing authoritarians scored higher than their right-wing counterparts **on measures of neuroticism, belief in science, and willingness to ban opposing views.**"* [Emphases added]

Enter the American Library Association.

(In loose political nomenclature, what exactly is a "fascist?" Who/what legitimately qualifies? Its popular usage today stretches well beyond the likes of a Mussolini or Hitler, a routine smear for adversarial political enemies. The following analysis aims to give the ALA a "dose of its own medicine," per its own expanding efforts to stifle free speech, that virtually all and any ideological opponents (dangerously and generically smeared as "white supremacist" and "fascist") are robbed of the right to debate the issues of the day. The ALA is not a "Nazi" entity. But, in its totalitarian posture, it's also hard to imagine (unless one is a narrow-minded, fanatical ideologue), in the American context, what "fascist" movement the ALA imagines to be threatening the library world. (Trump and his tens of millions of supporters?) At core, the expanding authoritarian nature of censorial and totalitarian ideologies within the ALA today should bear scrutiny, debate, and discussion. Per the use of the word "fascist" in relation to the ALA, in echoing its own huge ideological landscape for placing such a word: to use that old "white

supremacist” (?) adage, “what’s sauce for the goose is good for the gander.”)

The upper-echelon bureaucracy of the American Library Association recently proposed, on behalf of all its members, [a resolution “to condemn White Supremacy and Fascism as Antithetical to Library Work.”](#) (Who ever claimed that these ideologies WERE integral to “library work?”) It was formally “[adopted](#)” at the ALA’s “2021 Virtual Midwinter Meeting.

This document declares that *“libraries have upheld and encouraged white supremacy both actively and through discriminatory practices and passively through **a misplaced emphasis on neutrality.**”* It adds that *“libraries have a crucial obligation to provide access to accurate information which refutes white supremacist rhetoric”* and that the ALA *“acknowledges **the role of neutrality rhetoric in emboldening and encouraging white supremacy and fascism**”* and proclaims that an ALA bureaucratic division (“the Working Group on Intellectual Freedom and Social Justice” *“to review **neutrality rhetoric and identity alternatives.**”* It also declares that *“Black, Indigenous, and People of Color members, staff members, community members, and others”* will be *“provided confidential communication channels”* to the ALA for *“direct feedback.”* [Emphases added]

There is much to be shocked about here. And my interest in all this is in the parallels between Marxist and “fascist” authoritarianism and how such totalitarianism is coming to dominate American libraries, per the “reject neutrality” and “intellectual freedom is subservient to social justice” arguments.

This ALA “white supremacy” and “fascism” document, looking for “alternatives” to traditional library neutrality, is an extraordinarily hypocritical – and dangerous -- effort. It is, of course, *itself* a censorial “fascist” document. (“*Neutrality rhetoric?*” Find an “*identity alternative*” to “*neutrality rhetoric?*” Orwell’s [Newspeak](#) reigns supreme here with such blather and should send chills up everyone’s spines).

Key to the ALA’s *censorial* effort here is this overt prejudice against “neutrality” in the libraries, which is bedrock to past conviction about “intellectual freedom” at such institutions. This, in turn, is rooted in the new Left-wing censorial ideology of “[critical librarianship](#)” ([formally endorsed by the ALA](#)), wherein librarians are implored to reject neutrality in the workplace and advocate personal “social justice” activism over intellectual freedom (freedom of speech) in efforts to bend the public to their political views. (Such naked politicization is, however, typically conceived as transcending partisan politics and resting upon a purely ethical foundation). Note, for example, an online public libraries journal (*Public Libraries*, part of the bureaucratic octopus of the American Library Association) that celebrates the new library Thought Police with a headline like this: “[Public Libraries as Instruments for Social and Political Activism](#).” Of course. The subject of this article/interview is a librarian who says that she “*started out in the American Library Association by being involved with the Feminist Task Force, a part of the Social Responsibilities Round Table (SRRT).*”

Let’s start, however, with an investigation into the two realms the ALA condemns (“white supremacy” and “fascism”), as grounds for restricting intellectual freedom and endorsing Left-wing propaganda in our nation’s libraries. The charge of a widespread “white supremacy” as it is popularly constituted is, in total, absurd. (A case can even be made for “black supremacy” in the ALA’s top leadership, as we shall see). It is

also heavily laced with anti-white racism and [I have written about this elsewhere](#). Likewise, the term “fascism” is bantered about pretty wildly in political smears these days, mostly aimed at individuals on the right/conservative side of issues. In this world view, [Donald Trump ranks as a “fascist,”](#) as do [those tens of millions who voted for him](#). (In *NewLibraryThought*, all such library visitors are political morons [many “uneducated whites” [without a necessary college degree](#) to amend their bigotries], subject to the necessity to be politically inoculated by their friendly – or not so friendly -- activist local librarians.) The Anti-“fascist” net (as well as the “white supremacist” libel) is tossed out wildly, as a generic slogan, that political opponents can be [smeared](#) and dismissed as morally bankrupt, as easily as possible, without discussion, exchange of facts, or argument.

So what exactly is a “fascist?” Who merits that slander? Of course, the American Libraries document doesn’t say. The accusation of “fascism” is open-ended and, in the jargon of our times, can be merely someone who doesn’t agree with you. By the Merriam-Webster definition of fascism above, and its broadening censorial actions against free speech in our nation’s libraries, the American Library Association is, itself, a “fascist” organization, especially in its recent efforts to destroy a genuine “intellectual freedom” in homage to a growing Left-wing autocracy throughout our nation’s library system.

How Left-wing (and “authoritarian”) is the American Library Association? Let’s start with its top administrative strata. How “white supremacist” is it? And what of the “fascism” synonym above, the one stating “*one-party system*?” How much does the ALA celebrate the Holy Cow of Diversity, per *political views*? Examine for yourself the current political complexion of the American Library Association leadership and research expressions online of their personal ideologies. In the spirit of

the Left-wing sacred totems of *tolerance* and/or *diversity* in world views, how many of the following people do you think voted for Donald Trump in the past presidential elections? (Note: aside from the foundational Left-wing “identity politic”/”[woke](#)” base of the current American Library Association, [87-90% of Black voters chose Biden](#) over Trump in the last election).

The resolution against “white supremacy” and “fascism,” as well as the endorsement to find “alternatives” to free speech, was signed by Tracie D. Hall, the current “Executive Director and Secretary of the ALA Council.” She is Black. The president of the ALA, Julius C. Jefferson, Jr., is also Black as is the “Immediate Past President” Wanda Kay Brown.

Of the [five currently noted](#) “Executive Officers,” the Executive Director is Black, the “Immediate Past President” is Black, and the current president is of Asian descent. The president-elect is [ethnic Hawaiian](#). Of the five then, the token white is the Treasurer, [who is also a member](#) of the ALA’s “Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Round Table” (i.e., this token “white” doesn’t seem to be heterosexual).

Carla Hayden, the current ([highly political](#)) librarian of the Library of Congress, is also Black. It didn’t hurt that the then-president of the ALA, Courtney Young, who is Black, [lobbied our first Black president](#), Barack Obama, for such an appointment, writing him this, with the force of the American Library Association:

“Diversity and inclusion are foundational values of the library profession and essential elements in the provision of library resources, services, and staffing. We therefore urge that in making this appointment, strong consideration be given to a nominee who is a library leader reflective of the diversity of this nation.”

More broadly, there is so much male patriarchy in [the current ALA Executive Board Member](#) configuration that 11 of the 13 individuals are women. Of the two males, one is Black. In other words, per the insistence that white male supremacy is an omnipotent octopus that is strangling libraries, of the 13 currently highlighted ALA Executive Board Members, only one is a white male. Reflecting the *power elite* climate of the times, his identity might well be that of an LGBTQ activist – like the aforementioned Treasurer -- to make it all a political Royal Flush. If not, we have a *token* heterosexual white guy amidst the elites of library leadership – unless, of course, in the wild identity politic whirls of our time, we honor his declaration if he believes she’s a Black Lesbian.

Who is the current chief editor (and *publisher*) of the ALA’s media organ, the far Left-leaning *American Libraries*? That would be [Sanhita Sinha Roy](#), a woman of Indian (India) descent. [Her credentials for inclusion](#) in the ALA’s political mafia include the fact that she was the former Managing Editor of the Leftist journal *In These Times* (whose “[original sponsors](#)” include a range of famous Marxists like Herbert Marcuse and Noam Chomsky – more about Marxism and the ALA later) and associate editor for a propaganda institute called The Progressive Media Project (now called [Progressive Perspectives](#)), whose goal is “to help diversify and democratize our nation’s op-ed pages. We train activists and nonprofit staff on how to write powerful op-eds.”

Including Sinha Roy, of the 8 members of the current [editorial staff](#) at *American Libraries* magazine, 6 are, yes, women.

Go Sacred *Diversity*, and, go, gods of gender equity and equality, go!

One can argue about a historic ethnocentrism in libraries (as can be done about *any institution* anywhere on the planet, across any and all races and peoples), but to frame modern libraries as a kind of Ku Klux

Klan totem pole with scare terms like “white supremacy” [is ridiculous](#)). And, insofar as, dominantly, most American librarians are [white women](#), and the above ALA power elite are elected officials, this certainly reflects a significant degree of socialized “[white guilt](#),” hardly within a million miles of an alleged “white supremacy.”

I will not be surprised if merely pointing out these facts about ALA leadership will be branded by fanatics as “white supremacist” in nature, as well as “fascistic.” Maybe throw in “racist” too. That is the totalitarian world we live in. Dissension to leftist ideological dictate usually merits kneejerk smears in its very narrowly tunneled authoritarian world. And such liberal libels are also very much a form of effective future censorship.

