

**HOT, FAT, AND CLOUDED**  
The Amazing and Amusing Failures  
of America's Chattering Class



BARRETT BROWN



CAMBRIDGE HOUSE PRESS  
NEW YORK

© 2010 Barrett Brown.

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be used or reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopied, recorded or otherwise, without written permission of the publisher except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

Published by  
Cambridge House Press  
New York, NY 10001  
www.camhousepress.com

For special or bulk sales, contact us at sales@camhousepress.com.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Brown, Barrett.

Hot, fat and clouded : the amazing and amusing failures of America's chattering class / by Barrett Brown.

p. cm.

ISBN 978-0-9821391-4-1 (pbk.)

1. Mass media--Political aspects--United States. 2. Communication--Political aspects--United States. 3. Conservatism--United States. 4. Press and politics--United States. I. Title.

P95.82.U6B76 2010  
302.230973--dc22

2010005063

*Cover design by Nicola Lengua*  
*Book design by Rachel Trusheim*

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America.

# CONTENTS



## *Introduction I*

CHAPTER ONE:  
Thomas Friedman 1

CHAPTER TWO:  
William Bennett 32

CHAPTER THREE:  
Charles Krauthammer 56

CHAPTER FOUR:  
Richard Cohen 129

CHAPTER FIVE:  
Martin Peretz 154

CHAPTER SIX:  
Robert Stacy McCain 191

EPILOGUE 236

## CHAPTER SIX: ROBERT STACY MCCAIN



We have earlier examined the question of how incompetent an award-winning American columnist must prove himself before he is fired and thereby prevented from doing further violence to the knowledge of the citizenry. We have been unable to answer this question, though.

We now have the opportunity to ask another one: How many neo-Nazi connections must one have, how many unambiguously white supremacist writings must one be found to have composed, and how many crazy and undignified outbursts must one perpetrate in order to get oneself kicked out of the mainstream conservative commentariat? We will not be able to answer this question, either.



Mathematics professor Jonathan Farley has a hell of a resume, having served in varying academic capacities at Harvard, Cal Tech, Stanford's Center for International Security and Cooperation, and MIT, among other institutions of the sort, as well as having received such honors as the Harvard Foundation's Distinguished Scientist of the Year Award and Oxford University's Senior Mathematical Prize. He has been referred to

by prominent neuroscientist and longtime Harvard administrator Dr. S. Allen Counter as “one of the world’s most impressive young mathematicians,” was one of only four Americans to be named a Fulbright Distinguished Scholar to the United Kingdom in the 2001–2002 nomination round, founded a firm that provides consultations to filmmakers who find themselves utilizing mathematical concepts in their, uh, plots, and has even provided measurable contributions to U.S. counterterrorism capabilities by way of his own applied research into something which presumably involves math. As well as he’s done so far; Dr. Farley would have almost certainly managed even greater things were it not for a widespread campaign among neo-Nazis and Confederacy apologists to end the professor’s career by way of death threats and disinformation.

The nonsense in question began in 2002 with one of those irritating controversies over Confederate iconography; in this case, certain administrators at Vanderbilt University had floated the idea of removing the word “Confederate” from Confederate Memorial Hall, a dormitory which had been built in part with donations from the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Farley, who was then teaching mathematics at Vanderbilt, took the occasion to write an op-ed piece for *The Tennessean* on the subject of Confederate remembrance in general:

Lest we forget, the Confederacy aimed to destroy the United States. Every Confederate soldier, by the mores of his age and ours, deserved not a hallowed resting place at the end of his days but a reservation at the end of the gallows. The UDC honors traitors. ‘But the war was not about slavery,’ they whine. ‘It was about states’ rights.’ But the ‘right’ Confederates sought to defend was the right to murder, rape, and torture millions of Africans, with impunity. The Confederacy’s own vice president, Alexander Ste-

phens, declared that the Confederacy ‘rests upon the great truth that the negro is not the equal of the white man, that slavery—the subordination to the superior race—is his natural and normal condition.’ Today’s Confederates, who deny that the war was about slavery, are the new holocaust revisionists. Black Americans and white Europeans object to the statue of a 19th century Hitler [Ku Klux Klan co-founder Nathan Bedford Forrest] standing in public view off an interstate highway. It and the Confederate flags surrounding it represent nothing less than a death threat against scores of millions of people of color. That monument must go. Not only because it’s racist and violent but also because it’s just plain ugly.

Being a black academic of a rather leftist bent, Farley was perhaps not the best person to deliver that particular message to a region in which the most destructive and poorly conceived insurrection in American history is still celebrated as some sort of neat thing. The threats on his life, challenges to duels, racially-charged e-mails, and denunciations by public figures of various sorts began immediately, as these things tend to do. Just as it seemed that the whole incident might soon run out of steam, though, the story suddenly went national.

On December 3rd of that year, *The Washington Times* covered the Farley affair in the form of a news piece written by reporter and features editor Robert Stacy McCain, an up-and-coming journalist who had successfully made the transition from sports to politics a few years prior. A couple of passages merit particular scrutiny, beginning with this seemingly innocuous sentence fragment:

Mr. Farley has complained of threatening e-mails and phone calls . . .

Another way of phrasing this would have been, “Mr. Farley has received threatening e-mails and phone calls,” this having been a verifiable fact; Farley had by this point forwarded many of the more alarming messages to both the university and to the Nashville police. He’s since sent me a selection of them, and I have managed to determine that several came from presumably armed military veterans living within a half-hour of Nashville, whereas others came from out-and-out white supremacists with ties to violence-advocating organizations like the National Vanguard.

Now examine the following excerpt from the same article:

Tim Chavez, a columnist for *The Tennessean*, described one 66-year-old reader’s frustration over Mr. Farley’s views: “This just burns me because I don’t know what to do about it,” the man said. “If someone compared your ancestors to mass murderers, what would you do?”

Note that the anti-Farley crowd is merely afflicted with “frustration”; Farley does not merit such a benevolent and excusing qualifier even after having received hundreds of e-mails along these lines:

So, the Confederate flag and the Confederacy offends you, huh? You being a math professor, I am sure you can add this up: We do not care what offends niggers, you worthless, ugly, smelly, stupid, shitskinned jigaboo!!! Go back to the african niggerland where some of your ‘brothas’ will ‘welcome’ you by having you over for dinner (as the main course, nigger)! Anyway, how is it that a nigger math professor is suddenly an expert on history? Did you personally experience 400 years of slavery? I thought you would also be a reverend, as all niggers are reverends. If the

Confederate flag offends your minority-assed sensibilities, then this ought to REALLY make your day, nigger!!!

And then the fellow pastes a picture of the Confederate flag, which one might think to be a bit anti-climactic after all of that. Another frustrated Confederate sympathizer expressed his frustrating frustrations thusly: “You will reap the whirl wind for your transgressions. Get a Bodyguard or carry gun you will need it.”

Dozens of similarly threatening messages followed in addition to those conveyed via phone.

At any rate, McCain was too busy to call the Nashville police hate crimes division and verify that Farley had actually received a series of death threats by armed wackos; his hands were tied in documenting Farley’s own disturbing transgressions against civility:

In response to complaints from [Sons of Confederate Veterans] members, Mr. Farley has posted e-mail replies that “drip venom,” [SCV leader Allen] Sullivan said. Replying to one SCV member, Mr. Farley vowed to “form our own armies to expose and smash you . . . Very simply, we represent good and you represent evil.”

McCain does not bother to tell us what the SCV member in question may have written to provoke such a venom-dripping response as this (which, incidentally, Farley did not “post” anywhere, it being an e-mail reply); perhaps it was along the lines of other “complaints” Farley received from similarly frustrated individuals who identified themselves as belonging to that organization, such as the following: “wait a minute,,,you arent even a fucking american,,,go back where you came from, was it the islands or the mother country,,,,,d”



Incidentally, Farley is indeed an American, assuming that he hasn't rebelled against the flag by way of some treasonous secessionist movement since I last spoke with him.

