



MAC Arrow

Unitarian Universalist

Multiracial Unity Action Council
(UUMUAC)

“For the Unity of light and dark-skinned people of the world.”

Mission Statement

It is the mission of the Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Council to carry out and foster anti-racist and multiracial unity activities both within and outside the Unitarian Universalist Association through education, bearing witness and other actions, and expansion of our membership both within and outside the walls of our congregations.

We also seek to defend our UU Principles against those who seek to undermine them.

Vision Statement

We envision our congregations, denomination, and society as not being color blind but color appreciative; as judging and treating members of the world's rank and file by the content of their character, not the color of their skin or their cultural heritage; and as treasuring diversity in the context of the “Beloved Community.” We call this vision Multiracial Unitarian Universalism.

Contents of this issue

page

- 2 **Manifesto for Democracy in Multiracial Unitarian Universalism**, UUMUAC
- 3 **Historical Research is not ‘White’ or ‘Black’** a Dick Burkhardt review of *The New York Times’ 1619 Project and the Racist Falsification of History: Essays & Interviews*, edited by David North & Thomas Mackaman (2021)
- 7 **Ten Days Which Shook the UU World: A Political Analysis of UUMUAC’s Participation in GA 2021**, by Rev. Dr. Finley C. Campbell, Chair, UUMUAC
- 10 **Anatomy of a Witch-Hunt**, a Dick Burkhardt review of *The Gadfly Affair: A 21st Century Heretic’s Excommunication from America’s Most Liberal Religion*, by Todd Eklof (2021)
- 12 **Update from the Afghan Women’s Fund**, by Executive Director Fahima Gaheez
- 13 **Equality Not Ideology**, a Dick Burkhardt review of *Last Best Hope: America in Crisis and Renewal*, by George Packer (2021)
- 15 **Letter to the Seattle Times** from Dick Burkhardt, printed May 23, 2021
- 16 **On Congregational Polity**, Miles Feldman
- 16 **Hits It on the Head**, a Dick Burkhardt review of *Cancel This Book: The Progressive Case Against Cancel Culture*, by Dan Kovalik (2021)

UUMUAC

1448 E. 52nd St., Box 267
Chicago, IL 60615

www.uumuac.org

Editor’s email: uusj@sbcglobal.net

Manifesto for Democracy in Multiracial Unitarian Universalism

from the Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Council (UUMUAC.org)

What's Wrong

The historic vision of an activist multiracial unity for justice is being undermined by fallacious accusations of racism and white supremacy.

Some ministers of the Unitarian Universalist Association (UUA) are being "cancelled" without legal due process and for spurious reasons.

The dogmas of victimhood culture have undermined our Seven Principles.

This zealotry feeds the cultural wars and political polarization, especially with its demeaning attitudes toward the white working class, breeding demagoguery and paranoia.

New Attitudes Based on Old Truths

We must revitalize the old labor slogan "black and white, unite and fight" to include all races among workers, students, professionals, immigrants, and cultural groups.

Find common ground, instead of stoking divisions.

Recognize the toxicity of identity politics, which has fueled many of the great scourges of humankind - war, genocide, racism, and persecution.

To the UUA

We affirm the immense cultural contributions of black folks, but reject the racist dogmas of white privilege, white fragility, white implicit bias, and white supremacy.

Restore full legal due process for all claims of harm - avoid assuming or assigning blame.

Reject complaints without strong evidence, or if based on ideological, linguistic, or identity differences.

Employ high impact words according to popular usage - for clarity and to avoid alienation.

Sum-up

*Adopt the UUMUAC goal - **Unity of the Light and Dark-Skinned People of the World** - by fighting cancel culture and all forms of racism. **Chaos or Community?***

Historical Research is not ‘White’ or ‘Black’

A 5-Star Review by Dick Burkhardt of

The New York Times’ 1619 Project and the Racialist Falsification of History: Essays & Interviews, edited by David North & Thomas Mackaman (2021)

This is a well-organized and written collection of persuasive critiques under the auspices of the World Socialist Web Site (www.wsws.org). North and Mackaman are real leftist writers and scholars of the worldly, anti-Stalin, Trotskyite type, not the “pseudo leftists” of Critical Race Theory (CRT). They’ve interviewed many of the top historians on slavery and politics in the US, especially during the Revolutionary and Civil War periods. Their impressive historical research was ignored by Nikole Hannah-Jones, the lead journalist of the *New York Times* 1619 Project. Only later, after WWSW critiques were published, was the *Times* forced to back off on its narrative, changing a few words and re-interpreting its story as “metaphor” instead as fact.

The featured falsifications are that (1) the Revolutionary War was fought to preserve slavery and (2) that Lincoln was actually a racist. Why the egregious distortions of US history, as if (1) Britain was not profiting handsomely from the slave trade and (2) as if the Civil War was not fought to end the aggressive legal and political stranglehold of the Southern slave owning class?