But what of the broader ideology of rank-and-file ALA membership? In 2019, an editor for *The Federalist* [attended the American Library Association’s yearly conference](#), attended by over 21,000 library workers. What she found was an avalanche of political indoctrination and groupthink celebration. Reporter Joy Pullman noted that ALA conference workshops had “*an obsession on dividing people base on skin color,*” as well as functioning as a propaganda festival for LGBTQ advocacies – “*Celebrating Queer Sex with Public Resources, Even for Kids.*”

“At least half of America,” notes Pullman, *“does not agree with bisexual bathrooms or denying opportunities to white people based on their skin color. They are not on board with ‘queering’ public elementary school libraries. How can we trust these librarians’ judgment and management of public resources after seeing this kind of bias, which is extreme to the point of open hostility against our deepest values?”*

What about “one-party” as a synonym for “fascism,” as noted above?
As the *American Conservative* magazine [notes](#):

*“According to Open Secrets, an organization dedicated to tracking political contributions, donors with an occupation of “librarian” overwhelming contributed to Hillary Clinton’s campaign in the 2016 presidential election cycle. The Clinton campaign received \$12,566 in donations, while Donald Trump only received \$30—a ratio of 419 to 1 ... But a truly scary threat materialized last November when, against all sense of decency, Hillary Clinton lost the presidential election. Donald Trump’s election, and fears of an ascending Alt-Right, coupled with the long, ongoing march of “intersectionality” in academia and attacks on “offensive” conservative speech on campus—all have served to corrode the idea of ideological neutrality, a hallmark of the discipline that is even embedded in the ALA’s code of ethics. The shift is particularly pronounced in academic libraries. The April 2015 edition of *College & Research Libraries News* published an [article](#) with the title “Black Lives Matter! Shedding library neutrality rhetoric for social justice.”*

Open Secrets also notes very recent political contributions by ALA “affiliates” (as a non-profit, the ALA is forbidden from direct political support). [All ten](#) payoffs are to Democratic political operatives, from Joe Biden to the Democratic National Committee Services Corporation to the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

And here’s the grotesque depth of intolerant hypocrisy and political prejudice from the American Library Association, per one-party totalitarianism:

In October 2020, [the ALA released an official response](#) to an action by the Trump administration. Among other things, the ALA stated that: *“On September 22, the White House issued its Executive Order On Combating Race And Sex Stereotyping, prohibiting federal employees,*

contractors, and grant recipients from discussing or considering concepts such as critical race theory and white privilege and discouraging diversity education and training. This order is based on the patently false and malicious claim that diversity training—which is aimed at fostering a more equitable and just workplace and dismantling systemic racism and sexism—reflects a "Marxist doctrine" that is itself racist and sexist.

The American Library Association rejects this claim. We are painfully aware that libraries and the profession of librarianship have been—and still are—complicit in systems that oppress, exclude, and harm Black people, indigenous people, and people of color, and deny equal opportunity to women."

The ALA also had the embarrassing audacity to say this, a preaching that it doesn't practice any more:

"It is the longstanding role of libraries to foster intellectual freedom by ensuring access to the widest diversity of views and expressions, including those that are unorthodox, unpopular, or considered dangerous by those in power."

The ALA even tossed in this grandiose assertion:

"Totalitarian systems attempt to maintain themselves in power by the ruthless suppression of any concept that challenges the established orthodoxy. The power of a democratic system to adapt to change is vastly strengthened by the freedom of its citizens to choose widely from among conflicting opinions offered freely to them. To stifle every nonconformist idea at birth would mark the end of the democratic process."

“Conflicting opinions?” Since when is today’s ALA known for championing “conflicting opinions?” Read its magazine. Read its web site. Examine who speaks at its various conferences. Read its many documents demanding to “[transform](#)” (not merely “serve”) America. Check out what merits [inclusion](#) in its yearly Banned Books list. Even examine the narrowly focused Left-wing issues its “[Office of Intellectual Freedom](#)” cares about propagandizing. The irony here, of course, is that the ALA is itself a “totalitarian” system, suffocating today’s libraries with its “Spread the Ideology” tentacles, relentlessly suppressing alternative views that dare to dissent from its own dictatorial Left-wing orthodoxy. In this regard, the championing of its own “Intellectual Freedom” office is a sinister sham, an underhanded manipulation of the term, an Orwellian Doublespeak (“War is Peace,” “Ignorance Is Strength,” or “Ending library neutrality on public issues is actually support for Intellectual Freedom”) veiling of its manipulation of the term to solely advance its agenda to overthrow (“[transform](#)”) the existing sociopolitical order. True “Intellectual Freedom?” No. The ALA’s version is farce.

In 2018 *Washington Post* book editor Ron Charles [noted this](#) about the yearly ALA Office of Intellectual Freedom “Banned Books Week”:

“I can’t help noticing that no liberal tastes were harmed in the making of this list. The whole campaign is pungent with self-satisfaction, a chance for us enlightened liberals to remind each other that we are freedom fighters.”

Two conservative authors followed up on Charles’ article with this *Fox News* headline: [Liberals and Banned Books: Who Decides?](#) and this commentary:

“The American Library Association is unlikely to promote its own courage ... Banned Books Week often feels like Favorite Books Week ... Troublemakers with time on their hands could have fun compiling a list of books that libraries choose not to stock. We could host a splashy celebration of Books Librarians Hate Week.”

Such comments underscore the implicit two-faced, doublethink propaganda value of the ALA’s Office of Intellectual Freedom. On one hand, it mostly champions Left-wing agenda books that it endorses, and routinely neglects other perspectives. Making its list of “Banned Books” is thereby a form of promotion/advertisement which fits neatly into the ALA’s grand design to “transform” America into a Leftist playland, devoid of conflict with the Ideological Other. As any librarian knows in Collection Development (the process of choosing books for libraries), emphasis/advocacy for some volumes and attendant neglect for others is very much a veiled form of censorship.

One commentator at the left-wing *Slate* magazine [notes that](#) beneath the ALA’s extremely narrow celebration of “intellectual freedom” and its celebration of “banned books,” the truth is that most of these controversial texts are merely “challenged,” typically by concerned parents who take offense at a (fundamentally hyper-liberal sociopolitical) content directed at their children:

“There’s an enormous difference between parents saying a book shouldn’t appear on their kid’s required reading list and a citizen demanding that adults should have no access to a book at a public library. And it should shock no one that in a country of 300 million people, there are a few hundred cases each year in which someone objects to a particular book’s availability, especially to children.”

A good illustration of the hypocrisy of the ALA's Office of Intellectual Freedom is the case of "gay reversal" advocates finding no support from the ALA when trying to keep libraries from "banning" "ex-gay" volumes. *"Visit most public school libraries," [says a Fox News article](#), "and you'll find an array of books that address the subject of homosexuality. Many include sexually explicit content, and some even include graphic images.*

But if you're looking for a book that refers to the possibility that homosexuality can be "reversed," a Chicago-based group says your best bet is the banned books list.

Parents and Friends of Ex-Gays & Gays (PFOX) says there's an entire community of people across the world who say that their sexual orientation changed from gay to straight. But they're not getting their message out, the group says, because libraries across the country refuse to carry literature that describes these experiences or any studies that support them."

The ALA's Office of Intellectual Freedom was contacted by the advocacy group, and calls were made to the head of the OIF and the ALA's Media Relations department by Fox News. Emails and phone call requests to both departments were not returned.

Perhaps the most "banned book" of 2020 was *Irreversible Damage: The Transgender Craze Seducing Our Daughters*, by Abigail Shrier. But its perspective doesn't advance the political Left (in fact, it is counter to it), and it never made the American Library Association's "Banned Book" list.

The ONLY mention online of this book by the ALA is at its "Intellectual Freedom Blog" under the heading *Intellectual Freedom News*. And what

is [the tiny mention](#)? There is a link to a negative book review in *Psychology Today*, the ALA stating only this:

[“New Book “Irreversible Damage” Is Full of Misinformation”](#)

This link about “misinformation” is the entirety of the ALA’s commitment to “intellectual freedom,” per the book *Irreversible Damage*. The *Psychology Today* article is written by a Stanford MD, Jack Turban, who apparently is, among other things, a professional opinion author / [propagandist](#) (i.e., activist). Among other things, Turban declares *Irreversible Damage* to be flawed for merely being published by a well-known “conservative” book publisher, Regnery. (In Turban’s world, this is somehow grounds for criticizing the volume).

Under a chapter entitled *Dissidents*, Shrier’s book includes interviews with a range of psychiatrists and experts in the transgender world, including Kenneth Zucker, Ray Blanchard, J. Michael Bailey, Lisa Marchiano, and Paul McHugh. Marchiano was a co-author of an article that indicts Turban [here](#). Another [critical article](#) about him cites Turban as being under the thumb of the pharmaceutical industry. A common denominator of these “dissidents” to the likes of Turban is that have been, in some sense, “banned” [fired, censored, shunned, etc.] in their own fields for their views that don’t fully tow the dictatorial Transgender Party Line.

Never mind the absurd prejudice in the selection of what makes the ALA’s “Banned Books” list, how is such a singular dismissive smear even remotely an endorsement of “intellectual freedom?” It is, of course, the OPPOSITE: an effort to dissuade readers from touching the book towards making up their own minds, only a little short of an overt “Office of Intellectual Freedom” *ban* itself. (Note, too, in contradistinction, the ALA’s virtual army of activism [for EVERYTHING transgender.](#))

Consider, these facts about Irreversible Damage, as a PREMIERE “banned book”:

1. “No major outlet would review the book—not even *Kirkus Reviews*, the largest book reviewing magazine which reviews over 10,000 works a year, including self-published titles.”
2. “Shrier’s first publisher backed out on publishing the book after staff complaints.”
3. “When Shrier joined [Joe Rogan for a podcast](#) about the book, Spotify employees threatened to strike and [demanded](#) the episode be removed from the streaming platform.”
4. “Retail giant Target [temporarily pulled the book](#) from its shelves in response to two complaints on Twitter. They later reversed the decision after widespread backlash.”
5. “A GoFundMe page created independently by a concerned parent to raise money for a billboard promoting the book was [pulled by the crowdfunding site](#), citing, “intolerance of any kind relating to ... sexual orientation, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression.”
6. “Amazon refused to allow her new publisher to sponsor ads for the book. “Amazon allows sponsored ads for books that uncritically celebrate medical transition for teenagers,” Shrier [pointed out](#) in an Op-Ed for *The Post Gazette*.”

(citations from: <https://4w.pub/the-massive-effort-to-censor-irreversible-damage/>)

The American Library Association, its “Banned Books” list, and its “Office of Intellectual Freedom,” have become farce.

THE ALA, AUTHORITARIANISM, AND MARXISM

In the aforementioned October 2020 ALA text against the Trump administration, we see that the ALA doesn't resent being associated with Marxism. Rather, it seems to rumble with umbrage about the assertion that Marxism "is itself racist and sexist," and not that the association of the ALA and diversity indoctrination is within the umbrella of that totalitarian ideology.