While serving in the role of a journalist covering issues involving pro-Confederacy organizations, racial tension, and potentially dangerous neo-Nazi agitators, McCain was also pursuing his own hobbies—several of which, by way of a fun coincidence, happen to have lined up quite neatly with the subject matter of the article he'd written. He's a member of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, for instance, an organization which The Reader may recall from a few seconds ago, when McCain was covering it in the context of an objective news article regarding a controversial dispute between the organization of which he's a member and a fellow whom he and the organization both strongly opposed—and who belonged to a certain race with whom McCain has elsewhere expressed great interest.



In addition to having served for more than a decade as an editor and reporter for *The Washington Times*, our chapter subject is currently a regular contributor to *American Spectator* and *Human Events*, as well as the co-author of the 2005 book *Donkey Cons: Sex, Crime, and Corruption in the Democratic Party* in which the nation's liberals are taken to task for various things; his partner, Lynn Vincent, went on to ghostwrite Sarah Palin's 2009 biography *Going Rogue*. Most significantly, perhaps, McCain is an increasingly prominent blogger who has been linked to, praised, and defended by some of the conservative movement's most notable commentators.

It was in his capacity as blogger that our fellow citizen came across a news report regarding a study that was set to appear in an upcoming issue of the journal *Reproductive Health* indicating that religious teens are more likely to go and get themselves

pregnant than are their non-religious counterparts. That a journal on reproductive health would publish a paper on a matter of reproductive health was not only suspicious, decided McCain, but also indicative of some secularist bid to advance the cause of the irreligious:

The objective of this study? To convince college-educated middle-class people that religious faith is the No. 1 force for evil in the modern world. “OMG! If we let our daughter go to church, kiss Vassar good-bye!”

That same September afternoon, I was minding my own business, frantically reading other peoples’ articles and blog posts in order that I might find something of which to make fun lest I otherwise go a whole day without pointing out some flaw in my fellow man, when all of a sudden and with great suddenness McCain’s blog post happened to suddenly get itself caught right smack dab in my range of sight in a manner that I would probably describe as immediate and without warning. Suddenly, I felt a tap on my shoulder. It was Apollo, god of the sun.

“Greetings. I am among the greatest of beings, a bringer of light and truth. Do not be frightened by the radiance that streams forth from my personage, nor by my ethereal beauty, for these things are merely a manifestation of the highest and best in all men, whom I spend my days observing that I might spend my nights delivering divine punishment to the lowest and worst among them. All things fall under my purview; my dominion is the world itself.”

“Nice to meet you. I am Apollo, god of the sun.”

After some initial chit-chat, Apollo explained to me that, although it had been more than 1,500 years since he had last appeared on Earth, he had chosen to return on this occasion

because he had a message that had to be delivered to the world, but he could not deliver this message himself because . . . something to do with a crystal amulet that gives him all his power and maybe it's been stolen or something.

"So, what's the message you need me to deliver?" I asked.

"There is a sort of civil war ongoing among your republic's conservatives. One particular element of this conflict is particularly telling. You know, of course, of the importance of the blogosphere to the future of this country and to the world. The structure by which the traditional media operates tends not to punish failure in any meaningful way, and thus it is that men of insufficient ability are given the means to misinform and distract the voting citizenry."

"I've already kind of covered that in the earlier chapters, plus this whole bit is a little too similar to that stupid Ramna routine . . ."

"Yeah, that was retarded."

"So let's wrap it up."

"Sure. Now, the unprecedented dynamic of the Internet allows the best of commentators to speak directly to the people, and in this manner a great number of men and women who are attentive to the truth and responsible to their readers for the accuracy of their words have emerged. You, of course, are among the very best of them, Glenn."

"Glenn?"

"Sorry. You prefer to be called 'Mr. Greenwald.'"

"Oh. Yeah. I mean, no, Glenn is fine."

"Very well. Now, although the principle crisis is not a matter of ideology or party, but rather of structure, it is of course greatly relevant that some great portion of the voting public is of a particular political persuasion, this being conservatism. Just as relevant, then, is the crisis that has afflicted this movement, which has degenerated from Eisenhower to Palin in half a century, from reason and virtue to Evangelicalism and not being

able to name a single magazine that one reads when asked, and, hey, did you see that one clip?”

“Yeah.”

“Where she asked—no, wait, Couric, Couric asked her about what magazines—”

“I saw the clip.”

“Katie Couric.”

“Wrap it up.”

“Basically, pretty much everyone who’s worth a damn has either left the movement or been essentially kicked out, whereas all of these other incompetent freaks are now in control by default. The result is a conservatism that is administered by the most dishonest and incapable of men—and the result of this in turn is a conservative blogosphere that operates in relatively large part by way of dishonesty and disinformation. This is not to say that there is not some laughable degree of nonsense to be found among the bloggers of the left as well—but the discrepancy between the two sides is so great that any honest person who has been paying attention must be aware of it, even if such a person is not a leftist himself. And even many who are vaguely aware of this are not yet aware of the extent of the problem, and thus of the potential solution.”

“What’s the solution?”

“You should probably save that for the epilogue.”

“So, what do we do? Or what do I do since The Reader just seems to be sitting there?”

“There is a particular incident that is perfectly emblematic of the fall of the conservative movement. It is going on right now, in fact. Look at this blog post by Robert Stacy McCain here.”

“Okay, Apollo!”

“Uh, right. So, you see how he is trying to minimize the importance of high teen pregnancy rates among those families, which, like him, are heavily religious. Of course, McCain doesn’t want anyone thinking ill of the religious in any respect, as it is

his view that religion is superior to secularism and thus the religious must always be superior to the secularist. Confronted with proof that teen pregnancy is all the rage among religious teens in relation to their not-so-religious counterparts, McCain must now pretend that there is nothing wrong with teen pregnancy.”

“I don’t think it’s necessarily a terrible thing myself, although of course this is dependent on the circumstances, and it must of course be remembered that prospective parents are better off to the extent that they’ve either educated themselves or otherwise—”

“No one gives a shit what you think. Now, take a look at what McCain writes in order to minimize the negative aspects of teen pregnancy.”

“Doo doo doo, doo doo . . . copyin’ and pastin’ . . . select . . . block quote . . .”

McCain had written the following after having introduced the topic of teen pregnancy:

Consider this tragic example: Margaret started having sex when she was 12 and got pregnant when she was 13, in a community so violent that the 26-year-old baby-daddy got into a fight and died shortly thereafter, leaving the teenage girl, seven months pregnant, in the care of her mother, who was a devout Catholic and didn’t believe in abortion.

Another teenage motherhood tragedy, and you know the statistics about the children of teenage mothers. So you can predict what happened to that fatherless baby.

“Oh, god,” I said to the god. “Is he going to do that thing whereby it turns out that—”

“Yes. Yes, he is.”

Margaret named him Henry and on August 22, 1485—yes, I said 1485—Henry’s army defeated the forces led by the usurper Richard III in a place called Bosworth Field, ending the War of the Roses.

“Hooray for teen pregnancy!” I exclaimed. “Seriously, though, I’ve spent enough time analyzing the disingenuous statements of bad commentators to know that if I Google ‘Robert Stacy McCain’ and ‘teen pregnancy’ or some such, I’m going to catch our buddy here expressing concern about teen pregnancy when the teens in question aren’t cited as being religious.”

“You will, in fact,” said Apollo, smiling in a knowing and irritating manner. “You will also find something else that is even more interesting.”

“How do you know?”

“I’M FROM THE FUTURE, LOL.” And then he took off his mask, thereby revealing his mechanical face. AND I’M A ROBOT! BEEP BEEP BEEP!”

The two of us made love well into the night.