The answer is that, by its own admission, the *Times* chose to exclude ‘white’ contributions as much as possible. Even one black historian, who was familiar with the full range of scholarship, said that Hannah-Jones had ignored her critique in favor of the long-discredited theories of certain earlier black racial-nationalist historians. In other words, anti-white prejudice is the new orthodoxy at the *Times*, which should surprise no one who is familiar with the “whiteness studies” of Critical Race Theory or its doctrine of authentic voices.

The Marxist orientation of North and

Mackaman comes through, legitimately, in such statements as, “the 1619 Project, by prioritizing racial conflict, marginalizes and even eliminates class conflict as a notable factor in history and politics” (p xiii). Otherwise, they are in the mainstream, historically speaking, but focused on overall history, rather than as specialists focused on particular places and times. Thus the interviews with the specialists on the American Revolution and the Civil War, plus quotes from broad-view historians provide the context missing from the 1619 Project. For example, they quote Jonathan Israel that “the American Revolution formed part of a wider transatlantic revolutionary sequence, a series of revolutions in France, Italy, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, Ireland, Haiti, Poland, Spain, Greece” with the American revolution providing the “primary model for universal change.” They emphasized that “Slavery had existed for several thousand years but the specific form ... was bound up with the development and expansion of capitalism” (p xvi).

Even more damning is the quote from Hannah-Jones that the “1619 project is not a history” but a “new narrative” to replace the supposedly “white narrative.” Thus they conclude that, according to Hannah-Jones, “the purpose of history is ... to be nothing more than ... a narrative for the realization of one or another political agenda. The truth or untruth of the narrative is not a matter of concern” (p xviii). North and Mackaman note that this “national myth-making” approach to history is a direct consequence of CRT, with its emphasis on both language as an instrument of power and on identity politics as the primary explanatory factor in civic matters.

The authors blast Ibram Kendi for a “ridiculous concoction that attributes to the word ‘Enlightenment’ a racial significance that has absolutely no foundation in etymology let alone history” (p xx), noting that it was adopted as a literary English translation for the German word whose literal meaning is “clarification” or “clearing up,” having nothing to do with black or white. Indeed they point out that “modern racism is connected historically and intellectually with the Anti-Enlightenment,” as developed by Count Gobineau and others.

Even the theory of classical music has been labeled as “white” in CRT, with North and Mackaman noting “more than a passing resemblance between this call to liberate music from ‘whiteness’ and the efforts of Nazi academics . . . to liberate music from ‘Jewishness.’” In fact, “Academic journals covering virtually every field of study are exploding ignorant rubbish of this sort” (p xxi). As to the rationale for all this, the authors proclaim that “the Democratic Party – as a political instrument of the capitalist class – is anxious to shift the focus of the discussion away from issues that raise the specter of social inequality and class conflict” (p xxiv) while the corresponding media instrument is the *New York Times*. To sum up, “the structures of American democracy are breaking down beneath the weight of the social contradictions produced by a staggering level of wealth concentration” (p xxv).

After this hard-hitting forward, the book dives deeper, sometimes with unexpected results. When I read the Hannah-Jones claim that “anti-black racism runs in the very DNA of this country,” I took this metaphorically, as postmodern philosophy emphasizes the “social construction” of reality, not biological difference. But then North and Mackaman found a recent CRT-type article by Robert Sapolsky proclaiming biological and cognitive differences between the races. Of course, superficial differences are visible to all, and a few medical differ-

ences are known to researchers, but educational and cultural developments appear to overwhelm most genetic differences, even though statistical variations in IQ and the like are not yet fully understood. Thus the authors wonder if CRT, in its zeal for inherent racial differences, is reverting to 19th century social Darwinism or to the 1930s Nazi pseudo-science of race.

A deep dive into slavery reveals that Africa was “a major source of slaves for ancient civilizations, the Islamic world, India” (p 6), long before it arrived in the Americas, where less than 1 out of 30 slaves ended up in the 13 colonies. The initial Africans were treated more like the indentured servants from Europe, and “Slavery was not born of racism: rather, racism was the consequence of slavery,” according the renowned West Indian historian Eric Williams. After losing the US revolutionary war, Britain was also less able to extract profits from the slave economies of the “sugar islands” of the Caribbean, a key factor in Britain’s ending of slavery. The founding fathers who owned slaves, like Jefferson, thought that slavery was on the decline (Virginia had a surplus of slaves) and would be gone in another generation. This prediction only failed because of the invention of the cotton gin in 1793.

Also critiqued are some very glaring omissions of the 1619 Project. For example, Frederick Douglass is never mentioned, and Martin Luther King, Jr, is only named in one photo. Both Douglass and King admired Lincoln and Jefferson, viewing the ideals of the Enlightenment as achievable ends, not the hypocrisies portrayed by the 1619 Project. Neither does this project discuss the role of the Industrial Revolution, with the transformation of most slave and free labor into wage labor. This became the basis for a large reduction in racism, though it took a century of social battles after the Civil War for this to really take hold after the Civil Rights era.