So what about the ALA and its endorsement of the autocracy ("fascism") of Marxism? This has been going on for a while, gaining in intensity fairly recently. Let's start here:

In November of 1976, American Libraries magazine (house organ for the American Libraries Association) [published a relative puff-piece](#) (entitled MAO AS LIBRARY USER AND WORKER: HOW EARLY EXPERIENCES IN TRADITIONAL CHINESE LIBRARIES CONTRIBUTED TO MAO'S REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS) about Chinese communist leader Mao Zedong, and the curious fact that he was increasingly radicalized as a communist thinker while working at the national library in Peking/Beijing. His principal revolutionary influence was the director of that library, Li Dazhao (also translated as Li Tachao). One [academic site notes](#) that "Li Ta-chao, who was honored by the Chinese Communist Party as its first true leader and its greatest martyr, was the pioneer of Marxism in China and one of the two principal founders of the Chinese communist movement in 1920."

Noteworthy here, per the American Libraries piece, was its 1976 publication date and the fact that the Chinese "cultural revolution," instigated by Mao Zedong, had been roiling from 1966 until that same 1976 year, the date of Mao's death. An estimated 1.5 million people

were killed as consequence of this ideological cleansing effort. No mention is made of this in the *American Libraries* magazine puff piece (or any critique whatsoever) that merely revels in Mao as a Marxist librarian. *Atlantic* magazine, hardly a right-wing rag, [notes this](#) about the 1966-1976 cultural revolution:

“What started as casual brutality—class enemies forced to wear ridiculous dunce caps or stand in stress positions—degenerated into outright sadism. On the outskirts of Beijing, where traffic-crammed ring roads now lead to walled compounds with luxury villas, neighbors tortured and killed one another in the 1960s, using the cruelest methods imaginable. People said to be the offspring of landlords were chopped up with farm implements and beheaded. Male infants were torn apart by the legs to prevent them from growing up to take revenge. In a famous massacre in Dao County, Hunan province, members of two rival factions—the Red Alliance and the Revolutionary Alliance—butchered one another. So many bloated corpses floated down the Xiaoshui River that bodies clogged the dam downstream, creating a red scum on the reservoir’s surface. During a series of massacres in Guangxi province, at least 80,000 people were murdered; in one 1967 incident, the killers ate the livers and flesh of some of their victims.”

Context for all this: despite the lack of parallel large-scale violence (yet?), we seem to be enduring [a kindred “cultural revolution”](#) in this country, wherein statues are being pulled down, ideas are being blocked, and people of the past who don’t live up to current ideological purity are being deleted from memory and discussion. The American Library Association is positioning itself with its profound influence on libraries as an activist propaganda organization in this broad effort. And, as the 1976 article seems to underscore, it has been doing this for a long time, rather recently gaining in intensity. (Note also, for example,

the ALA's own recent in-house "cultural revolution," expunging, for example, both its [Melvil Dewey Medal](#) and [Laura Ingalls Wilder award](#) based on these historic individuals' failures to live up to today's demands for ideological purity).

More sycophancy to Marxism? Under the heading "*Selective Opposition to Censorship*," the organization *Influence Watch* [notes that in 2003 the ALA refused to condemn](#) the communist Cuban imprisonment of 65 of that nation's librarians whose crime was to make available books to the public, including those by Martin Luther King, Jr. and George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. The Organization of American States, Amnesty International, and Freedom House, as well library associations in Poland, the Czech Republic, Latvia, and Estonia (all formerly trapped under a communist regime) joined in a public condemnation effort against a censorial Marxist Cuba. Nate Hentoff, a prominent journalist (who won the ALA's Immroff Intellectual Freedom Award in 1983) even highlighted one of his articles: [Endless Shame of the Spineless American Library Association](#) and another [In Castro's Gulag- Librarians](#).

Not only did the ALA refuse to help the cause against Cuban communist censorship and jailing. It seemed to endorse it. [As one journalist noted](#), the ALA

"invited the official Cuban government librarians to speak at its June 19-25 ALA convention in Toronto — but adamantly refused to invite any of the librarians from the 105 independent libraries in Cuba. They said the independents were "not professionals."

This means that the semi-official American Library Association is embracing Marxist librarians who keep Marx, Engels and (but of course!) Castro on their shelves but keep out biographies of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., the homilies of Pope John Paul II, the U.N. Declaration of

*Human Rights and the works of Mahatma Gandhi and Vaclav Havel ...
To make it worse, after the ALA's public refusal to allow any voice of the independents to be heard at its conference, it formed a panel discussion on Cuban libraries. The only problem is that all the panelists were Cuban 'professional librarians' ...*

"Robert Kent, a librarian at the New York Public Library and founder of the "Friends of Cuban Libraries," which speaks in America for the independent Cuban libraries, points out that most librarians are focused on their own specialties, as, for instance, children's books. The ALA has a "Latin American subcommittee," he told me, made up largely of "extremists" on Cuban affairs. A group traveled there in 2001 and could find neither repression nor censorship, even while they had in their hands printed instructions from the government forbidding them from bringing in books.

It is the old Marxist story, where a small group of disciplined radicals with a specialized goal is able rather easily to take over a big professional organization where attentions are focused and scattered."

My own firing as a public library librarian was because [I defended political neutrality in libraries](#) and resisted the American Library Association's solicitation for librarians to join Black Lives Matter. With [recent Cuban unrest](#) against their communist regime, Black Lives Matter has officially come out [in support of the Cuban communist regime](#). One of the Cancel Culture complaints against my neutrality comments -- a complaint that was [cited as reason to fire me](#) in formal termination documents -- was from a stranger named Mike Schull who hypocritically wrote this: *"black lives matter is not a political statement but a moral one ..."*

How overt is this Marxist influence at the ALA today? An important facet of increasing modern day library “fascist” censorship is the aforementioned tyrannical notion of “critical librarianship.” Ardent Marxist Elaine Harger, for years an influential activist within ALA upper ranks, [is even still cited](#) as a seminal authority for today’s ALA’s official sanction of this censorial ideology. [See, for example, Harger’s advocacy book about her Marxist activism within and beyond the ALA: *“Which Side Are You On?: Seven Social Responsibility Debates in American Librarianship, 1990-2015.”*] A longtime ALA board member, Mark Rosenzweig, was even [chief librarian](#) for the Center for Marxist Studies, the archive of the Communist Party USA.

A pioneer in revisionary Political Correctness, per cataloging, in the library universe is [Sanford Berman](#). One reviewer of Berman’s efforts in 1983 [anoints Berman](#) as “*a representative of the New Left in American Subject Cataloging,*” wherein Berman clearly lays – in the library context -- the fabric for today’s politically “woke” agitation that is quick to declare offense at what is now termed “microaggressions” within an allegedly endemic “white supremacist” culture (Berman’s go-to term was “Christocentric.”) Intriguingly, in [one article by Berman](#) in the far leftist “Progressive Librarian,” he notes that “*Self-censorship is librarianship’s ‘dirty little secret.’*” [p. 50] This is from a man who has spent an entire career revising (banning) traditional library categories that are decreed to *offend* people. Yet here Berman’s interest is in advocating what many (certainly on the political right) would call obscene. He argues that libraries should spend limited library funds on what large numbers of people would consider (to their own mores and ideology) to be offensive pornography: a book celebrating “male masturbation” with “generous photos,” “explicit photos” in a book called “*Erotic By Nature,*” a book subtitled “*Women Pleasure Themselves*” including over 100 photographs, a volume featuring “32

full-color photographs of women's genitals ... The vulvas belong to a group of women diverse in age, race, and ethnicity.") [p. 51]

The point here is not to argue pro or con what materials a library with limited funds should have the luxury to carry and whether they should be locked away for request, featured in a Welcome Penis/Vulva Poster at the doorway for library visitors, or framed as a scientific investigation for children in the kids' area. (You think I joke? Am I far off? Facing enormous controversy, a library in Maryland, the Lexington Park Public Library, [aimed to have](#) "sex education" courses for teens taught by a lesbian "pole dancer" who [regularly donated to a prostitute organization](#) which assisted "*female, male, and transgender individuals engaging in sex work in Washington D.C in leading healthy lives.*") The searing point is this: Sanford Berman's sociopolitical double standard. This is a man who successfully crusaded to entirely ban "offensive" terms and categories throughout the American library system, but he abandons this crusade completely when it is a counter world view ("Christocentric") different than his that faces prospective – or more likely certain -- "offense." And this posture of *selective* "intellectual freedom" and *selective* "offense" is endemic to today's American Library Association.

Left-wing library censors today are legion, exemplified recently by the likes of Alison Macrina (self-appointed potentate of something she calls the "[Library Freedom Project.](#)") (!) The title of her lecture at the 2021 ALA convention was direct: "[Intellectual Freedom Is Meaningless Without Social Justice.](#)" "Reject neutrality" totalitarians like Adolf Hitler and Mao Zedong would certainly agree. Both founded censorial political states that murdered millions of people (as many as [45 million dead in China](#) alone). There isn't much in their stated goals and beliefs that exactly overlap, but this certainly is the same: both believed in the

suspension of intellectual freedom in the name of their respective views of “social justice,” to indoctrinate people to the importance of The Cause. Hitler’s appeal was to a German populace facing rampant unemployment and economic chaos in the wake of World War I. Zedong leaned on Karl Marx’s “dictatorship of the proletariat” via literal class war. By any terms of interpretation, both autocratic appeals were to “social justice.” *And the suspension of free speech was instrumental in attaining their respective goals.*

The Marxist influence in today’s library world is deep. A 2017 book, [Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Science](#), featuring the Leftist racial views of 29 library professionals, is introduced by a Marxist professor, Todd Honma, with this Karl Marx quote as foundation to the volume:

*“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]*

The sweep of the Marxist movement is international, of course. There is even a new 2021 book, [Public Libraries and Marxism](#), which argues that public libraries move towards an organizational framework that reflects that ideology. One of the co-authors is the head librarian of a public library in Canada, and the other a PhD student in England who is also co-author of *Managing Cultural Change in Public Libraries: Marx, Maslow, and Management*.

With the overlapping censorial admonitions of both Marxism and Fascism, each based in a “social justice” claim in limiting intellectual freedom, and that fair-minded “neutrality” invites the enemy (whoever

it is) to have a platform to speak, let's examine some useful "fascist" tips about propagandizing totalitarian ideologies:

"The most brilliant propagandist technique will yield no success unless one fundamental principle is borne in mind constantly - it must confine itself to a few points and repeat them over and over." -- Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's minister of propaganda

"The receptivity of large masses is very limited. Their capacity to understand things is slight whereas their forgetfulness is great. Given this, effective propaganda must restrict itself to a handful of points, which it repeats as slogans as long as it takes for the dumbest member of the audience to get an idea of what they mean." — Adolf Hitler

"The leader of genius must have the ability to make different opponents appear as if they belonged in one category." – Adolf Hitler

These advising quotes could have been written by whoever drafted the ALA's "white supremacy" and "fascist" resolution – probably a committee ("collective") of some kind. Who knows the ALA's actual conception of these terms? As obtuse as they are, they are merely exploited as simplistic – and generic – scares and smears to ensnare ANY ideological enemies that stand contrary to ALA sociopolitical dictates.