McCain had indeed written another article about teen pregnancy, and he had indeed done so in such a manner as to maximize, rather than minimize, the problems inherent to such a phenomenon. In dramatic contrast to the September blog post in which he’d made fun of those who worried over the prospect of young girls giving birth, he had in this earlier article made fun of those who failed to worry over the prospect of young girls giving birth. *The New York Times*, of course, is singled out for particular criticism:

Given the sort of spin that most media put on the 102-page report, Parker-Pope of the *Times* obviously

felt a need to debunk the alarmist fear-mongering. She cited previous reports showing that the percentage of girls ages 15–17 who reported having had sexual intercourse actually declined from 38 percent in 1995 to 30 percent in 2002. And she enlisted the sort of “expert” opinion that is indispensable to respectable social-science reporting, with University of LaSalle sociologist Kathleen Bogle providing the pooh-pooh quote: “There’s no doubt that the public perception is that things are getting worse, and that kids are having sex younger and are much wilder than they ever were . . . But when you look at the data, that’s not the case.”

Well, that settles it, eh? Despite the blip in teen pregnancy, teenagers actually aren’t screwing around so much. Another “myth” busted by *The New York Times*!

The skeptical reader raises an eyebrow. Less teen sex, more teen mothers? Skepticism is arguably justified . . . In contrast to the necessary ambiguity of self-reported survey results, birth statistics are solid data, and that data confirms that some teenager are, we might say, living la vida loca.

The big news in NCHS report was that Mississippi had reclaimed its accustomed No. 1 status as America’s teen pregnancy capital, supplanting Texas, which had led the nation in 2004. According to the NCHS data, in 2006, the three states with the highest teen birth rates were Mississippi (68.4 births per 1,000 females ages 15-19), New Mexico (64.1 per 1,000), and Texas (63.1).

“Hmmm,” says the skeptical reader. “Perhaps demographics may be a factor?”

Perhaps it may, LOL. McCain goes on to cite data indicating that Hispanic teens are more than three times more likely than whites to bear babies, and about twice as likely as blacks

to do so. Having here raised the alarm about teen pregnancy among Hispanics, McCain would just a few months later make fun of those who raised the alarm about teen pregnancy among religious teens of no specified race. There are demographics, after all, and then there are demographics of the sort one wouldn't want dating one's sister. McCain scolds the media in general and one reporter in particular for failing to go all Paul Revere on the Latin explosion:

None of that data appeared in *The New York Times* story, which in nearly 900 words didn't even acknowledge the demographic factor in teen pregnancy statistics. Chris Hansen keeps trapping Internet pervs, Greta Van Susteren keeps flying down to Aruba to explore the Mystery of the Missing Blonde, and *The New York Post* (we assume) eagerly awaits the next teen-sex scandal of "Long Island Lolita" proportions, but the much larger "scandal" remains remarkably underreported.

Confronted with the prospect of white teenage girls being outbred by brown teenage girls, McCain was for some reason disinclined to brush off the problem of teen pregnancy with the happy example of Henry Tudor, as he would later in the course of explaining why teen pregnancy is no big deal after having here explained why teen pregnancy is a big deal that everyone ought to be worrying about. I had indeed found something more interesting—the sex bot, it seemed, had been telling the truth.



Having determined that R.S. McCain had accidentally outed himself as being unworried by teen pregnancy among generic religious teens while being very worried indeed by teen pregnancy



among Hispanics, I wrote a short article for The Huffington Post and True/Slant pointing this out, though I refrained from characterizing him a racist or a white supremacist or even a white nationalist just then inasmuch as the facts did not necessarily prove any such thing; it was entirely possible that this discrepancy of worrisomeness was in service to the religious rather than in opposition to the brown. At any rate, I knew very little about the fellow at the time; he was simply one of the many commentators whose work I checked out from time to time in the course of my duties as a professional pointer-out of oracular notes.

A few weeks later, I noticed that McCain had gotten into some sort of rhetorical scuffle with *The Charleston Gazette*, the editorial board of which had recently referred to him in passing as a “white supremacist.” McCain responded in such a way as to ensure that everyone concerned would be aware that McCain is not a man with which to be trifled; the several discredited charges that had been made against him several years previous and which have nothing to do with the demonstrably true charges that are being made against him now, as he wrote in slightly different words, had collectively come to form “a Gordian Knot of non-fact that is not worth the effort it would take to unravel it.” No mere metaphor can deter our warrior-poet, of course. “Like ancient Alexander, however, I am prepared to swing the sword,” he announced. “Retract, please.” McCain does not seem to have been satisfied with the ambiguously violent nature of this particular simile, though, and thus later that day he made reference to “the wise advice of Andrew Jackson’s mother,” which, as he noted, consisted of the following homespun maxim: “Never tell a lie, nor take what is not your own, nor sue anybody for slander, assault and battery. Always settle them cases yourself.” Clearly, the editorial board in question had fucked with the wrong would-be tough guy. “Consider that it is 299 miles from my house to the offices of the *Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette*,” McCain later explained in further clarification. “I could leave by noon

and walk into their lobby before 4:30 p.m.” He didn’t, incidentally. But had he done so, one can imagine the badass things he would have done in the course of doing whatever it is that he was planning on doing.

When I was 22 or thereabouts, I drunkenly challenged some guy to a fight in the midst of an Internet debate. Of all the ridiculous, flamboyant nonsense I’ve pulled in the course of a ridiculous and flamboyant life, this particular item of nonsense still keeps me up at night in embarrassment, or at least it would if I didn’t have such a comfortable mattress and also had any shame left. McCain, in contrast, does not seem to believe that there is anything undignified at all in the practice of constantly depicting one’s self as itching for a fight without actually going through any such steps that might bring such a fight into fruition; this *Charleston Gazette* affair is simply one among several such incidents of the hold-me-back-hold-me-back-yeah-you’re-lucky-my-girlfriend’s-here-to-stop-me-come-on-Rachel-let’s-blow-this-party-and-go-fool-around-in-the-back-of-my-Ford-Explorer sort that one might expect from some young fellow at a high school keg party, but which one might be surprised to find coming from a middle-aged man who writes for several of the nation’s most respectable conservative publications.

About an hour after publicly estimating the drive time between his home and the location of those *Gazette* editorial board members (whom he never did get around to beating up or trapping under a giant chandelier that he’d cause to fall on them by cutting the supporting rope while grabbing the end with the other hand and thus being hoisted up to the indoor balcony from which he’d then deliver some such line as “Sic semper tyrannis!” or whatever the fuck he thought he was going to do when he arrived at that newspaper’s office), McCain learned of the article I had written about him. “Barrett Brown—he’ll get his in turn,” McCain wrote. A few minutes after that, having apparently done a bit of Googling, McCain discovered that I serve

as director of communications for what was formerly known as the Godless Americans Political Action Committee. The revelation prompted him to put up an excerpt from the PAC's "About Us" page and follow it up with a single, mysterious sentence: "Thanks for this helpful information, sir. How many Philistines did Samson slay with less?" What the fuck? Sometimes a person will pretend not to understand what someone else means in order to convey that that someone is incomprehensibly foolish. That's not what I'm doing. I've actually thought about this for a long time and I have no idea what he was saying other than that it involves violence.

A few days later, one of the conservative bloggers who had previously written an attack on me in the course of defending McCain contacted me in private and explained that he was troubled by some of the things that McCain had been discovered to have written several years previous. Among them was a 2002 article that the pundit had composed under an assumed name, Burke C. Dabney, itself derived from the names of two Confederate figures known mostly for the particular enthusiasm with which they advocated slavery. The essay warned that American whites were in danger of being outbred by their black and Hispanic counterparts, in part due to the success of programs intended to reduce teen pregnancy in general but which appear to have been most effective in reducing such incidents among whites:

The 'success' of such propaganda only accelerates the decline of the white population. If crusaders against teenage motherhood were serious, they would concentrate on the black and Hispanic girls who account for more than half of teenage births. Targeting whites as part of a general campaign is yet another form of racial suicide. We should encourage whites to have children within marriage; instead they are encour-

aged only to use contraceptives, whether married or single.