Of course, there is no mention of how the

Russian Revolution inspired many black leaders of the 1930s, but also not even of Malcolm X or the Black Panthers from the 1960s. The elitist origins of the 1619 Project are even more evident in its failure to cast a critical eye on US militarism and imperialism, especially where it was the Soviets, not the US, which allied itself more closely with the aspirations of non-Western racial and ethnic groups. Meanwhile the US deindustrialization of the last 40 years has hit the working class and lower middle class hard, setting the stage for renewed racial tensions. Again, this was engineered by economic elites of the ruling class, targeting whites, who had more to lose, more than blacks, who had affirmative action. Since most of these elites were still white, this says that today, as in the past, it's profits that come first, not race, giving the lie to the entire 1619 narrative. Or, as North and Mackaman put it, "Historical falsification and identity politics are strategic weapons in the hands of the ruling class" (p 30).

In fact, the basic thesis of this book is that "race and racism are not immutable but emerge out of material and political interests" (p 19). "Historians have searched in vain for any racial justification for slavery in colonial Virginia . . . To the extent that there was any ideological rationale for slavery, it was first religious, not racial" (p 22). "Not until the final decades before the Civil War did a fully developed system of racist ideology exist to justify slavery" (p 23). Meanwhile Washington had hoped for a plan to abolish slavery and Jefferson yearned for a "total emancipation," even authoring the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, banning slavery in the territories covered by Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. "Hannah-Jones, ironically, finds herself in league with the fire-eating advocates of slavery, including John Calhoun, who called Jefferson's claim of human equality 'the most false and dangerous of all political errors'" (p 28).

Especially egregious is the 1619 portrayal of

Lincoln as a racist at heart, with the Emancipation Proclamation as "a reluctant act of last resort." In fact, his anti-racism had deep roots and, politically speaking, he was always at the leading edge of anti-racism, though, being politically astute, he occasionally had to make compromises. According to biographer Sidney Blumenthal, "Lincoln's deepening understanding of slavery in its full complexity as a moral, political, and constitutional dilemma began in his childhood among the Primitive Baptist anti-slavery dissidents in the backwoods of Kentucky and Indiana" (p 32). And he later told how he, himself, "used to be a slave," since his father rented him out as day laborer, a common practice among slave owners when this brought in more money than plantation work.

Politically, Lincoln first aligned himself with the Whig Party, and later the new Republican Party, in opposition to the racial politics of the Democrats. Lincoln began the Civil War "to save the Union" because that was the political center at the time but quickly moved "to abolish slavery" as public sentiment shifted. Later Lincoln was preparing to grant former slaves full citizenship, first "for very educated blacks and those who had fought for the Union" (p 142), when he was assassinated by the white supremacist John Wilkes Booth for precisely this reason. North and Mackaman also refute the 1619 presentation of "slavery as a purely racial institution from which all whites benefited in the South," regurgitating the argument of the slave holders. They quote historian Keri Merritt, "In the slave South, where white laborers were in competition with brutalized enslaved labor, the laborers, whether legally free or not, had little to no control over their labor power" (p 40). "Succession . . . was not a popular movement from below." Most non-landowning whites survived as itinerant day laborers in extreme poverty, living in "one room shacks made of logs and mud, normally without windows. They had difficulty in traveling from place to

place, often in carts pulled by dogs” (p 41). Of their white neighbors, one slave noted, “We had more to eat than them . . . They were sorry folk.” Historians noted that “alcoholism and illiteracy were widespread” (p 42) with a deliberate paucity of public schools. The jails were full of poor whites for minor infractions, much as it was later for blacks under Jim Crow. Mob lynching of poor whites was common, nullifying due process.

“These class tensions made it impossible – politically, economically, and militarily – for the Confederacy to continue fighting the war . . . The poor counties in Alabama, for example, voted to elect anti-secessionist delegates by margins of up to 90%” (p 44). “300,000 Southerners fled the South at the onset of the war to fight for the Union army”, while “up to 2/3 of all Southern soldiers deserted,” contributing greatly to the Southern losses at Vicksburg and Gettysburg” (p 45). “Bread riots spread in 1863” (p 46), with thousands of spontaneous pro-Union groups, often integrated, forming to conduct guerilla warfare and establish safe routes for deserters and abolitionists. The slave owners introduced poll taxes but the people often responded with popular votes. “Britain and France were prevented from intervening militarily on the side of the South by the overwhelming support among British and French workers for the cause of abolition” (p 47).

Moving to the origins of Critical Race Theory and identity politics in the current era, North and Mackaman examined the highly influential Combahee River Collective, concluding that “The aim was not social equality and the liberation of all mankind, but one’s own personal advancement, leveraging various categories of identity to achieve positions of power and prestige . . . Poor whites, and particularly white men, were categorized by the Combahee Collective under the general heading of ‘white male rule’” (p 65). The authors note that in recent years “the vast majority of black Americans, as with

the vast majority of the working class as a whole, have, in fact, suffered historic retrogression in their conditions of life. A small section, however, has made significant progress” (p 67). Marxists call this group the ‘black bourgeoisie’ – the professionals, managers, sports and entertainment stars, etc., who were educated and promoted to diversify the ranks of the ruling class.