In this regard, the aforementioned library Marxist tome, [Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Science](#), smoothly follows the above "fascist" propaganda strategies wherein the broad range of Left-wing ideological enemies are conflated into one specific term: "whiteness." Book contributor Katrina Spencer states her various nemeses like this:

"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 ablebodied.”

Ultimately, all variant enemies are borne here as one: “white supremacy.” And, of course, “fascism” is popularly used by the Left as a virtual synonym for the former term. These two wild -- and typically fused -- slanders frame an easily conjured cartoon boogeyman that anyone moral is called upon to fight. (And, in our current social world, ANYONE who is successfully libeled a “white supremacist” or “fascist” is rendered a censored non-person in the world of public ideas. That, of course, IS THE ALA’S IMPLICIT AIM with such a resolution, to silence dissent to its own (ultimately) Marxist sociopolitical dictates, both by smearing opponents as “white supremacist-fascists” and then, using illusory ethical claims (these days rooted in Leftist conceptions of racial and gender injustices) to comfortably delete their contrary arguments. And, routinely in recent years, the base of this “white supremacist/fascist” scarecrow starts with Donald Trump and the tens of millions of people who voted for – or sympathize – with at least some of his views. And once started with that generic censorial attack, where – and how -- does such defamation and dismissal against an entire class of Americans end? Once upon a time such people had the right to go to libraries and *not be told what to think*.

Of course, not all Leftist ALA librarians adhere to the specific nomenclature of Marxist dictate, but prefer to follow the so-called “post-modernist” ideology – in its many permutations -- of Marxist expansion without actually naming what it actually is, other than a proclaimed allegiance to the secular religion of “social justice,” which, in its various forms, is rife with rigid Marxist undertones.

Marxist socialization in the library world runs deep. The ALA has an online endorsement of a book called “[Communism for Kids](#)” at its web

site. Children need to *learn* about Marxism – no, be *propagandized* to its value -- *in elementary school*? And the ALA needs not merely provide this information as an accessible resource, but to expressly *advocate for it*? No neutrality, indeed.

This early ALA socialization of vulnerable kids is considered, of course, a blow for “intellectual freedom.” Yet on the other hand, when conservative parents struggle to get books reflecting their own respective ideology into libraries under the banner of “intellectual freedom,” the American Libraries Association is nowhere to be found. And this narrow selectivity of the ALA’s focus on “intellectual freedom” is endemic to its propaganda efforts. It is simple yet masterful censorial ploy: championing some sanctioned ideas, while merely ignoring others, all the while heralding itself as a bastion of “intellectual freedom.”

MICROCOSM OF THE ALLEGED “WHITE SUPREMACY” AND “FASCISM” CENSORIAL PROBLEM AND ALA TOTALITARIANISM: THE CASE OF LIBRARIAN APRIL HATHCOCK (i.e., Leftists eating their own)

“Fighting whiteness is hard work that requires additional labor from everyone.” – African-American library diversity activist [April Hathcock](#)

Here’s how the “White Supremacist-Fascist” game works. If you say “fighting whiteness” (however one defines that) is cool, you’re a member of the Moral Elite. If you say its parallel, say, “fighting

blackness” is cool ... (No, no, no. Nowhere near that -- merely daring to *criticize ANYONE* black), you are, categorically, a “racist.”

First of all, “social justice” activist librarian April Hathcock is Black, hysterically Black. That is the bedrock of her world, with the omnipresent addendum that white “racism” apparently defines, for her, even the remotest corner of her personal universe. In November of 2019, Hathcock (or her groupthink ideologues) somehow managed – within a week (the political Left in the mass media is this incestuous?) -- to get a prominent journal, *Inside Higher Education*, [to feature an article](#) entitled “*Racism and the American Library Association*,” about her struggles with alleged “racism” in the ALA, claiming that – Hell’s Bells -- she was “*verbally attacked by a white [male] colleague at an ALA meeting.*” How terrible is ALA racism? “*It seems,*” [she declared at her blog](#), “*I will never be able to attend an American library Association meeting without encountering some kind of racist, sexist trauma. ALA just isn’t a safe space in our profession for me. And I’m not the only one.*”

Her full allegations [are these](#):

“*[The white male] accused me of being a hypocrite, for doxxing people and making ‘racial innuendos’ on my blog. He accused me of being uncivil and unprofessional (yes, he accused me of this in a tirade in a public forum amongst our colleagues). Then, he ended by claiming that I gave him ‘nightmares.’*”

This, coming from a white male, translates into obvious “racism.” Nothing else. And this claim by Hathcock, in all its heady newsworthiness, somehow merits a red alert article in *Inside Higher Education*.

Nightmare, indeed. Hathcock's accuser knows that, by being Black and relentlessly vocal about omnipresent "racism," she is immune from criticism, or even fair debate. She plays the tried and true "race card" every second and dares anyone to touch her for whoever she actually is deep within her exterior racial fortress. She's clearly, as evidenced by her online portfolio, the kind of person who drains all the energy out of a room, who controls a work environment, and is impossible to discipline, let alone fire. She seems Hell-bent on fulfilling the stereotype of the "[angry black woman](#)." Nonetheless, "[social justice](#)" groupies were quick to [rally around Hathcock](#) and make demands, in consequence of all the "racism" against her.

About 30 people were present in the room during the conflict Hathcock had with her white nemesis, "*including prominent members of the library profession.*" Most were apparently white. None came forward to condemn the alleged evil white monster who apparently told Hathcock off, so, in Hathcock's pure world, the entire roomful of people was, of course, categorically, by default, "racists" too, ruthlessly poised in their silence against a withering Victim Flower.

As Hathcock melodramatically explains it:

"No one said a thing [after her encounter with the white male] ... Me? I said nothing. I was struck dumb with fear. [I have been attacked by white men just like this person through trolling and harassment in the past.](#) These people have called and emailed me at work. They've called my library dean. They've called the president of my university. One even sent me a postcard full of vile language. Why? All because I speak up unabashedly against racism and systemic oppression. [NOTE: This response to her is probably rooted in the fact that "conservative" web sites like the [Washington Examiner](#) and Campus Watch have dared to report on Hathcock's [own anti-white prejudices](#). Note the political

battle lines drawn against “conservative groups” by the ALA [here](#)]. *And now here I was living my own worst nightmare face-to-face in person. And no one was there to protect me ... Immediately after the meeting ended, this person tried to approach me. While I was still terrified. I told him to stay away from me. To not speak to me. I told him he made me feel unsafe. Then, I ran to my room to curl into a ball and cry in terror. At some point, I realized I needed to report him.”*

Report him, of course. Hathcock even charges that the ALA president at the time, Wanda Kay Brown, who is Black, was part of [an alleged ALA effort to silence her](#) about this incident. Cited political defenders of Hathcock in the *Inside Higher Education* article include Meredith Farkas, president of the Association of College and Research Libraries-Oregon, [who wrote an article](#) for the ALA’s *American Libraries* magazine in celebration of “critical librarianship” AGAINST library neutrality, implicitly favoring personal Left-wing political agendas (and implicit censorship).

The *Inside Higher Education* article about Hathcock and ALA racism even references an alleged endemic “racism” in academia [by citing another of its news items](#). In that report, a white professor is branded as a “racist” merely for wondering if being Black for a colleague was central to that individual being hired at her college, despite the fact that priority Black and minority hiring is a demonstrable fact throughout the academic and library worlds – and beyond. Note the avalanche of “[diversity initiatives](#),” for instance, virtually [omnipresent these days](#). Michael Kelley, for example, then-editor of the *Library Journal*, desperately hand-wrings about how more “diversity” is needed in the library world, [even arguing](#) that minority library workers should be promoted through library ranks without MLS degrees required by white applicants. So, whatever the job candidates’ qualifications, magnificent, good, bad, or ugly, it is automatic “racism” to note this

priority hiring ideology as an important part of a minority job applicant's *real resume*? No. The accusation of "racism" in such a case is a form of denial/censorship of stark facts, ultimately a grotesque celebration of the Emperor's New Clothes, *wherein what's naked before you dare not be mentioned*.

One of the outrageous things about this bogus association of "racism" in academia to Hathcock's case, oozing systemic delusion and hypocrisy, is that also in 2019 – the year of Hathcock's "racism" accusation -- the ALA's Spectrum scholarship program (part of the broader organization's "diversity" efforts) advocated for Hathcock's candidacy to the ALA Council (its "congress") [ONLY BECAUSE](#) Hathcock was a minority, a so-called "Spectrum Scholar," one of four recommended individuals that year. A choice for Hathcock was in fact primarily an underscoring of a voter's personal "diversity" ethics, an endorsement for minority advancement which is the entire reason the Spectrum division at the ALA even exists: favoritism to get more nonwhites into the library system. "*We encourage you to support the mission of the Spectrum Scholarship Program by supporting these leaders!*" declares the promo. [What is the Spectrum project?](#) "*The Spectrum Scholarship Program actively recruits and provides scholarships to American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Middle Eastern and North African, and/or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander students to assist them with obtaining a graduate degree and leadership positions within the profession and ALA.*"

Obviously this is an example of more chronic racism at the American Library Association which the likes of Hathcock must perpetually endure.

In Hathcock's case, the consequence of her preposterous claim of widespread ALA racism was a formal apology from the ALA and the resignation of the evil white male in question, allegedly a man named Chris Corrigan. One ALA member, Anita Kinney, noted what was Forbidden to Say in a case like this, that there were obviously two sides to the story (actually, in this case, that of around 30 other "racists"), which, per the white male's perspective, is, of course, published nowhere. (To dare to give voice to his "racism" would of course be "racism.") And here is the importance of this trivial (albeit "newsworthy") April Hathcock incident in the broader censorial sphere: Kinney, who apparently knows Corrigan well, stood up for him and noted that an endemic **FEAR** among librarians enforces silence and censorship in such an emphatically, intentionally, racialized and politicized case:

"The people who want to stand up for Chris are unable to do so for fear of professional repercussions. If I were employed as a librarian, I doubt I'd be speaking up. The fear of becoming a target for cyberbullies has silenced more witnesses than we will ever know."