The venue in which the article appeared, *American Renaissance*, correctly bills itself as “America’s premiere publication of racial-realist thought;” as of this writing, the website’s main page features an article entitled “Transition to black rule?” in which Obama is compared to Robert Mugabe and other African tyrants. “Let us hope whites all over the world save their newspapers from November 5, 2008, with their extravagant headlines and dizzy hopes,” the piece concludes hopefully. “Let them reread them 10 or 15 years from now—and let them think of South Africa.” Much of the content consists of news item aggregation pulled from mainstream sources, with a marked emphasis on stories concerning blacks who have committed crimes, anything that happens in Zimbabwe, reports on negative effects of immigration, and even more stories about blacks who have committed crimes. Each of these get the *American Renaissance* touch by way of none-too-subtle subtitles. Let’s take a look at a couple from the site’s main page as of January 2, 2010, shall we?

**Rape—Silent War on SA Women—Another “legacy of apartheid.”**

**A Quiet End for Boys Choir of Harlem—Destroyed by scandal and tax problems.**

**Slaying of Drug War Hero’s Family Shocks Mexico—Our lovely neighbors to the south.**

**Foreign Models Flock to China, Which Embraces a Western Vision of Beauty—Even the Chinese have officially fallen for blondes.**

**Out of Control Crowd at JFK—Only passengers flying to Haiti required police intervention.**

**Illegal Alien Arrested for Slashing Throat of Elderly Woman—Another illegal turns on his employer.**

**California Safeway Store Doors Unlocked During Christmas . . . People Leave Cash—Ad hoc “honor system” probably wouldn’t have worked in Watts or East L.A.**

My personal favorite of the site’s original articles found on the main page at the time of this random viewing, though, would have to be “Whitewashing Jack Johnson,” which concerns efforts by John McCain to bestow a pardon upon the infamous black boxer. Not so fast, Senator! It turns out that this uppity Negro was an uppity Negro! Ah, but then I’m giving away the story; as contributor Addison N. Sheffield relates:

Jack Johnson, who was born in Galveston, Texas, but later moved to Chicago, was the original loutish celebrity athlete. In the early 20th century, when white supremacy was still the norm, he taunted his opponents both in and out of the ring, and boasted about his endless fornications with white women . . .

. . . This, then, was the background to Johnson’s prosecution under the Mann Act. The act, passed in 1910, got its name from its chief sponsor, Congressman James R. Mann (R-IL). The statute authorized federal prosecution of anyone who transported a woman across state lines ‘for immoral purposes.’ Congress claimed that its authority to regulate interstate commerce could be used to stop the white slave trade. The act was part of a series of religious and Progressive

Era reforms aimed at civilizing American society, and the city of Chicago took part enthusiastically in this effort. Johnson, however, continued to flaunt his insatiable sexual appetite, especially in the aftermath of his victory in 'the fight of the century' . . .

. . . I predict this most recent attempt to rehabilitate Johnson will succeed. After all, he is just the sort of black person we are supposed to admire: In his prime, he could beat any white man in the ring and he debauched untold numbers of white women . . .

Of course, McCain ought not be held responsible for content that other people may have written in an outlet for which he happens to write as well. And the single article that he wrote for *American Renaissance* is actually pretty inoffensive relative to, say, the vast amount of blatantly anti-black and white supremacist content one finds at the site. In fact, if you consider how incredibly racist the website is in general, and note how innocuous is McCain's article is when one compares it to all the other articles about how blacks are monstrous, rape-happy animals, then McCain comes out looking pretty good. Contrast this with the situation over at *The New York Times* op-ed page, which tends not to include any white supremacist content—can one truly say that the columns of Nicholas Kristof, for instance, are considerably less racist than the columns of Gail Collins or David Brooks or Paul Krugman? Surely one cannot, as all of these columnists are actually rather similar in the extent to which they express anti-minority sentiment and pro-white rhetoric. McCain, then, is far less racist than most of the people who write for his favorite outlet (we may assume he thinks dearly of it inasmuch as he is willing to write for it under a fake name and so without receiving any credit). Nicholas Kristof, meanwhile, is just as racist as all the

other liberals who work for his favorite outlet. Who's the real racist here, eh? Eh?

Besides, surely there's nothing amiss in McCain's tendency to be fond of his own ethnic group and to hope for its continuance in perpetuity—and of course we wouldn't want to see white people disappear altogether, because then who would play white people in movies? All in all, there's certainly no reason to suspect that McCain's views on race are anything like those expressed by his colleague Sheffield, who is so disturbed by the prospect of interracial couplings.

Just kidding. In a comment posted to the Internet forum Reclaiming the South, McCain took pains to reassure the world's racists that they were not actually racists because, after all, you see, uh:

[T]he media now force interracial images into the public mind and a number of perfectly rational people react to these images with an altogether natural revulsion. The white person who does not mind transacting business with a black bank clerk may yet be averse to accepting the clerk as his sister-in-law, and THIS IS NOT RACISM, no matter what Madison Avenue, Hollywood and Washington tell us.

Okay, so his take on interracial marriage is similar to that of all of the white supremacists who write for the white supremacist site for which McCain writes under a pen name taken from a couple of white supremacists who are best known for their white supremacy. To McCain's credit, though, *American Renaissance* is one of the nation's most respected journals of white supremacist news and commentary, as opposed to just being some clunky, poorly designed website with spinning swastikas and dancing Hitlers. I mean, it's a little rough around the edges here and there, but by and large, if you're looking for an outlet from which to

display your anonymous essay on how whites must collectively out-breed their black and Hispanic fellow citizens, you could do worse than *American Renaissance*.



This we know: Our ancestors' cause was just and their conduct was honorable. Anyone who says otherwise is insulting the memory of heroes . . . If the Confederate cause was a matter of honor for our ancestors, then it is a matter of honor for us, their descendants. It is our duty to defend the honor of our ancestors, and to preserve their memory for our own descendants.

The above excerpt comes from a speech that Robert Stacy McCain presented to the Sons of Confederate Veterans in May of 2003—five months after *The Washington Times* staple had written his “news account” regarding Professor Jonathan Farley’s conflict with that very organization, of which he also happens to be a member. Having sacrificed all ethics and journalistic objectivity in service to “the Confederate cause,” McCain can truly be said to have fulfilled his “duty to defend the honor” of his ancestors by virtue of having bravely stood up to a black mathematics professor who had been “insulting the memory of heroes.”

McCain did such a fine job of taking on Professor Jonathan Farley, in fact, that Farley himself admitted defeat when he contacted me after having read another article I had written on the pundit’s more recent activities. “McCain killed me,” he wrote to me in October of 2009. “My career (as I can clearly see seven years on) was wrecked by the likes of Robert McCain.” Things had not gone well for Farley in the aftermath of *The Washington Times* article, which had gone a long way towards nationalizing



the story and alerting certain parties to the fact that some black liberal was speaking ill of the Confederacy while also ensuring that even those readers who might not have a strong opinion on the matter were inclined to see Farley as the villain and his detractors as merely “frustrated.”

The administrators of Vanderbilt were presumably worried that the backlash against Farley would result in further collateral damage against themselves and the university, even to the extent that endowments might dry up as a result; thus it was that, instead of defending the professor, the university instead released a series of statements meant to distance the institution from its most controversial employee.