From the authors’ point of view (the traditional Left), the new identity-based pseudo-Left is in “increasing alignment with the conceptions and politics of the far Right” (p 68), especially its anti-Enlightenment and anti-working-class perspectives. That is, increasingly, the antagonists in the cultural wars are two sides of the same coin, not fundamentally different directions; they are both opposing authoritarian ideologies, not a representation of economic and political democracy versus oligarchy and imperial rule. Reality points in the opposite direction: “Attitudes toward race have been transformed enormously over that last half century” (p 69).

In the rest of the book we get fascinating details and perspectives from interviews with 8 historians, and extensive documentation of the controversy with the *Times*. This was especially true for the eminent black Marxist, Adolph Reed, who echoes John McWhorter when he says that “What the Afro-pessimist types or black nationalist types get out of it is that we can’t ever talk about anything except race. And that’s partly because talking about race is the thing they have to sell” (p 127). He also studied how New Orleans was affected by Hurricane Katrina and discovered that “blacks weren’t displaced at a higher rate than whites” or died at a higher rate. “Class was a better predictor than race” (p 129), and New Orleans emerged with a more interracial ruling class. Also, “listening to how people talk about intersectionality, it just seems like dissociative personality disorder” (p 131). What refreshing honesty, versus the ideologically-driven falsification coming out of CRT and the 1619 Project.

Ten Days Which Shook the UU World: A Political Analysis of UUMUAC's Participation in GA 2021

by Rev. Dr. Finley C. Campbell, Chair, UUMUAC

Part I: Thesis: What we did right

The purpose of this analysis is to examine the positive and negative aspects of our incredible 10 days of theological/ideological struggle against the coalition of neo-racists, anti-democratic authoritarians, and their dupes (the drinkers of their Kool-Aid) as related to GA 21, with the outlook of searching for synergy between the positive and negative forces in our organization, or more precisely, in the Board of Directors. From June 18 to June 27, over a hundred people heard aspects of our approach to working in the UU Reform Movement, i.e., opposing racism, especially during our Zoomerama, classified as our supplement (or alternate) to GA 2021. This specifically covered the time period, Wednesday, June 23 to Sunday, June 27. I give a special salute to the work done by our Religious Professionals Task Force team consisting of Brother Rev. Trudeau (leader), Sr. Rev. Beverly Seese, and myself, with Brother Allan Lindrup helping to coordinate it all by running the Zoom technology.

Here are some of the highlights: June 18, the meeting of the Ten Days Event Committee, as I call it, to finalize the calendar and deal with any last minute problems; June 19, the forum featuring a discussion between proponents and opponents of the proposed Eighth Principle; June 20, I speak at the Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Columbia South Carolina about the need to see the Seven Principles as a kind of credo, a personal commitment ([see link](#)); June 21, our symbolic action press conference in Milwaukee Wisconsin; June 22, our Conversations Against Racism featuring a

discussion about critical theory, Critical Race Theory, and neo-racism with MAC members Anthony Dawahare, Wesley Hromatko, Marie Cobbs, and me.

The key event, of course, was our UUMUAC Zoomerama GA21, June 23 – June 27, consisting of mid-day, and evening events of various kinds:

- (a) Wednesday June 23: I did the welcoming, mainly focusing on the petition drive and the UUMUAC Manifesto, and that afternoon Brother Lindrup did the socializing program, getting us off to a good start.
- (b) Thursday, June 24: Brother Jay Kiskel laid out the dimensions of his candidacy for the UUA Board of Trustees, reporting that he felt things were going well; Kelvin Sandridge handled the socializing with good effect by sharing some of his personal experiences with neo-racism; and that evening the focus was on anti-racist actions: Sister Fahima Gaheez of the Afghan Women's Fund (and a MAC Board member) described our support for her successful work in building the Achin school for women and girls and Brother Carl Wolf called for a variety of actions including the controversial suggestion that UUMUAC members join their local Black Lives Matter movement.
- (c) Friday, June 25: Brother Eklof showed conclusively the illogicality of much of the rationalizing underlying the pronouncements of the UUA neo-racist cabal; Kelvin Sandridge and Carol O'Neill, the leaders of the Chicago Area Chapter

of MAC, were in charge of the following socializing, with a variety of discussions related to GA 2021; and that evening Brother Rev. Wesley Hromatko discussed the men behind much of the theorizing underlying Critical Theory/Critical Race Theory: Martin Heidegger and Herbert Marcuse.

- (d) Saturday, June 26: Brother Rev. Trudeau, Sister Dr. Anne Schneider, and our newest member of the Religious Professionals Task Force, Rev. Ken Phifer, spoke about the various contradictions flowing through the UUAC, with a discussion on whitesupremacyology; FCC and Allan handled the socializing, which went overtime, so much to be shared; and that evening Alan Spector and Marie Cobbs did some wide-ranging discussion on how to recruit more Black UUs into UUMUAC, especially emphasizing what I call civic action projects: tutoring, food pantries, etc.
- (e) Sunday, June 27: Sister Rev Beverly Seese, before presenting her sermon, gave a passionate outburst of condemnation about the Afro-centric, neo-racist religious service presented by the GA Worship Committee as the major, final service of the Assembly, a service underscoring the white-supremacy-ological theme dominating GA 2021. This service, in my opinion, preparing the way for the successful vote for the neo-racist Statement of Conscience (SOC) later that day. However, against this evil, Sister Beverly gave a powerful, inspiring sermon on the theme of the awakening, a kind of spring awakening, from all the pain and the suffering created by Covid and by social injustice, and spoke earnestly about the need to carry on the struggle with a great deal of patience.