Read that quote again because it is worth your time towards understanding American Library Association documents about "white supremacy" and "fascism" in the library world, and beyond. It also speaks loudly in underscoring the precarious status of "intellectual freedom" in today's information world. *No one has the guts to stand up against a one-sided, totalitarian, censorial onslaught, via a moral midget like April Hathcock or the entire totalitarian creep in today's "information access" world. **"Intellectual freedom," in any true and honest form, does not exist.*** Librarians everywhere are afraid to speak. Everyone knows it, but are powerless to do anything, lest they end up in the unemployment line, career and reputations ruined. Or worse. (Note also, for example, [the case of library "senior branch manager"](#))

[Alix Freck](#) of the Alachua County Library District who was demoted for critical comments in 2020 she had on Facebook about Black Lives Matter. She resigned, sued the library, and eventually “reached a settlement” with her former employees. A local news organization, in reporting on Freck’s case, noted that a library coworker who spoke supportively of Freck “*requested anonymity in order to not jeopardize their work status.*”)

So, who is this person, April Hathcock, Oppressed Princess, darling of the political Left, and a reigning Dynamo among hordes of race baiters, who is personally suffocated by supposed white racism *everywhere*? Hathcock, the totalitarian, in ALA terms the “fascist,” could probably have drafted, alone, the ALA’s “white supremacist-fascist” document. Let’s start here:

The remarkable thing(s) about Hathcock’s claim to “racism” within the ALA (and beyond) is that it is the kind of organization that walks on hyper-brittle eggshells around such a Black prima donna yelling “racism” at the slightest perceived offense. Our broader social world has been so “racist” to Ms. Hathcock that she has had the luxury to choose between TWO upper echelon careers as a Black woman in a “White Supremacist” world. She was a [corporate lawyer](#) “with a six figure salary” (!) before she decided to go back to school to become a librarian, ultimately landing within the force and prestige of a prominent university. In the library sphere, she faces so much endemic “racism” that she has wide public forum to promote the proverbial “race card” shamelessly, again and again, in her biased, self-promotional favor. She was selected as an esteemed “[Mover and Shaker](#)” (i.e., rewarded for her Left-wing political activism) for the *Library Journal* in March 2018. In 2016, Hathcock was an anointed “[Member of the Week](#)” by the innately “white supremacist” (?) Association of College of Research Libraries and, in the same year, was

[a keynote speaker](#) addressing over 400 librarians at the 2016 National Diversity in Libraries Conference at UCLA. She even wrote an [article](#) that summed up that meeting for the aforementioned *Library Journal*, the largest circulating library periodical in America. At this conference, Hathcock [reportedly wanted to ban white people](#) from some meetings. Furthermore, a fully “fascistic” Thought Police regimentation was apparently in order at this “Diversity” Festival:

“Notably, the conference attendees were required to abide by a [“Code of Conduct”](#) that prohibited “verbal comments that reinforce social structures of domination related to gender, gender identity and expression, age, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance, body size, race, ethnicity, national origin, or religion.”

Violations of the code of conduct were documented in an [online reporting system](#), and could result in sanctions or expulsion from the conference without a refund.”

April Hathcock is such a hypocritical icon in the American Library Association that we need to examine her efforts against “fascists” within that “racist” organization. She exemplifies the errant track of such an organization’s claim to moral -- or even civil -- endeavor.

In 2016, the American Library Association’s Washington D.C. lobbying office reached out to the victorious incoming Trump administration with a routine courtesy, [saying](#):

“We are ready to work with President-elect Trump, his transition team, incoming administration and members of Congress to bring more economic opportunity to all Americans and advance other goals we have in common.”

As a result of this innocuous comment, loud, intolerant, bigoted, and [censorial factions](#) in the American Library Association flew for its jugular vein. The outrage from the activist “progressive” wing of the library world over this simple statement of cooperation with the new American governmental administration was enough to force the then ALA President Julie Todaro (and ALA Washington Office Executive Director Emily Sheketoff who is [blamed](#) for the original missive) to cave in submission to a barrage of left-wing intolerance that refused the simple offer of a generic, abstract American library civility to the incoming presidential administration. The original statement of cooperation [was quickly deleted](#) (i.e., self-CENSORED) by the ALA’s online posting apparatus and the standard, groveling, *Kiss Political Correctness Butt* statement was offered instead to accommodate the most hyper-hysterical voices in the library world.

Astoundingly, Ms. Todaro’s (the ALA’s) revised statement included [this](#):

“The American Library Association (ALA) has heard your concerns regarding how we should approach the incoming administration. To address these concerns, we have rescinded the ‘ALA offers expertise, resources to incoming administration and Congress’ press release posted to ALA.org on Nov. 15.”

“Rescinded” an offer for our nation’s libraries to routinely cooperate with a yet untested and democratically elected American President? “Rescinded” the same to the U.S. Congress? And the alternative to cooperation with an *elected* American governmental leadership is -- *what?* Are we again toying with a term like authoritarianism – and “fascism?”

In the *American Libraries* magazine, Todaro further [groveled to the ALA’s leftist base, declaring](#):

*“We are sorry that these communications created confusion and anger regarding our Association’s position on safeguarding and promoting its commitment to our core values including diversity, equity and inclusion. We understand that content from these press releases, including the 11/18/16 release that was **posted in error**, was interpreted as **capitulating to and normalizing** the incoming administration. ALA administration and leadership issues an apology to all who were negatively affected by these communications.” [bold type added]*

The ALA’s hostile, immediately adversarial stance is supposed to enhance Federal support for the nation’s libraries? What the Hell? Isn’t popular support and funding for libraries supposed to be a bedrock of the ALA? (If the ALA isn’t foremost interested in actually promoting *libraries*, and if it wants to bend society to its own ideological will, why doesn’t it change its name to something more appropriate, like the Transformative Identity Politics Party? Or Subversive Librarians for an Anti-Whiteness Revolution?) And Ms. Todaro “heard” – and *accommodated* -- WHOSE voices? The nags and whiners and pouters and chronic complainers and self-obsessed totalitarians basking in a celebratory victim culture who, in a public library context, seek to angrily barricade themselves from half the American voters and the very civil foundations of this country, including the traditions of its electoral college. The standards for voting that has worked since the 1700s wasn’t good enough for them or the ALA. What kind of message does that send to library visitors everywhere? If there is any truth at all to the stereotype of some kind of undying “hatred” in this country that must be morally eradicated, it is best evidenced by the collective rage of this embittered class of revolutionaries. And any organization that “rescinds” an introductory, explorative olive branch in deference to incessantly defiant war-mongers had best examine more closely what it is doing and what – and who -- it now represents.

But what of intolerant icon Hathcock and the ALA's collective repression against an elected American president and those who voted for him? What about the ALA and "fascism?" In her 2016 postpresidential election blog post, entitled "[F@ck you, ALA](#)," Hathcock declared that the ALA's (rescinded) olive branch congratulation to the victorious Trump was a

"kind of fascist ass-kissing" ... The truth is ALA will gladly sell out its members and their communities for this bottom line. It will collude with hate-filled fascists. It will trample all over its values. It will spit in the faces of the marginalized ... My ALA does not collude with fascists. My ALA does not normalize hate. My ALA does not sell me and mine on the auction block to the highest bidder for a few bucks to fund a library. This is not my ALA. F@ck this ALA."

Bear in mind, this is a prominent activist librarian at a major university who hysterically screeches that she personally OWNS the ALA; it her HERS to control – in league with *attack the garrison* comrades -- with the dictates of her own world view. Her coddled fanaticism runs deep and there are many like her in the ALA ranks (Twitter mobs and the like) that form its public posture and ideology in direct defiance of the tens of millions of American "fascists" who are the target of such slander and libel simply because they don't agree with her own authoritarian obsessions. The real "fascists" are loud, they are incessant, they are obsessed, and they shape the political advocacy posture of the ALA -- and beyond.

And what about Hathcock as, say, an untouchable Black racist (which her white nemesis, Collingsworth, probably in softer tones, may have tabled to her)? Hathcock's anti-white animus runs deep. In a truly equal and just society, she would probably herself be called out as an

[antiwhite “racist.”](#) What if a White individual – say, Collingsworth -- dared to [decree the following](#):

“I just spent the last 5 days at the American Library Association annual conference in Chicago, and I am suffering serious race fatigue. [Race fatigue](#) is a real physical, mental, and emotional condition that white people experience after spending a considerable amount of time dealing with the micro- and macro-aggressions [offenses] that inevitably occur when in the presence of Black people. The more Black people, the longer the time period, the more intense the race fatigue. “

The words of an obvious “white supremacist,” no? Alas, take out the word “White” and insert the word “Black” or “People of Color” and these are the racist musings of our Social Justice Queen, Hathcock, whose contempt and disdain for white people is not only tolerated by Leftist Hypocrisy, but celebrated as justified. Presumption: The white guy, Collingsworth, was offended by Hathcock’s comments, but (not a presumption) *only Hathcock’s declaration of offense counts.*

If Collingsworth had posted a parallel “I’m sick of Black people” comment, what do you suppose would have happened to him?

In writing about “gentrification” of a neighborhood she recently moved to in Harlem, [Hathcock also wrote](#): *“as my sister noted on one of her last visits, ‘Damn. There are a lot of white people around here.’”* What if a white individual – in any context – publicly heralded a parallel relative proclaiming *“Damn. There are a lot of black people around here.”* What would a Politically Correct decoding of its ultimate meaning be?

Hathcock also co-authored a piece for the aforementioned Marxist “Topographies of Whiteness” volume (2017, a year after the Trump election). Reflecting a kind of widespread library political mafia, her

coauthor, also Black, was Stephanie Sendaula, “reviews editor” for the *Library Journal* (the same periodical that [awarded Hathcock its “Mover and Shaker”](#) award for March 2018. [Note the political advocacies](#) of the current chief editor at *LJ*). Here these two authors 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.” “*Many white patrons,*” they write,

“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* (“white

supremacist”) workplace “standards” that anti-whiteness malcontents don’t feel they should have to follow.

But one more important note about Ms. Hathcock and the racism that so much overwhelms her. The American Library Association is so very racist that, like the elite Executive Board that runs the organization, [Hathcock was elected](#) by [dominantly white female](#) librarians to the ALA’s own “Council” (its “Congress”) over six years ago (wherein she has presumably served ever since).