That Farley was receiving death threats from those with the means and motive to carry them out, meanwhile, did not seem to bother anyone in the administration, as Farley was not offered any protection from campus security. One might defend the administration in this instance by noting that death threats are so ubiquitous in the Internet age that they may be generally disregarded—or at least one might make such a defense if the powers that be at Vanderbilt had indeed disregarded such things, which they plainly did not. When then Chancellor Gordon Gee received a single threat on his life at the time of the controversy, he spent the rest of the day with campus police in his office. It did not seem to occur to anyone at the university that perhaps Farley, who had received far more death threats and who was of course the main focus of the slanted coverage thus far, might perhaps need some protection as well. Gee discusses the incident in his 2006 book *University Presidents as Moral Leaders*, in which he also claims that Farley suddenly took a position with MIT during all of this, thereby leaving the chancellor to “clean up in his wake;” in fact, Farley had told the administration of his decision months beforehand. Ironically, Gee himself had in 2000 suddenly left his own position at Brown University for the higher-paying chancellorship at Vanderbilt after having served

as president for an uncommonly brief stint of only two years—during which time he cut several costly programs out of the school budget while also renovating his school residence to the tune of several million dollars—thereby angering his associates at Brown to such an extent that the controversy still dogs him to the present day.

In the aftermath of all this, Farley was relieved to begin the unpaid leave of absence that had been arranged beforehand and during which time he was to take a visiting professorship at MIT. Meanwhile, the controversy was about to be revived; the Daughters of the Confederacy was preparing a lawsuit regarding the renaming of Confederate Memorial Hall, thus potentially putting Farley front and center once again and possibly forcing him to testify. Disinclined to get further involved, Farley wrote a letter to Richard McCarty—who was at that point dean of Vanderbilt’s College of Arts and Science and who today serves as provost of the university as a whole—explaining that he felt unsafe returning to Nashville in light of a possible revival of the controversy. McCarty declined to approve any such extension:

“This letter is to inform you that your ‘request’ to continue your leave of absence from your tenured position at Vanderbilt is not approved . . . Your stated reasons for not returning from your leave of absence, i.e., a purported debate over whether the founder of the Klu Klux Klan should be honored in Nashville and past threats you claim have been made against you, are not sufficient to support the continuation of your leave of absence and your unilateral decision not to return is unacceptable.”

The Reader may notice that McCarty is suggesting that no such debate occurred, and that the death threats made against Farley were simply something that the professor had claimed

into existence—this, despite the fact that the university at which he served as dean (and at which he today serves as provost) had been saturated with the iconography controversy for months, and despite the fact that the death threats Farley had received were actually in the possession of the university as well as of Nashville police. One might think that, when considering the request of a tenured professor to have a leave of absence extended, one might want to factor in the datum of whether or not people had been announcing their intent to kill that professor, and that, if one is unsure of whether this is the case, one might take a moment or two to find this out by way of information that could easily be obtained from either his own institution, the local police, or the professor himself; of course, this is only the case if one's intent is to actually make a truthful determination in this regard. If, on the other hand, one's actual intent is to protect the reputation of the university by trying to depict a professor who's presumably unpopular with the endowment crowd as being a poor team player, then it's of course best to leave open the possibility that a debate which demonstrably occurred is only "purported" to have occurred and that a series of death threats that were demonstrably received are merely the result of some unverifiable "claim."

Incidentally, I spoke to Richard McCarty about all of this in 2009, asking him specifically about the above letter and other related matters. At the beginning of the conversation, he spoke in such a manner as to convey that he had Farley confused with some journalist—at least until I reminded him that the fellow of which we were speaking had received death threats. "He said he received death threats," McCarty corrected, suddenly knowing exactly to whom I was referring (when I asked him about this unusual exchange in a follow-up e-mail the provost declined to reply). And although McCarty told me that he had never seen the death threats and indeed had never asked to see them, he told me at another point that "we did not feel at the time that the threats were of a sufficient magnitude that

he should not be returning to his duties.” He was ultimately unable to explain how the sufficiency of the magnitude in question could have been determined by someone who had never seen the e-mails in question and who in fact had never thought it necessary to determine whether such e-mails existed in the first place. Farley believes—and I must agree with him, having seen dozens of pertinent documents and having had this particularly unsatisfactory conversation with McCarty—that the university had simply been trying to get rid of him in such a way as that it would seem that Farley was at fault, rather than that the university had cut loose a troublemaker by any means convenient.

By the way, here’s an interesting lead from an Associated Press story from January 11, 2003:

NASHVILLE—Vanderbilt University says administrators involved in a decision to drop “Confederate” from the name of a residence hall have been targeted with threats, and it wants a judge to keep their names sealed.

A Confederate heritage group is suing Vanderbilt over the decision to change the name of Confederate Memorial Hall.

Certain members of the university’s administration, faculty and Board of Trust ‘have been subjected to a deluge of mail, electronic mail, and telephone messages, including some threats’ since the name-change decision in September, university lawyers wrote in a motion filed last week in Davidson County Chancery Court.

Some threats make it all the way up to the county

courthouse; some never make it beyond the status of “past threats you claim have been made against you.”

Even after resigning from Vanderbilt in disgust at his treatment, Farley continued to be targeted by unknown detractors whom we may assume to overlap with those who had spent so much time and energy hassling him in the months after the publication of his column. The day he began at Caltech, his colleagues began receiving anonymous e-mails along the following lines, directed to Farley but forwarded to his superiors, for whom they were obviously intended to begin with:

Could you please spend more time preparing lectures for your students and less time on writing articles expounding on racism in the United States? Many of us find your course very confusing . . .

Clearly, some party was continuing to track Farley’s movements and take such actions as they believed might deter him from successful employment at other American institutions. It would be impossible to determine how many people were involved and what organizations with which they were associated, if any, but we know of a couple that had already been overtly involved in going after Farley and which may have been covertly involved as well. One of these, of course, was the Sons of Confederate Veterans, with which McCain was obviously coordinating at the time inasmuch as that he was involved with that organization while also covering it as a reporter without disclosing this fact. Meanwhile, members of the prominent neo-Nazi website Stormfront had identified Farley as someone to be monitored and harassed. One member posted a copy of a letter he had sent to a Vanderbilt spokesman; another wrote, “This Farley guy is truly dangerous, he runs his mouth constantly, yet the university and everyone about him is on tippy-toes because they don’t want to upset their Oxford-educated Negro appar-

ently. One thing is for sure, Farley IS the enemy if you're a WN [white nationalist]." Another was more to the point: "These SOB's are really starting to get my goat. :attack." [Inexplicable use of colon in original.]

Other, similar incidents were to occur on and off for several years until such time as Farley finally gave up and left the country to take a position at Johannes Kepler University in Linz. He didn't fight back by means of the press, refusing to speak to anyone associated therewith for seven years until finally reaching out to me in 2009. Farley had learned early on that the media is among the most unaccountable of our collective institutions, more so perhaps than even our universities. The fact that Robert Stacy McCain is still published by such outlets as *American Spectator* seven years after using *The Washington Times* as his own personal white nationalist propaganda outfit at the expense of someone else's career would certainly seem to confirm this. Of course, the folks at *American Spectator* had no way of knowing this, as the Farley incident is revealed here for the first time; the editors in question are only privy to the other dozen or so blatant pieces of evidence that have already been made public, and in their defense, they've been too busy looking for racism among their enemies ("Is Dick Durbin a Racist?" and "Michael Wilbon Endorses Racism in Rush Attack") and attacking liberals for looking for racism among their enemies ("Do Immigration Concerns Equal Racism?" and "The Girl Who Cried Racism") to look into something as innocuous as racism among their own regular contributors. Note that those articles are all taken from the last year, and that they are only a sampling of the great number of articles that the *Spectator* runs on the subject each year.