We ended the Zoomerama that evening with a roundtable discussion about how we viewed the Zoomerama and the GA 2021 itself, which can be summarized as follows:

- (a) Quite a few delegates, both UUMUAC and non-UUMUAC members, attended many of our supplemental programs, often commending us on our being there as a real alternative to the new racist ideology and the anti-democratic authoritarianism characteristic of much of the General Assembly;
- (b) Indeed, several were enthusiastic about our fight against racism, old and new, from a multiracial perspective, inspired by our commitment to historic Unitarian Universalism, and impressed by the presence of our three black leaders;
- (c) All our non-MAC Zoomees saw us as a welcome contrast to the whitesupremacyology culture dominating much of the GA 2021 racist outlook;
- (d) And many appreciated us being a part of the UU reform movement being led by Brother Todd and Brother Jay.
- (e) Many loved the important information shared by our Zoom attendees, enjoyed the fellowship of being among like-minded people without being conformist, and appreciated the opportunity to share that information without being stopped by someone being “ouched.”
- (f) Most of all, we took part, those who were official delegates, in many key discussions, a few of us met with the Board of Trustees, and all were a part of the “vocal” dissent against the various forms of neo-racist ideas which were brought up, while supporting all positive ones; in other words, we were involved with what was positive at GA 2021, whether we won, lost, or were ignored.

Part II: Antithesis: What we got wrong

Being self-critical I failed to give “on the job” leadership in combating some major errors that we made. In other words, I failed to make sure that our full vision was front and center in all of the discussions and presentations, especially the MAC vision and mission statement, the Manifesto, and the Petition Drive. Next, our key speakers never spoke about the concept of multiracial Unitarian

Universalism. And then there was the issue of joining the Black Lives Matter Movement. I was, unfortunately, not there to point out that we should do so, only if such chapters had not adopted the white supremacy culture outlook, and were fighting racism in a multi-racial manner. Most of all, such BLM chapter members would have to agree with our radical notion that anti-black racism also hurts white brothers and sisters and cousins in the rank-and-file, despite the use of disparity/disproportional studies to hide that fact.

But the most serious weakness was that we had no full discussion about how neo-racism is accounting for the widespread, toxic atmosphere at GA2021 and indeed for the “cancel culture/white supremacy culture” ideology dominating the UUAC as a whole.

In summary, I forgot to remind the UUMUAC participants of our reasons for presenting our Zoomerama in the first place: the petition drive calling for a plenary session in 2022 to discuss the future of the UUAC; getting explicit support for the UUMUAC Manifesto; and to intentionally invite those interested in our ideas to join our work. Being critical, I must point out to some of our UUMUAC leaders and members how, despite our experiences with the neo-racist cabal, many of you allowed the illusion to emerge that it is possible to trust the makers of the Kool-Aid, to trust those who scorn our UU Principles, our Sources, who scorn our members' views and beliefs as being the product of so-called "white supremacy culture.”

Part III: Synergy: The Negation of the Negation

Our experiences at GA2021 was important because they revealed that, on the whole, we did great things and showed what we have to do to be even better. In the long-range fight against racism, priorities for UUMUAC members are key because they determine

commitment, and priorities are determined by the Fourth Principle in the following manner. Most of us can have three types or levels of priorities, usually associated with our personal, existential, and political outlooks and situations. Consequently, whatever is the priority becomes the focus of a great deal of our energies, shaping our outlook on the work of preparing the way for the emergence of the Beloved Community as an historical reality. I propose that our central priority between GA2021 and GA2022, for example, is to build UUMUAC as a mass, action-oriented organization. This means having an organization with a minimum of 100 members, with nuclei and chapters in the United States, but eventually becoming a global phenomenon. (Editor's Note: UUMUAC membership is currently at 95). We are, in a sense, in a race against time based on the fact that God or Dialectical Materialism has given us some time before a possible World War III or Great Depression II or climate change hits us full force. So, I disagree with those who advocate patience in this struggle – patience up to a point is deadly for this work, unless it is also combined with urgency.

Conclusion

In the future (GA2022), we should make sure that our priorities are clearly manifested in the main goal is making UUMUAC a mass organization committed to a multiracial struggle against racism in all its forms, involving a host of folks who can commit themselves to our mission and vision and to our roots in UUism, and, most of all, committed to building nuclei and chapters to carry out actions no matter how minimal wherever they are. We are an ACTION Council, and the Action Faction must take the lead. So may synergy be key.

[Editor's Note: Rev. Campbell refers to the UUA as the “UUAC,” as a reminder that the UUA is “an association of congregations;” *congregations* are its proper constituency.