THE “ONE POLITICAL PARTY” AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION – HILLARY CLINTON ON DOWN

“Since Mr. Trump took office a little more than three weeks ago, a vocal and growing number of librarians across the country have begun to take a more politically active stance.” – [PBS article](#)

“I have also been the faculty advisor to the College Republicans for 15 years. During the last year prior to my retirement, I wrote to eight faculty members whom I knew to be of a conservative bent, asking them to take over for me. All eight turned me down. This is important since no official campus club can exist and apply for funds without a faculty advisor. All eight expressed to me fears about some sort of reprisal, either in tenure, promotion, committee assignments, or all three. Today, I understand better their hesitation.” – [Mark Herring](#), professor and Dean of Library Services emeritus, Winthrop University (Note: the Republican club apparently [doesn’t exist anymore](#)]

The American Library Association is a 501(c) (3) tax-exempt non-profit organization and is prohibited from political activity. How it tiptoes around this is simply a game of semantics within obviously obsolete Federal IRS regulations. The ALA [notes that](#), for organizations like itself,

“All political activity is prohibited. Political activity is the support of or opposition to candidates for public office.”

That’s a ridiculously narrow definition of “political activity” in the real world. After all, the hyper-political left-wing ALA frames itself as an [advocacy](#) group with a goal of “transforming” American society into something other than it is today. The ALA’s core, activist ideology is far Leftist “progressivism” (arguably Marxism), an assault on “conservative” culture and values. And how is this not “political?” The manipulative veil is that the “transformation” is postured to be increased literacy, education, etc., for the masses. Its program, [Libraries Transform](#), for instance, is heralded as *“an ALA initiative focused on increasing the public awareness of libraries and the critical role they play in transforming lives and communities through education.”* Well, terms like “education” are wide enough to drive an endless convoy of Leftist campaign trucks through. After all, the ALA’s idea of “education” has a profoundly heavy political slant in its aim to overthrow the traditional mores and values of the existing social order. (Refer again to the opening ALA document about its undefined enemies of “white supremacism” and “fascism” and its implicit understanding of such terms: “white supremacists” and “fascists” are typically held to be generic “conservatives,” that part of the American population that resists the ALA’s own sociopolitical dictates, voted for Trump, bristle beneath dictates about how to think, etc.).

Take, for example, the “critical role” [the ALA plays in spreading](#) “Drag Queen Story Hours” for children throughout the country. This is education? Sure, you could argue that. So could totalitarians like Hitler or Mao argue their own darling propaganda projects as “education” too. But how, in our current Culture Wars, is such ALA [drag queen advocacy](#) at tax payer expense not “political?” I was [fired from my public library job](#) for resisting an ALA solicitation for librarians to join Black Lives Matter, an extremely political – no, revolutionary -- movement that the ALA actively [endorses](#). (The official Black Lives Matter web site expressly [calls itself](#) “a Black-centered **political will and movement building project**.” [Emphasis added] It even has a PAC – “[political action committee](#).” A forthcoming book [argues](#) that it is an expressly Marxist organization.

The ALA even has a division, the Rainbow Round Table, that awards a “[Rainbow Round Table Award for Political Activism](#),” wherein

*“the purpose of the award is to honor librarians, library related organizations (including libraries, library staff, library boards, library friends), and other individuals or groups (public or private) that have demonstrated excellence in the area of LGBTQIA+ activism. The award is designed **for someone who** is involved in efforts to promote LGBTQIA+ issues, **impedes the progress of anti-LGBTQIA+ efforts**, or raises awareness of LGBTQIA+ matters locally, statewide, nationally or internationally.”* [Emphasis added]

This text is exemplary of the American Library Association’s expressly POLITICAL hustling on many issues, even censoring [“*impeding*”] counter views. No one at the ALA’s LGBTQIA+ bureaucratic mafia is quibbling over the term “political,” per what they are actually attempting to do here. And no one at the “Rainbow Round Table” gives a rat’s ass about “intellectual freedom.” They want a clear, unimpeded,

one-lane road to force their world view on people. And, apparently, as long as they avoid endorsing a specific political candidate, they can be prejudicially politically active in any way they wish, with the entire force and influence of the ALA (good for revenues [over \\$39 million](#)) throughout the once “neutral” library world, and still keep the ALA tax exempt, non-profit status.

Examine all the stuff the ALA advocates today and you’ll find a starkly clear partisan line. There is no balance, no debate, no two sides to an issue, and certainly no “intellectual freedom” in its ardent advocacies (self-described above as “political activism”). Meanwhile, there isn’t any advocacy for National Rifle Association 2nd amendment “education” at libraries. (Maybe kids could learn the shoot guns the day after the local Drag Queen Story Hour? Controversial, sure, but so what? The precedent of “Who cares about whoever doesn’t agree with whatever a librarian feels like promoting” is set. *Unless only one kind of ideology is allowed to be offended.*) What? No Anti-Abortion Week posters? Nothing advertised anywhere about anyone’s variant religious values? (There’s a “banned book” for you). Here’s what’s really at stake with all this: if you’re arrogant enough to piss off one sector of people with your own personal sociopolitical advocacy, it’s only fair to start pissing off *everyone* in every direction with the inevitable anti-neutral chaos you invite.

Here again is what the ALA is [forbidden to do](#) as a non-profit, tax-free organization:

“All political activity is prohibited. Political activity is the support of or opposition to candidates for public office.”

So, to easily get around even this narrow restriction, the ALA schemers have a sort of a systemic *post*-support for candidates for public office. Winners or losers, it invites such individuals to speak at big ALA

meetings AFTER their campaigns are over, not really supporting them (the campaign is finished), but avidly supporting (per sneaking under IRS regulations) THEIR POLITICAL PLATFORMS. Ultimately, the specific politician is irrelevant. The ideology they carry/spread to the next “progressive” politician is what actually counts. It is a kind of default support for the *next* political candidate that endorses ALA left-wing ideology, without having to overtly champion him/her overtly.

In 2017, *American Conservative* magazine [noted that](#)

“A glance at the speaker lineup of ALA events from the Bush era is just as revealing. The American Library Association’s annual conference in 2003 featured speakers such as Ralph Nader, Bernie Sanders, Naomi Klein, and Gloria Steinem. In 2004, there was a special screening of Michael Moore’s Fahrenheit 9/11. Then U.S. Senator Barack Obama was a featured speaker in 2005. Meanwhile, Laura Bush’s appearance in 2006 was met with controversy, with ALA Councilor-At-Large (and director of the Reference Center for Marxist Studies) Mark C. Rosenzweig railing against the first lady’s apolitical speaking role.

But a truly scary threat materialized last November when, against all sense of decency, Hillary Clinton lost the presidential election. Donald Trump’s election, and fears of an ascending Alt-Right, coupled with the long, ongoing march of “intersectionality” in academia and attacks on “offensive” conservative speech on campus—all have served to corrode the idea of ideological neutrality, a hallmark of the discipline that is even embedded in the ALA’s code of ethics.”

The American Library Association has for years celebrated its Leftist political advocacies at its national and territorial meetings, never foregrounding a “neutral” view about controversial public policy issues. Single-minded and dictatorial, it festers in its self-contained political bubble. Its [main speakers for the 2021 national conference](#) were

former president Barack Obama and [Nikole Hannah-Jones](#), creator of the profoundly [controversial](#) 1619 Project, which seeks a historical revision in our nation's schools, centering slavery as base for American historical understanding. The "racist" ALA that needs to amend so much in that regard also featured as its "Main Speaker" journalist Isabel Wilkerson. She is Black, as were all four of the principal lecturers, including Hannah-Jones, Obama, and Obama's co-lecturer, Lonnie Bunch III. Of the 36 [highlighted speakers](#) at the ALA convention, you'd be hard pressed to find anyone who strays very far from the ALA's authoritarian Party Line. (Perhaps – presumably -- the best chance to break this totalitarian bubble might have been country singer Trisha Yearwood. But, alas, she's among those featured under a *Washington Post* headline [entitled](#): "*People often assume all country singers have conservative views. This year has proved – yet again – that's not the case.*")

But let's go back a bit. After Donald Trump won the 2016 presidential election, loser Hillary Clinton [was featured as the main speaker](#) a few months later at the 2017 ALA Annual Convention. More about her in a minute. Other speakers lined up that year in the usual political Bubble, most with expressed anti-Trump intent, included

Reshma Saujani: Ms. Saujani is of Indian [India] descent: home of [the Hindu caste system](#) and [the wealthiest ethnic group](#) in modern America. Inexplicably, Ms. Saujani once [twittered](#) the following hallucination: "*I am a Hindu and I can tell you that Donald Trump values and words are in direct contradiction to my religion's teaching.*" Because Hinduism is ***fundamentally*** [discriminatory](#)? The ALA focused on Saujani as a great female role model. Meanwhile, *Salon*, hardly a right-wing journal, once introduced her to the public [in an article](#) by framing her as a callous Wall Street exploiter: "*So what are you to do if, say, you spent years working as a hedge fund attorney, and all your*

friends and colleagues are in the finance industry, but you really, really want to get elected to something in a liberal city as a Democrat? If you're Reshma Saujani, you just pretend you never had anything to do with Wall Street and hope no one digs too deep ...

Sara Jessica Parker: star of "Sex and the City," was a sanctioned speaker "as part of the official launch of ALA Book Club Central [a list of ALA-recommended readings] for which she will serve as Honorary Chair." Parker is [on record](#) as being a supporter of Hillary Clinton and being "terrified" at the prospect of a Donald Trump presidency and everything he stands for. (She says she was even "scared of Mitt Romney.") "I feel like there is a civil war," she complained. "There is an unspoken, undeclared civil war going on in this country and it really astounds me ..." Trump had solidified her enmity in 2015 [with one of his inane Twittered insults](#), agreeing with *Maxim Magazine* voters that Parker was the "unsexist woman alive." Parker's novel [selection](#) as "honorary chair" for the ALA's new Book Club Central was Black author Stephanie Powell Watts. It was Watts' first novel, "[billed as an African American version of 'The Great Gatsby.'](#)"

Carla Hayden: the aforementioned Obama-appointed Librarian of Congress. Aside from the politically correct requisites of being Black and female, the liberal *Nation* magazine added that Carla Hayden was a "[radical librarian](#)," noting that:

"Hayden advanced the notion of librarians as activists, and of libraries as vital community institutions, not just repositories for books ... She worked to make Baltimore libraries ... [among other things] spaces for community [conversations](#) about race ..."