Around the time that I began receiving documents from

Farley, I was informed that someone else had already been waging a campaign by which to bring attention to Robert Stacy McCain's obvious racial sentiments for quite a while before I got around to bothering people about it. Charles Johnson had for years existed as the darling of the conservative blogosphere, having been instrumental in determining that documents appearing to reveal special treatment for Bush during Vietnam were fraudulent and thereby forcing a retraction from Dan Rather, and having otherwise been at the forefront of several of citizen journalism's most memorable victories over the mainstream media. His blog, Little Green Footballs, was among the most widely read of the right-leaning blogs for much of the last decade. A web developer by trade, Johnson went on to co-founded Pajamas Media, a conservative blog network, which remains a cornerstone of the Internet's right-of-center informational infrastructure to this day. At some point, he came to grow disgusted with the conduct of his colleagues and had begun to say as much in public. Naturally this resulted in a bit of a fissure, which has only grown since; unnaturally, it's developed into some sort of really crazy, deranged fissure. Yeah, that's the metaphor I'm going with: deranged fissure. The matter of R.S. McCain had become a particular sticking point. Johnson's efforts to point out what McCain had been up to in years past had prompted a massive counter-campaign against Johnson himself; many of his former allies were now attacking him on a regular basis while also defending McCain, even as the evidence against the pundit continued to mount.

Nothing seemed to matter to McCain's apologists, though, even as they found themselves confronted with more and more for which to apologize. McCain has admitted to a long friendship with Bill White, an ideologically fluid radical whose views fell under various nuance-heavy variants on communism and anarchism until perhaps 2002, by which year he had publicly transitioned into an active white supremacist. Being a white

supremacist, White found himself at an *American Renaissance* event, since, you know, *American Renaissance* is a white supremacist-oriented publication that publishes articles in advocacy of white supremacy and is funded by advertisements for white supremacist literature and other products that white supremacists might be interested in purchasing and holds events such as this which are attended by . . . attendees. Attendees of a white supremacist nature. While being a white supremacist attendee at the white supremacist event, Bill White is acknowledged by both parties to have spent some amount of time with Robert Stacy McCain, who himself was attending the convention in the capacity of a “reporter” for *The Washington Times*—and who, of course, was writing under the name Burke C. Calhoun on the side, even having graced the online pages of *American Renaissance* itself. McCain had in fact known of White’s various bizarre activities before meeting him, having interviewed the fellow in 1999 for a story on White’s anti-government website Overthrow.com and some wacky incident with which its wacky owner had been involved. McCain today admits to having been friends with the fellow thereafter, though he claims that the two drifted apart before White made the transition from Utopian Anarchist or what have you to an extraordinarily enthusiastic white supremacist.

One might wonder what the two would have had in common before White suddenly committed his life to full-time advocacy of white people and their white ways; White was on the record as strongly opposing Christianity to such an extent that he on several occasions expressed understanding and even appreciation for the Columbine killers, whom he claimed to have been acting out against a fascist institution and the religion that bore it. As he explained to Reuters in reference to the victims:

The reason they got killed is that they are part of an



authoritarian social movement and were seen by the killers as symbolic of that movement . . . What the shooters were shooting at was not people but the movements they symbolized. It's a shame that authoritarian Christians, who are trying to dominate our society, don't have a clue how objectionable they are until people start shooting them.

McCain, by contrast, is such a devout follower of the Christ he rarely emulates that that he involves himself in such movements as *Quiverfull*, a popular trend among Evangelicals that advocates constant child-bearing on the part of Christians that they might come to outnumber their unbelieving adversaries and otherwise be in possession of a "quiver full" of young adherents. In the course of responding to my various irritating and never-ending attacks on him, McCain has several times brought attention to my role with *Enlighten the Vote*, which he terms "The Godless Herd of Faithless Fools," "The Lemming Herd of Faithless Fools," "the Godless Coalition [sic]," and similar epithets of apparent disapproval, often presenting me with the title of "godless twerp" or some such thing for good measure or at least the movement conservative equivalent thereof. White never seems to have gotten any of the same treatment. Additionally, our atheist was also a communist of various sorts for the entirety of his adult life before eventually moving on to fascism, whereas McCain is, of course, a rather staunch conservative who spends much of his time attacking leftists of considerably less socialist sentiment than one might expect from, say, a communist.

Let me just stop everything for a moment. Hey, it worked! Now check this out. Imagine if I had been discovered to have written something to the effect that "authoritarian Christians, who are trying to dominate our society, don't have a clue how objectionable they are until people start shooting them." Does The Reader

think that McCain would have had something to say about this? Would he be likely to draw any conclusions thereby?

Despite what one might think to be a couple of ideological deal breakers, McCain couldn't seem to get enough of White's anti-Christian, pro chose to publish four letters from White in 2000 in his capacity as an editor at the *Times*. During the same time, he was also linking to White's bizarre, sometimes-communist-sometimes-anarchist-sometimes-fascist-but-always-anti-government website from other forums under his Burke C. Dabney alter-ego, with the articles in question often focusing on slave reparations and other such topics that white people really spend much time thinking about unless they're really, really into the subject of race. McCain does not seem to advocate slave reparations, in case The Reader was about to ask that question, in which case, no, Reader, he doesn't.

McCain wrote off his relationship with White thusly in December of 2009, upon the occasion of White's conviction for crimes involving violent threats he'd been making in the course of his activism:

When he lived in the D.C. area in 1999-2000, White was actually a useful source for behind-the-scenes information on, among other things, the anti-globalization protests and the effort of Pat Buchanan's supporters to take over the Reform Party. After the 2000 election, however, White got mixed up with the National Alliance, a neo-Nazi organization run by William Pierce.

McCain's oft-expressed position that he would not want to associate with any such person with such ties as this is, of course, absolute nonsense; McCain was himself involved with the white supremacist organization *American Renaissance* at the very same time as he was supposedly concerned with White's association

with the white supremacist organization National Alliance. McCain had also been linking to Overthrow.com from the conservative forum Free Republic until he stopped posting to the latter site altogether in 2001, had published several of the nutty fellow's letters in the *Times* in his capacity as editor, and kept in touch with him via e-mail and phone calls—all despite White espousing views that were diametrically opposite to McCain's. What was it about White that appealed to McCain, who would have had such strong disagreements with the fellow on so many fundamental issues?

The idea that White just suddenly became a white supremacist leader in his own right in 2002 without first having held white supremacist views beforehand is just as nonsensical as the nonsense above. McCain associated with White for the same reason he associated with *American Renaissance*, Sons of the Confederacy, The League of the South, and whatever other parties and organizations with whom he may have successfully concealed his involvement—McCain is, and long has been, a white supremacist. Still, let us for a moment play with McCain's assertion that White was indeed not any sort of racist during their officially acknowledged period of friendship from 1999 to about 2002. If so, then McCain—who was associated with all of those organizations and who had even written an article for the most clearly racist of them, who had in the '90s written a large number of forum posts in defense of the institution of slavery, who had expressed his sentiment that it was natural to view mixed-race couples with revulsion, and who did much of this under an assumed name taken from men who were themselves known mostly for their particularly enthusiastic advocacy of human bondage—was, of course, far more keyed into white supremacy than was White before such time as White started to move towards his friend's views. If White was not a racist at such time as he began to associate with McCain, he was by all accounts a racist just a couple of years afterwards—in fact, he

was even associated with the same organization/publication with which McCain was so active, as evidenced by his presence at the *American Renaissance* event. If White was truly not a racist beforehand, as McCain claims, it may very well have been McCain who recruited him to the cause.