Anatomy of a Witch-Hunt

A 5-Star Review by Dick Burkhart of

*The Gadfly Affair: A 21st Century Heretic's Excommunication
from America's Most Liberal Religion, by Todd Eklof (2021)*

This short, readable, and to-the-point book pulls back the veil of duplicity surrounding the Unitarian Universalist Association in its witch-hunt against the Rev. Todd Eklof, the well-regarded senior minister at the UU Church of Spokane, Washington. His supposed crime was the distribution of a book called “The Gadfly Papers” at the 2019 UU General Assembly, which was held in Spokane that year. He had called for dialogue on his “concerns regarding the punitive, authoritarian, chilling and otherwise illiberal turn Unitarian Universalism has taken”.

Rev. Eklof reports in this book that the UUA has consistently refused to engage with his concerns, instead extending its “character assassination” – alleging, without evidence, a slew of nasty “isms”. To Eklof this signals a new age of “Endarkenment” - versus “Enlightenment.” As to one of those *isms* - racism, he quotes the young African-American writer Coleman Hughes calling for “an anti-racism grounded in the idea that there is a single human race to which we all belong.” He also quotes the African American public intellectual John McWhorter: “Virtue Signalers Won’t Change the World.” Eklof counters all this with an astonishing sense of humor, with key chapters titled “Swatted,” “Banished,” “Condemned,” “Pilloried,” “Flogged,” and “Excommunicated.”

In each of these chapters Rev. Eklof details what actually happened, with full documentation in appendices at the end of the book – red meat for historians. His first chapter begins with a quote from Socrates, proceeding past the dark ages of Christian dogma, to a “return to the kind of debate about ethical principles that had flourished in Antiquity.”

Thus he is calling for a second Reformation – “The problem is that Critical Race Theory has ceased to be a philosophy and has instead become a dogma, an organized religion that verges on aspects of fundamentalism” (Irshad Manji).

The “astonishing reaction” to his book certainly proved Eklof’s point. Right from the beginning, the UUA violated the sacred legal principle of “innocent until proven guilty.” First off, the “Right Relations Team” ordered him to enter into “a process of public restoration” with only hear-say evidence that it was he, not his accusers, who were “out of covenant” (few had read the book, none could point to offending passages).

Rev. Eklof did meet once with this group but quickly realized that he was facing a “kangaroo court” where the “restoration” was to be facilitated by an individual who had participated in the slander against him. Meanwhile a sympathetic colleague advised him not to meet with any official group without the presence of a Good Officer or an attorney, a Good Officer being a minister designated to act as kind of advisor instead of an attorney.

Rev. Eklof once again emphasizes that his *Gadfly Papers* book “is not about racism, but about Unitarian Universalism and how far it has strayed from its liberal tradition and values”. Yet the UUA continues to use its “anti-racism, anti-oppression” policies as a cover for the sanctions against him, never apologizing for the slander spearheaded by DRU-UMM and others, let alone holding them “accountable.” Eklof illustrates his actual concerns by quotes from letters condemning him. One is “anti-intellectualism,” because

he is attacked for using “reason and logic.” Another is in labeling standard language as “violence” and free speech as “oppression.” That is, “simply encountering ideas we disagree with is not enough to claim we have been harmed.” Also, “disagreeing with persons who have been oppressed does not make us intolerant; but being afraid or unwilling to do so denies them the fullness and richness of their humanity.” And “truth cannot be . . . determined by identity.”

An even bigger concern for Rev. Eklof is a “new wave of authoritarian ministers who are being taught to loathe the very religion they desire to lead, also being groomed to support the end of congregational . . . autonomy,” not even understanding, let alone supporting, our UU tradition of religion grounded in “reason, freedom, tolerance, dissent, and our common humanity.”

But in the end, despite all the duplicity against him, even with the removal of his ministerial credentials, Rev. Eklof’s congregation voted to keep him by about 80%. This was possible only because of congregational “polity,” which the UUA is now seeking to revoke so that they could completely ban any minister who openly objects to the latest dogmas from Critical Theory and victimhood culture.

This would represent the official end of our 4th principle, as “a free and responsible search for truth and meaning” surrenders to Orwellian thought police in every congregation. Also our fifth principle would be strongly curtailed, as “the right of conscience and the use of the democratic process” continues to fade into authoritarian rule, featuring cancellations (= extra-legal shaming, punishments, and purges) by tiny groups of “woke” individuals and their allies. And, of course, our 1st principle on “the inherent worth and dignity of every person” has long since been a casualty of identity politics.”

Another interesting point that Rev. Eklof makes has to do with the lack of a clear iden-

tity for the UUA itself, evidenced by the difficulty most UUs would have giving a brief “elevator speech.” He says, “With no true identity of its own, the Association has come to worship the identities of others, turning this idolatrous totem into a taboo that is strictly guarded and that no one may disrupt.” Then he rebuts the “3 errors” of the influential Rev. Frederick Muir, who attacks (1) UU individualism, (2) a claimed UU “exceptionalism,” and (3) UU aversion to “authority and power”.