The editors of the conservative *National Review* [wrote a piece](#) about Hayden entitled “*Obama Politicizes Even the Library of Congress,*” arguing that the Librarian of Congress was a job rooted in scholarship and

“[Hayden] is not suited to the position of librarian of Congress. This was made embarrassingly apparent last month when the White House released a four-minute commercial touting Hayden for the job. In the video, Hayden describes her work with neighborhood libraries in Baltimore: “opportunity centers” where you could “get the latest Harry Potter as soon as it came out . . . apply for a job . . . and find that step up in your life.” And she touts how Baltimore libraries “became a site for people to actually get food, to get supplies” during last year’s riots.

That’s all very nice, but it has nothing to do with the Library of Congress or the role of its librarian. No one is ducking into the Library of Congress to pick up “the latest Harry Potter” — and they couldn’t check it out if they tried. The Library of Congress is not just another library ...

*Hayden is not a scholar. She has edited one book — *Venture into Cultures: A Resource Book of Multicultural Materials and Programs* — and published a smattering of articles, mostly on race and library access. She is, if anything, an activist. ‘We are fighters for freedom,’ she told *Ms. magazine* in 2003, waxing grandiose about ‘the social work aspect of librarianship’ ... The Library of Congress, though, is not the place for ideological agenda-pushing.”*

Of course it is, in our new *Identity Politics Is Everything* world. As it is throughout the “agenda-pushing” American Library Association. Working with the ALA (Hayden was once even its President) she [was active](#) in the lobbying efforts to allow library patrons to view pornography on the Internet in libraries:

“She spearheaded the A.L.A.’s efforts to overturn legislation that forced all libraries receiving federal funding to install internet content filters on their computers. Eventually the Supreme Court upheld the right of adult library users to request the filter’s deactivation, though they did not overturn the requirement that the filters be installed. Hayden has worked with the A.L.A. to publicize and uphold the right to deactivate the filter.”

PJ Media [concluded its own knock](#) on Hayden’s prospective Library of Congress [appointment](#) with:

“Before voting on Dr. Hayden’s confirmation, senators should think long and hard about whether the library should be pillar of scholarship or a monument to political correctness.”

Sandra Uwiringiyimana: a Black refugee and human rights activist. She wrote a book, *How Dare the Sun Rise*, about her life experiences. As one book review notes, her pastor was burned alive in Africa, her brother was kidnapped, an angry mob chased her, and a sister was murdered among 115 others. Then she came to America where the reviewer frames her different country experiences [with moral equivalency](#):

“Her experience [in the United States] underscores some ugly aspects of our culture: prejudice, social pressure and a “don’t know, don’t care” attitude, even among neighbors.”

“I had grown up in a war zone,” [she writes](#), “but life in America...was a different kind of war zone.”

Another kind of “war zone?” Comparable to African massacres? Yes, indeed, a book deal with a major publisher and a national forum before

fawning librarians at the ALA annual conference, et al, are another kind of Monster Hell.

Ron Chernow: a historian who has [proclaimed](#) *“I have been deeply disturbed by the Trump campaign — more deeply disturbed than by any other presidential campaign in our history.” “The only historical movement that Trump alludes to is a shameful one: America First,”* he says, which [is declared](#) to have anti-Semitic roots. Chernow’s opinion is part of a collective expression of political activism by a small group of historians who did a series of short video presentations for liberal filmmaker Ken Burns, entitled [“Historians on Donald Trump.”](#)

These people represent the flavor of that year’s post-presidential ALA conference. And then the Big Gun came out: Hillary Clinton.

Here is a sampling of what Ms. Clinton [said](#) to her enthusiastically supportive ALA audience. Fulfilling the library and information requests and needs of a library community is one thing, but agitating for ideological Guard Towers that effectively legislate over that same community from Politically Correct Central is quite another:

CLINTON: *“Reading fiction builds empathy. It helps put ourselves in others’ shoes. One study even found that young people who read the Harry Potter books ... were more compassionate towards immigrants, refugees and members of the LGBT community.”*

CLINTON: *“I [was] so thrilled to learn about little 11-year old Marley Dias who noticed that there weren’t many characters in her books who looked like her. And she started the campaign known as 1,000 Black Girl Books and launched a national conversation. [Applause] Marley and organizations like We Need Diverse Books are doing crucial work!”*

CLINTON: *“A few years ago I visited the Queens Library in Flushing, Queens, New York. And part of the reason I did was because Queens County – one of the boroughs of New York City – is the most diverse place in our country and it was packed with people from all over the world looking for information in dozens of different languages.”*

[Question from the Internet audience, i.e., me: So how does such a lone library realistically accommodate a disparate crowd “*looking for information in dozens of different languages*” as opposed to, say, suggesting the pragmatic novelty of everyone there trying to learn English?]

CLINTON: *“When an elementary school in Wisconsin recently cancelled an event in support of a transgender student because they received threats from a hate group, it was the local public library that stepped up to host a reading of [I AM JAZZ](#) for six hundred people.” [APPLAUSE]*

Extended discussion about Hillary’s defamatory comment above is necessary here. The transgender student in question here was a first grader, [6-years old](#). How a child so young has any burning – and certainly lasting -- conviction about his or her sexuality is beyond me. I wonder with concern about the parenting, but that is not the point here. (Canada’s *National Post* followed [the U.K.’s Telegraph](#) in recently noting the moral position in this realm of Miroslav Djordjevic, a “[world leading transgender reconstructive surgeon](#)”: *“While the World Professional Association for Transgender Health guidelines currently state nobody under the age of 18 should undergo surgery, Prof Djordjevic fears this age limit could soon be reduced to include minors. Were that to happen, he says, he would refuse to abide by the rules.”* [Djordjevic also observed](#) that *“I’m afraid what will happen five to 10 years later with this person. It is more than about surgery; it’s an issue*

of human rights. I could not accept them as a patient as I'd be afraid what would happen to their mind.")

Clinton doesn't say what "hate" group threw threats at children, but I well know that unsubstantiated *smears* are common parlance in our Culture Wars. So I investigated it. Hillary's unreferenced "hate group" is the [Liberty Counsel](#). The "threat" from that "hate group" wasn't the insinuated thugs with guns, Ku Klux Klan shrouds, and pick axes, but a [proposed law suit](#), originating from upset parents who didn't wish to cede their personal codes of parenting -- per a child's introduction to *any kind of sexuality* -- to school "Diversity"-driven bureaucrats and administrators. The "threat" letter from the intervening Liberty Counsel objected to the usual diversity jargon included in a letter school parents received about a planned

"discussion of gender confusion and sexuality, under the guise of 'antibullying,' 'diversity,' and building a 'safe and nurturing environment,' by means of reading to First Graders this coming Monday, November 23, 'transgender' activist book 'I AM JAZZ.'" The [school's] letter was sent with one business days' notice and appears designed to catch parents off-guard, to prevent them from opting their children out of reading and subsequent discussion ... [You ignore the School District's] obligation to support the vast majority of students who are not gender-confused, and [your plan] creates the potential of gender confusion and resulting harm in these other students, who are currently happily living as normal, well-adjusted First, Second, and Third Graders."

In detail, the Liberty Counsel "hate" group logically (and ethically) [argues the following](#) potential "harms" to children subjected to the surprise "diversity" event:

- “1) Promoting non-factual, radical, and controversial assumptions about ‘gender’ – which is neither the right nor business of government schools to do;*
- 2) substituting the beliefs of the principal, school psychologist, and school counselor for those of parents;*
- 3) necessitating many parents teaching their children about a psychological and moral disorder about which they believe their children are too young to learn; 4) making other children uncomfortable;*
- 5) confusing many children;*
- 6) disturbing children who will now falsely believe that one can choose one’s gender;*
- 7) undermining modesty and privacy rights of students;*
- 8) undermining the religious free exercise and free speech rights of teachers and students in relation to incorrect pronouns.*

Clinton’s posture of innuendo and deliberate defamation to a supporting ALA mob is a prime example of how censorial smears like “hate group” towards those with whom one disagrees – particularly “conservatives” -- are part of modern political discourse. And, in the American Library Association case, it is *applauded*. Such unethical behavior emanates from all political directions, but is dominantly from the Left. Clinton’s irresponsible libel falls of course with equal shame on the ALA itself, which incongruously claims to champion “diversity” and “intellectual freedom.” There is no “hate” in the Liberty Counsel’s complaint, unless the wishes of parents for their children have been reconfigured as categorical “hatred” these days.

In fact, the Liberty Counsel has recently sued *Guidestar* (which compiles tax data about nonprofits) for referencing it as a “hate group.” Fortythree “conservative” leaders also [signed a successful letter of complaint](#) about *Guidestar’s* “hate” designation for the Liberty

Counsel, including the President of the American College of Pediatricians, President of the American Family Association, the former U.S. Attorney General under Ronald Reagan (Ed Meese), the President of the Heritage Foundation, Congressman Allen West, former Senator Jim DeMent, and the President of the American Foreign Policy Council.

In a word, Clinton's "hate" smear is nakedly political, aimed at defamation and, ultimately, censorship. (Who would dare give voice to a "hater?")

The origin of the Liberty Counsel's "hate" designation, however, is not *Guidestar*. It is directly [traced to the left-wing Southern Poverty Law Center](#), whose baseless allegations were routinely absorbed by *Guidestar*. The SPLC is increasingly recognized for declaring "hate" to be whatever its purveyors disagree with politically. (Hillary Clinton herself says that she "*helped to start*" a similar smear organization, David Brock's Media Matters, which is a focus of Sheryl Attkison's recent book about modern defamation campaigns by multi-million dollar organizations created to kill free speech and to silence political opponents). [ATTKISON, p. 45]

Even an author at the hyper-liberal *Huffington Post* has [condemned the SPLC](#) for "*hounding conservative organizations*" and "*CNN's awardwinning anchor Lou Dobbs*." Underscoring the political contours behind such SPLC charges of "hate," in 2014, in accepting an award from what the SPLC declared to be an "*anti-Muslim group*," the Israeli Ambassador to the United States, Ron Dermer, "[attacked the Southern Poverty Law Center](#)," "*lambasted the SPLC at length*," and declared that "*they seem to want to stifle debate*." Dermer [later called](#) the SPLC "*defamers and blacklisters*." Wherever you fall on the political spectrum, the accusation of "hate" is increasingly becoming merely a political tool to silence – and censor-- counter views.