I called to order several screen savers and, before any of the others got here, the Nathan Bedford Forrest screen saver arrived and came with plenty of extra graphics. Quite frankly, it got here firstest with the mostest. When I loaded the Forrest screen saver, it immediately captured the hard-drive space formerly occupied by my Streight screen saver. *Warning: The Forrest screen saver is incompatible with the Bragg and Wheeler screen savers.*

The evidence continued to mount throughout the end of 2009. On October 19th, Holocaust researcher Sergei Romanov made public a great number of message board posts that McCain had composed throughout the '90s in such outlets as alt.war.civil.usa, from which the above comment is taken. Most were written in 1996, before McCain could have reasonably expected to find his actions subject to scrutiny (and before most people understood the permanency of the Internet). In these, one finds a pattern:

The very pervasiveness of Uncle Tom's Cabin and other such abolitionist propaganda goes a long way toward explaining not only the war, but the sometimes ludicrous perceptions of slavery which flourish to this day. I have in mind one well-known author who begins his study of slavery with a ritual denunciation of the institution as immoral, a crime unparalleled in

human annals, but who, once he actually begins to cite facts relating to slave life, exhibits little evidence of the ‘crime’ except his own analyses of ‘paternalism’ and ‘white supremacy.’

Whipping and branding, Axel? How common were whippings? How common was branding? Did the slave who had proven his dilligence, honesty and trustworthiness—and I think it would be racist to say that slaves were not generally so—really have to face such treatments? I doubt it.

Do I expect Pitcavage or Brooks or Epperson to suddenly repent, join their local SCV chapter and start reading Dabney and Calhoun and Davis? No, I fully expect them to continue in their current opposition to Western civilization and the Judeo-Christian tradition, feeding the wolf and hoping to be eaten last.

This last instance is perhaps the most damning thing that McCain has been found to have written. Robert Lewis Dabney, whose surname McCain took for his alter ego, is known for one thing in particular other than his biography of Stonewall Jackson (and we may probably disregard the possibility that McCain named himself for the person out of admiration for his having written a biography of some other more prominent fellow): his spirited defense of slavery on theological grounds, a defense that he would maintain for decades after slavery had already been abolished. Now, Dabney also composed works other than those concerned with advocating the practice of white control over black labor. It is very possible, then, that McCain’s fascination with Dabney stems from his having read and appreciated such of the theologian’s works as *Syllabus* and *Notes of the Course of Systematic and Polemic Theology* or perhaps the more airy *Penal Character of the Atonement of Christ Discussed in the Light of Recent Popular Heresies*. However, we do not find McCain spending any time on Pearl Jam-era message boards debating the virtues of polemic theology or the patent absur-

dity of any particular interpretation of Christ's transmutation from lead into gold. It is more possible, then, that McCain is simply a white supremacist who believes slavery to be justified by the Bible. It's also worth noting that McCain in the above quote seems to associate a failure to appreciate Dabney, Calhoun, and Davis with "opposition to Western civilization and the Judeo-Christian tradition." The guy is really, really fond of Dabney, who was really, really fond of slavery.

Bill White, meanwhile, was convicted in December of 2009 on four counts of making violent threats, thereby earning him a prison stint that may end up stretching into decades. Some of these had been directed at black apartment tenants who had initiated legal proceedings against white landlords, with others targeting public figures such as Leonard Pitts, a black syndicated columnist. White may be one of the most prolific threat-makers in Internet history (he is certainly more accomplished in this regard than is McCain, who has only made a handful of implied threats to go to people's homes or offices and slap them with a dueling glove, at least in the couple of months during which I've been managed to catch his act). He once challenged Charles Johnson to provide him with his home address in order that White might "come and see" him, later posting what he wrongly believed to be the blogger's home address and phone number on his wacky anarcho-fascist-communist-white-nationalist-libertarian-socialist-or-whatever-the-fuck website, and still later posting the following bizarre thingamajig on same:

**Little Green Footballs Little Yellow Cowards  
I Don't Know What Kind Of Bolshevik They Are,  
But Boy Are They Mad**

Recently, I've received some emails from the website "Little Green Footballs." I can't say I'm able to decipher

the politics of that website; from reading it, I can't tell if it is nominally "Republican," "Democratic," "conservative," or "liberal" and I don't pay enough attention to such things to know what it claims to be. Its actual politics are Jewish, atheist, and Bolshevik, but I get a feeling its supporters perceive themselves as either flag-waving *Free Republic*-style faggots (flaggots) or some kind of militant Bill Clinton-style liberal. Regardless, they are an angry bunch.

We have begun planning actions against the publishers of several D.C. area blogs, simply because they are irritating loud mouths, cowards, and people who can easily be smashed not only for our fun and amusement, but for the edification of the general public. Right now, I, personally, am busy planning actions in North Carolina, but its not like these guys are going anywhere, so we have time. I would like to thank, though, the Little Green Footballs commentators for getting so angry as to give me the name of the publisher of that website, so I did not have to work to find it.

Thank you for identifying the name of the publisher of Little Green Footballs for me. That saves time.

As I have explained to others from your site, some retired nitwit who spends his time publishing comments on a website because [sic] he has nothing to live for is of no interest to me. Our ideal target is someone who is high profile and has a lot going on, both because it generates good press and because they tend to be a lot less brave, out of fear of what they perceive they may lose.

If you can explain why you are important enough that you would make a good target, I would be happy to consider sending someone by. Just forward your address.

**Bill White, Commander  
American National Socialist Workers Party**

It's kind of tough to get past the subtitle. "I Don't Know What Kind of Bolshevik They Are, But Boy Are They Mad." What the fuck kind of weird manner is that in which to write? Anyway, White's history of violence extends back into the '90s, when White did time on several charges including weapons possession and resisting arrest. Remember that this is a fellow with whom McCain was closely associated for at least three years and perhaps quite a bit longer. Also, seriously, "I Don't Know What Kind of Bolshevik They Are, But Boy Are They Mad."

Now, take a gander, if you would, at the following excerpt from a profile of White that appeared in *The Gazette of Montgomery County* in 2002:

On the afternoon of September 11, 2001, White wrote a memo blaming Israel and 'traitors' in the United States for the attacks: "We have gotten what we deserve. The chickens have come home to roost." White said the "terrorists" were reacting to support for Israel and the "murder" of millions in Iraq.

The Reader may perhaps remember a certain notorious pastor using the phrase "chickens have come home to roost" in the exact same context to the delight of a certain presidential candidate's detractors, including R.S. McCain. Now take yet another gander—you should have two of them by now—at the lead to the *Gazette* article:



William A. White, a candidate for state delegate in District 39, blames much of what's wrong with Montgomery County, Maryland, the United States and the world on a Jewish elite bent on nihilism that controls the government and the media. "I am an anti-Semite," he told the *Gazette*. "I am just so tired of this Semitism."

What's up with all this Semitism, man? Nihilist Jews, White believes, are a serious problem. Incidentally, McCain had expressed a similar sentiment back in 1996 during the course of his Civil War debates:

I'm glad to see, Lynn, that you are a religious Jew. As far as I can tell, much of the anti-Semitism in America today is directed at the secular Jews who worship the Modern Trinity: Darwin, Marx and Freud.

Unpack that one at your own risk; kudos in advance to anyone who can figure out how to read this in such a way as it does not imply that secular Jews bring anti-Semitism on themselves by way of the cultural degradation they have forced upon American culture at large.

White and McCain had something in common, and it certainly wasn't religion or fondness for a particular political program. In fact, whatever it is must have been important enough to both of them that it managed override such otherwise fundamental differences of opinion. But what was this shared interest?

Hey, maybe it was white supremacy!



If all of this were to be brought to fuller public awareness, it would be embarrassing to dozens of individuals and outlets with whom McCain has been associated to some degree or another.

The editors of *American Spectator* and *Human Events*, Glenn Reynolds of the popular conservative blog Instapundit and other prominent citizen journalists who have linked to McCain over the years, the editors of *American Spectator*, *Human Events*, the blog network Hot Air, and scattered additional venues which have continued to publish McCain's work even after this information has come to light, and Lynn Vincent, the writer with whom McCain co-authored the book *Donkey Cons* and who later went on to assist Sarah Palin in writing *Going Rogue*, all risk damage by association, at least in the sense that the McCain connection would make it more difficult for certain parties to attack their opponents for similar instances of guilt-by-association. These same parties have consequently taken great pains to either ignore the evidence or attack those who bring it forth; some have even managed to do both at the same time.