Of course, Muir’s claim of UU exceptionalism is simply false, as contemporary UU draws on many global sources and is the opposite of the belief-in-Jesus exceptionalism preached by evangelicals. As to Muir’s first and third “errors,” Eklof provides a cogent defense. For example, when Muir advises the UUA to implement an authoritarian regime using accusations of “out-of-covenant” to keep people in line, Eklof notes that there are plenty of denominations that are way ahead of us on this creedal path and they too are losing membership.

Eklof says, instead, let’s build on our strengths and expand our vision to the global level. Retreating into identity politics is a dead end that will lead to decay as free thinkers give way to conformists attempting to keep up with an ever-changing array of acceptable identities. As moral individuals we will continue to be free to learn from and honor multiple sources – to fashion our own identities to better navigate our rapidly changing world.

Even worse, the Muir approach would be unjust and unfair, by design, because it would be based on the double standards that are inherent to identity politics. Thus, standard principles of legal due process would be violated intentionally, making kangaroo courts the norm. A properly running system would quickly investigate complaints based on an impartial assessment of the evidence (with biased investigators recusing themselves), discarding those complaints without

merit and seeking dialogue between the parties where possible, with the intention of mutual learning, not assignment of guilt. Instead of principled and experienced leadership we've had leaders who just jump on

board with the latest slogan or orthodoxy of identity politics. Needless to say, I admire Eklof's incredible courage and tenacity, a rare willingness to stand up for truth and justice against the latest dogmas of identity and strategies of fundamentalism.

Update from the Afghan Women's Fund by Dick Burkhart

by Executive Director Fahima Gaheez

The main building of the school in Achin is almost finished, will be completed by the end of July. I talked to the locals /elders again, a few days ago and expressed my concern and some donors' concerns. They have reassured me "that this school belongs to the villagers and they will protect it with their blood." Their elders already talked to the Taliban and other

insurgents about their concerns. They got reassurance from them that as long as the school respects their dress code and doesn't teach anti-Islamic subjects, the villagers are free to run it the way they like to. I have also been in contact with other areas where the Taliban are in control, and they are telling me that the girls' schools are open.

Thank you for all your support.



Equality, Not Ideology

A 5-Star Review by Dick Burkhardt of

Last Best Hope: America in Crisis and Renewal, by George Packer (2021)

In this amazing popular book, *Atlantic* writer George Packer cuts to the chase: Economic inequality is destroying America, but this devastation has driven the activist population into four ideological camps, each feeding the others and paralyzing the nation through dubious theories of blame and redemption. Two of these camps are Smart America (the meritocracy) and Just America (social justice youth), both driving the Democratic Party. The other two are Free America (libertarian types) and Real America (traditionalists), driving the Republican Party.

This is a tale of narcissism and classism run amok, but carefully hidden behind barriers of privilege. . . a tale of grinding inequality destroying communities, while zealots demonize “the other.” As Packer puts it, “The American people have grown used to parasites attaching themselves at the top of our democracy and sucking its lifeblood.” Meanwhile, “Sexting with a staffer does more harm to a politician than profiteering in a national crisis” (p 22).

But the real damage is much deeper: Real America hates the hypocritical and condescending elites of Smart America and Just America so much that they love Trump even for his lies, just for sticking it to the elites. Even when “Trump saw the federal government as property he’d acquired by winning the election” (p 26) they didn’t object. Trust in the system had broken down. The same was true for COVID-19: “It didn’t matter what the experts said. The populists refused to believe them because they were experts” (p 31).

Thus “destruction of a shared reality does more damage than economic decline or impeachable acts,” and “once politics becomes

an identity clash or tribal war, a death spiral can set in” (p 32). Yet Packer sees hope in US history. We’ve been here before – the Civil War, the Gilded Age, the Great Depression, Vietnam and Civil Rights. In his later chapters he narrates the captivating stories of three activists who accomplished big things but kept their balance – their desire to reconcile the ideological camps of their day. These were Horace Greeley* (anti-slavery publisher), Frances Perkins (architect of the New Deal), and Bayard Rustin (strategist of the Civil Rights era). [Editor’s Note: [Horace Greeley](#) was a Universalist.]

Packer takes issue with all four of the ideological “Americas,” but especially with the most recent addition now sweeping the country – Just America – in an attempt to bring it back to sanity before it causes more damage. The proximal cause has been the Black Lives Matter protests, especially over the death of George Floyd. But Packer puts this in an historical context, “at once utopian and nihilistic,” going back to our Puritan ancestors: “These awakenings can take on the contours of religious experience, a particularly American one – sin, denunciation, confession, atonement, redemption, heresy hunting, book burning, and the dream of paradise” (p 53).

I note that the black public intellectual, John McWhorter, actually sees Critical Race Theory as a kind of religion. And Packer cites the key dogma of CRT, that students are now being taught is that “racism is not a matter of individual wrong but a system in which everyone is enmeshed regardless of conduct or intent.” Then the CRT experts revived the phrase, *white supremacy*, and “applied it to liberal newspapers and foundations” (p 54).