The liberal *Politico* news source even [wrote an article](#) wondering if the SPLC has been “*overstepping its bounds*” and wondering in the title “[Has a Civil Rights Stalwart Lost Its Way?](#)” “*There are new questions,*” noted the piece, “*arising around a charge that has dogged the group for years: that the SPLC is overplaying its hand, becoming more of a partisan progressive hit operation than a civil rights watchdog.*”

J. M. Berger, a researcher for the International Centre for Counter Terrorism at the Hague, is cited as an authority in the article. “*Like many observers,*” says *Politico*, “*he worries that the SPLC has gone too far in some of its hate group characterizations.*”

Mr. Berger’s profoundly relevant [quote](#) is about the smearing of political/ideological foes and the resulting quagmire in losing objective reality:

“The problem partly stems from the fact that the [SPLC] organization wears two hats, as both an activist group and a source of information.”

Where have we seen an exact parallel to this before? What other national group currently hustles itself as an “*activist [advocacy] group*” within its older, revered framework as a stalwart “*source of information?*”

The American Library Association.

A Fox news story [noted](#) that at least six “conservative” organizations were on the SPLC’s “hatewatch” list. “*A number of the socially conservative organizations the SPLC labels as hate groups,*” [noted the story](#), “*because of their views on LGBT issues, have beliefs about such issues that are strikingly similar to those of the Roman Catholic Church.*”

Aside from the Liberty Counsel, other SPLC-designated “hate” organizations include the [Family Research Council](#), the [American Family Association](#), the [American College of Pediatricians](#), the [Family Research Institute](#), and the [World Congress of Families](#).” Follow their links and check out their “hate” for yourselves. Former (Black) presidential candidate Ben Carson was even once placed on SPLC’s [“Extremist Watch”](#) list for his views on same sex marriage. Conservative radio pundit Rush Limbaugh [has declared](#) the increasingly obvious: that the SPLC organization itself is a “hate group.”

Of particular note, [says Fox News](#),

“On June 11, Attorney General Jeff Sessions gave a speech to members of the [Alliance Defending Freedom](#) (ADF), the religious freedom group, [prompting some media outlets, like ABC and NBC News, to label the ADF a “hate group.”](#)”

In this realm of muddy labeling, the SPLC has refused to call “Black Lives Matter” a “hate group” (although some authorities like Black Milwaukee County Sheriff David Clarke [did](#)). But a loose-knit response to BLM, “*White Lives Matter*,” WAS [decreed](#) to be a “hate group” by the organization. The rationale for this decision [was examined](#) recently by the *Washington Post*.

We can follow the dragon’s tail forever with this. In the wake of the infamous Charlottesville *white supremacist versus Antifascist riots* [as the mass media singularly simplifies a complicated socio-political convulsion], the CEO of Apple, Tim Cook, [donated a million dollars](#) on behalf of Apple to the SPLC to fight generic “hate.” Shortly thereafter, African-American Denise Young Smith, “*Apple’s first-ever vice president of diversity and inclusion*,” was attacked [for the following reasoned](#),

[genuinely “inclusive,” and open-minded comments](#) about what diversity should be:

“There can be 12 white, blue-eyed, blonde men in a room and they’re going to be diverse too because they’re going to bring a different life experience and life perspective to the conversation ... I focus on everyone. Diversity is the human experience. I get a little bit frustrated when diversity or the term diversity is tagged to the people of color, or the women, or the LGBT.”

No, no, no. That kind of frustration is forbidden. And everyone knows the term “diversity” IS *“people of color, or the women, or the LGBT.”* Ms. Young Smith realized her mistake soon enough. The Apple diversity chief’s kind of broad-minded “inclusiveness” isn’t acceptable to the Diversity Thought Police and Ms. Young Smith [had to walk her comments back](#) and fall in line as a corporate shill:

“I regret the choice of words I used to make this point. I understand why some people took offense. My comments were not representative of how I think about diversity or how Apple sees it. For that, I’m sorry ... Understanding that diversity includes women, people of color, LGBTQ people, and all underrepresented minorities is at the heart of our work to create an environment that is inclusive of everyone.”

Some of Apple CEO Tim Cook’s million dollars against “hate” may be going where the company didn’t intend. At least two lawsuits are pending against the SPLC for defamation, [one by the evangelical National Center for Life and Liberty](#) and another by Maajiid Nawaz, a Muslim British politician and founder of a “counter-extremist think tank” called Quilliam. *“How Did Maajiid Nawaz End Up on a List of “Anti-Islamic Extremists?”* [wondered the Atlantic magazine in its headline about the SPLC](#). The SPLC heralded him as [“an anti-Muslim](#)

[extremist](#).” In the wake of this defamation, talk show host Bill Maher even announced that he would like to join in a “[crowd-funded lawsuit](#)” against the SPLC.

In evaluating the Liberty Counsel smear, the *Washington Post* even featured [a headline](#) declaring “*After conservative backlash, charity tracker GuideStar removes ‘hate group’ labels.*” Apparently Hillary Clinton didn’t bother to check (or really care about?) the changing nomenclature of her convenient “hate group,” especially since it was a useful tool in American Library Association rabble-rousing.

No matter. These days a “hater” has simply come to be defined as someone who disagrees with you. And the accuser is routinely on the political Left. For Clinton and the ALA and other nakedly political kindred, the scattershot accusation of “hate” against those on the other side of the political aisle is a lot easier than having to argue anything.

MORE CLINTON (to her ALA audience): *“Don’t give up. You are not only are standing on behalf of those with whom you work and those whom you serve, you are standing for tens of millions of others who need your advocacy, your voice, your quiet commitment. I’m with you. I know how important this work is. And I look forward to supporting you in the years to come.”* [STANDING OVATION TO THESE CONCLUDING WORDS]

But before we leave Ms. Clinton’s speech, let’s underscore two other noteworthy assertions she made.

CLINTON: *“I know that many any of you read the story this weekend of a 33-year old young adult librarian in Philadelphia who became trained to administer naloxone, which is the drug antidote that can help reverse*

heroin overdoses. So when someone collapses near her library, she's the person they call. She has saved six people's lives since April. [APPLAUSE] And how smart it was for the library system in Philadelphia to know that because of where librarians are situated and who comes to libraries, training librarians to be literal life-savers made sense?"

Sense, indeed. Clinton was referring to [Chera Kowalski and the staff](#) at McPherson Square Library, and how they had become media darlings, albeit mired in a particularly unsavory part of the modern library's enforced *transformation* at the altar of America's increasing liberalizing malaise: in this case, regularly tossing tentative life preservers into the ever-expanding tidal waves of America's drug epidemic. Part of Ms. Kowalski's job at her library (aside from being both the teen and adult enrichment librarian) has become "*scan[ning] the room for signs that someone is overdosing on heroin.*" Kowalski has "*encountered dozens of addicts on the verge of death.*" "Drug tourists" from across America peruse Philadelphia's "Badlands" near the library to partake in a particularly pure grade of heroin. There were 907 drug fatal overdoses in Philadelphia in 2016, and predictions are that the numbers will continue to rise. But this issue doesn't just impact Philadelphia. "*As the epidemic sweeps the nation,*" notes the *Washington Post*, "*American libraries have become a pit stop of sorts for users.*"

[Similar troubles](#) in recent years have been reported in libraries – big and small -- across America: from San Francisco to Lansing, MI; Chicago to Norfolk, VA; Batesville, IN to New Brunswick, NJ, [Boston](#) to Eureka, CA. Years ago the public library in Ann Arbor, MI, had to remove toilet tops and rest room ceilings to "*cut back on cocaine trafficking.*" In 2016, the *New York Daily News* [featured a headline](#) declaring "*Librarians Concerned about Surge of Heroin Use Inside Nation's Libraries.*" "*People need to know that this is happening everywhere and that public libraries haven't done anything wrong to cause it to happen in public*

libraries," once [said Josie Parker](#), director of the Ann Arbor Library. (I once interviewed this administrator at this same library, via a project for graduate school, who told me that a proposed homeless shelter across the street sent this liberal, college-town community reeling. Such a proposal couldn't go forward. What else would this affluent library become, many feared, but a Homeless Lounge, scaring everyone else away?)

In the way modern PC culture functions, the only miserable plus, perhaps, to this growing opioid and heroin tragedy is that at least – to political pundits -- the crisis is “racist”-free and diversity-sanctioned. As Pennsylvania Governor Tom Wolf observed to pacify this realm of concern, *“This [opioid] disease does not have compassion, or show regard for status, gender, race or borders.”* (Actually, this assertion is not true. The opioid crisis [dominantly impacts whites far more than any other racial group](#)).

Of course, there is, however, an unfortunate “diversity” element to the new heroin/opioid avalanche. It is even rather Trumpian because it has something to do, in large part, with Mexican criminals and illegal aliens. By 2014, Sam Quinones, in his *Dreamland: The True Tale of America's Opiate Epidemic*, notes that

“heroin trafficking was expanding dramatically across America. The potency of brown powder heroin, from other regions of Mexico and sold by black gangs out of Detroit and the East coast, was getting stronger. The Sinaloa Cartel seems to have massively upped its heroin exports to Chicago and New York City and elsewhere. Heroin seizures at the U.S.Mexico border had risen sixfold since 2007.” [QUINONES, p. 318]

The Library=Heroin Safe Space story seemed like an odd one for Clinton to champion at the American Library Association. Of course, there is a nice ring to it: librarians literally save lives. But who wants to bring their kids to such a place? Who wants to go there to study? And not only was Clinton heralding the noble retrieving of essentially suicidal people, she was also inadvertently underscoring what modern libraries are fast becoming, especially – but far from only – in urban areas: echo chambers for the implosion of enormous social problems, and sometimes a relatively supportive refuge for some pretty sick stuff. (Seen someone passed out in a library restroom lately? If not, you must not go to libraries often.)

But here, at the ALA annual convention -- wherein political correctness on amphetamines defines the moment and a failed presidential candidate advertises libraries as benevolent heroin sanctuaries (if you're going to shoot up, why not do it where someone is obliged to save you if anything goes wrong?), it is Hillary's antiquated Andy of Mayberry observation that most sticks in my mind:

CLINTON: *"I can remember my library, growing up in Park Ridge, and the librarians were often the only adults besides your teachers, and your parents, and the parents of your friends, that you knew. And so you trusted them to give you advice about what you would like to read."*

Trusted? [TRUSTED](#)?! Only now, you may be led by a librarian from out of state with rap star tattoos streaked across her face and have to step over a pile of groaning heroin addicts to get to those kids' books about why you should be an angry lesbian and tear up the town.

End of THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, PART 1