Eventually, I got in touch with McCain himself in order to give him a chance to address the various allegations that had been leveled by Charles Johnson, myself, and others who have been bothering the fellow over all of these things. McCain had already written a few things about me even as I was writing a few things about him, and so I figured it would not be amiss if he and I were to write things at each other rather than about each other. So I sent him an e-mail, to which he replied by way of an open letter published on his blog. I print it below, interspersed with the point-by-point reply I sent to him immediately after. Both of us are from the southern states and write very flamboyantly when dealing with each other, I'm afraid:

A rare occasion, Mr. Brown, when any of those who've chosen to attack me even bother attempting to contact me. Of course, no one ever contacts me in advance: "Hey, did you actually write X, Y, Z? If so, why? What did you mean? What are your opinions about these things?" Instead, they leap to assump-

tions (if it's on the Internet, it must be true) and the fact that certain things have been endlessly repeated online leads to the assumption that these things are true.

*The fact of the matter is that you did indeed write X, Y, and Z, and in fact you do not even dispute writing X, Y, and Z, and X, Y, and Z happen to consist of such things as you writing bizarre apologies for the institution of slavery, jokingly proposing bumper stickers with messages such as, "Have you whipped your slave today?," and claiming that viewing mixed race marriages with "revulsion" is a natural thing. The rest of the alphabet continues in a similar vein.*

How often, since Charles Johnson began attacking me, have I emphasized that, during the years I was at *The Washington Times*, I was not permitted to address these allegations? And how often have I remarked that "white supremacy" is quite contrary to my observed conduct among those who actually know me?

*I don't know. Twice? More than twice? That is between you and The Washington Times. Insomuch as that publication is owned by the self-proclaimed king of the universe, I can understand why you followed their orders on this. "Pick your battles," my dad always said.*

You are, I gather, a young man, and quite arrogant.

*This is true, unfortunately.*

Not an unusual combination, really, but neither should you mistake your own arrogance for knowledge. Try Googling my name in combination with the phrase "Hayekian insight." There are in the near-infinite number of things you don't know certain facts that may, I suspect, be far more important than

those facts you know. And it may be that you are mistaken about some things you accept as facts.

*Very well.*

Well, I've had more time to study all this sort of thing than you could imagine. You desire to make me look like a villain, for whatever selfish motive, and therefore assemble a prosecutor's case—the Ransom Note Method. This you present with a lot of noise and clamour: "A-ha! I have exposed the dangerous villain, whose stealthy evil had never been fully known until now!"

*And then I twirled one end of my handlebar mustache in satisfaction and took a pinch of snuff; the single vice I allow myself.*

Now, what is \*expected\* of me in response is that I will address your "evidence" point-by-point or, failing that, that I will Deny, Denounce, and Repudiate: "Oh, I'm not actually friends with Person A, and I abhor the thought of being associated with Person B."

*I don't expect you to do anything of the sort.*

Ah, but there is never an end to it, you see? Were I to answer charges A, B, C, you would then proceed to interrogate me about D, E, F, etc. To address your accusations in such a manner would ultimately avail me nothing, while tacitly acknowledging your authority to act the part of the interrogator. Further, such a response would suggest that there is some legitimate cause to suspect my good faith, to cause others to believe that perhaps I harbor a hidden hatred, which must be rooted out and renounced.

*Now see here, Raskolnikov, a student or formerly a student—all I'm doing is pointing out things that you have done. I haven't summoned you to my crazy Eastern European interrogation chamber in order to demand answers without telling you with what you are being charged. I'm just writing things about you—you know, that thing you yourself have been doing for years in opposition to your own enemies.*

You invite me to a Maoist re-education camp, with yourself playing the role of commissar.

*Why does it have to be a Maoist re-education camp? Maybe I'm inviting you to a party.*

The cloud of suspicion is thrown upon me, and I must prove myself innocent!

*Zounds!*

Except that I don't. We live in a free society and I am not even a candidate for public office. I am not paid for having the correct opinion about anything. Opinions might be profitable to Bill Kristol or George Will, but I am not one of those big-shot pundits. It is my skill and hard work, and not my opinions, which are my stock in trade.

*That's all very well and good. So why not simply admit that you're a white supremacist and then reinvent yourself as a white supremacist pundit? You have every right to express whatever views you may on anything you like. Likewise, I have the right to point out that you clearly hold such views.*

What you and Johnson and others apparently wish to do is to cast upon me a stigma, which you may then use as part of a campaign of guilt-by-association

smear against various of my friends. You seem to assume that my friends are fools and cowards, and will automatically disassociate themselves from me, lest you then say, “A-ha! So-and-so associates with Robert Stacy McCain, who is a hateful racist!”

*What your various political allies do is none of my concern. That’s a matter for the conservative punditry, not for me.*

Except that I’m not a hateful racist. And this, sir, is the big point that you seem to have missed entirely.

*I’ve never called you “hateful.”*

People know me, and the people who know me know that I have no hate in my heart, and if they felt it necessary to speak up on my behalf, you might be surprised at who would sing my praises. Their silence you mistake for fear, is rather an expression of their contempt for your malicious behavior.

*Again, that’s between you and your buddies.*

Whatever you say about me, I am certain you will fail to convict me of hate, Barrett. I don’t even hate you.

*I don’t hate you, either. I simply think that you have contempt for the Enlightenment principles upon which our republic was founded, and your past writings seem to bear that out. Sergey Romanov in particular has recently unearthed some staggering amount of things you wrote before you were in the public eye, and the general thrust of these writings is very clear—you are an apologist for slavery, an advocate of white control over non-white populations, and a proponent of the theocratic basis of government. You are not an American—you are a Confederate. This merits pointing out inasmuch as that you are two degrees from such figures as Sarah*

*Palin by way of the book you wrote with Lynn Vincent, as well as a single degree away from hundreds of conservative pundits, activists, and politicians.*

Anyway, welcome to the 21st century.

I later provided McCain with the chance to write up to 2,000 words in which he could defend himself and attack me, an essay which I would agree to publish verbatim in this chapter no matter how devastating the result to myself. He turned this down.

Although a couple conservative bloggers here and there have since gone public in repudiating McCain, as of this writing many others continue to defend him even in light of such things as we have seen above. Meanwhile, the conservative punditry as a whole has continued to degenerate to such a point as that there is no longer room for people such as Charles Johnson, who is of the sort to point out inconvenient facts about those with whom he may agree on certain major issues even if such facts could have the effect of damaging efforts to address those issues in such a way as he would like to see them addressed. Johnson worries over Islamic fundamentalism, but is unwilling to coddle others with the same opinion if those others happen to be aligned with neo-Nazi organizations, as is the case with certain of his former allies in the conservative punditry. And so Johnson must be denounced for the crime of ideological indiscretion because it is the only crime for which conservatives can denounce fellow bloggers, apparently. Threats, defenses of slavery, open disgust with interracial marriage, articles secretly written for white supremacist publications, pen names picked from the annals of apologists for human bondage, an association with a bizarre and violent neo-Nazi leader with whom no overt political beliefs are held in common, “journalism” conducted in collaboration with an article subject with which one is secretly associated by membership and in opposition to the other article

subject with whom that organization is embroiled in conflict—none of this will suffice to prompt any more than an obscure handful of McCain's defenders in the conservative punditry to speak up against the fellow, as such things do not actually bother such people so long as these are perpetrated by their allies and not their enemies.

Faced with a choice between such a fellow as McCain who does such things as he has clearly done and another fellow such as Johnson who feels compelled to disassociate himself with pundits who do such things as McCain has clearly done, the conservative blogosphere chose the former. There is no room for Charles Johnson in today's American conservative movement; Robert Stacy McCain has taken it all up.