I note that the underlying purpose here was to weaponize these words, which, as commonly understood, describe a reality in terminal decline. Now any person identified as “white” could be attacked and beaten down with the clubs of *racism* and *white supremacy* if they did not abide by the latest linguistic or doctrinal orthodoxies of CRT. The immediate effect has been a cancel culture reminiscent of fundamentalist / totalitarian / fascist / McCarthyite thought control but the bigger political effect has been to throw gasoline on the fires of the cultural wars with Real America – especially the white working class. At one point Packer even uses the phrase “cultural revolution” (just think what that meant in Maoist China).

But why this craziness? Packer’s first answer is that our meritocratic youth had justifiably lost faith in the system due to the foreign policy debacle of the Iraq War, followed by the financial crash of 2008. But they also saw “below them, lousy schools, overflowing prisons, dying neighborhoods,” while they, themselves, were “loaded with debt” and meager opportunities, while “planetary destruction bore down” (p 119). The result has been a deep cynicism, with America “less a project of self-government to be improved than a site of continuous wrong to be battled” (p 120).

After-all, students had been taught the tenets of Critical Theory for a generation, upending “the universal values of the Enlightenment: objectivity, rationality, science, equality and freedom of the individual.” Instead it is assumed that “these liberal values are an ideology by which dominant groups subjugate other groups.” Here “all relations are power relations” with the focus on “language and identity more than material conditions,” centered around subjectivity “in place” of objective reality” (p 121), especially the “lived experienced of the oppressed”.

Packer concludes that “the fixed lens of power makes true equality, based on common humanity, impossible.” This locks us into a caste system where it’s not about

physical suffering, but purported “psychological trauma, harm from speech and texts, the sense of alienation that minorities feel in constant exposure to a dominant culture” (p 123). People are reduced to acting in “performance spaces” when “it would be far better to have real conversations between two people” (p 128) about objective reality, not theatrical poses and slogans.

Instead, in organizations we get “monolithic group thought, hostility to open debate, and moral coercion.” The sad result is that “grand systemic analysis usually ends up in small symbolic policies” (p 130) instead of the slow, hard work of productive change. To top this off, “Just America is a narrative of the young and well educated, which is why it continually misreads or ignores the Black and Latino working classes” (p 131).

While CRT is nominally a “repudiation of the meritocracy,” it is blind to how “confessing racial privilege is a way to hang on to class privilege” (p 132). Meanwhile the key to its success is white, meritocratic guilt: “Achievement is a fragile basis for moral identity, [so] when meritocrats are accused of racism they have no solid faith in their own worth to stand on.” That is, “Smart America abdicated to Just America” (p 133). The result is that we are now in a post-liberal era where “justice is power” (p 134), a zero-sum game of power plays rather than justice for the least among us, ennobling all.

Packer’s final verdict is that Just America is a “dead-end street.” Its origins in Critical Theory, its intolerant dogma, and its coercive tactics remind me of left-wing ideology in the 1930s. Liberalism as white supremacy recalls the Communist Party’s attack on social democracy as ‘social fascism’ (p 137). But Smart America, Free America, and Real America are also dead-ends, so we see a pitting of “tribe against tribe” with each narrative cramped into “an ever more extreme version of itself” (p 138). All of these tribes “anoint winners and losers” but the reality is that without equality, of at least dignity, “America doesn’t work” (p 139).

Thus in his final chapters Packer outlines some of the measures that will restore a more egalitarian society. There are no miracle cures here, just the hard work of things like universal health care and voting rights. But it will require giving up both American exceptionalism and its mirror image – American moral defeatism. He even suggests restoring a sense of patriotism in good government to find common ground between Real America and Just America.

Sectoral unions could restore the dignity and power of our essential workers. But a new national identity is needed based on the restoration of our liberal values – in the context of celebrating our ever-evolving multicultural roots – European, Indigenous, African, Asian, and Hispanic, of myriad varieties. Packer proclaims that “the solution to individualism is not religion or human fellowship or central planning – it’s self-government” itself, yet without equality “there is no

longer any basis for shared citizenship” (p 161).

Fortunately, America is now headed in the right direction – with rising wages in many sectors, a sudden increase in job mobility, and a Green New Deal on the horizon. But governance remains precarious, still blocking needed socio-economic reforms that privilege the few at the expense of the many. On the plus side, bipartisanship is starting to emerge in unlikely places, such as ending Middle East wars and revival of anti-trust laws.

The growing backlash against the excesses of Just America is forging new alliances across old party lines. Moral integrity and critical thinking skills are now being energized against unhinged ideologies, both new and old. Packer also hints at how this will help restore the international standing of the US, but a new global order remains to be envisioned.

Letter to the Seattle Times, printed May 23, 2021

RE: “How Wokeness Ends” [May 16, Opinion]

By Dick Burkhart

David Brooks’ column missed a key point. It is not just wokeness that is escalating, but also outright rebellion against its “second element” – its unhinged ideology. This resistance is building a new alliance across the political spectrum, from “principled conservatives” like Brooks himself all the way over to “principled progressives” like long-time Unitarian activists, myself included.

The ideological wokeness now sweeping through the Unitarian Universalist (UU) hierarchy, feeding off elite white guilt and linguistic battles, has lit up a backlash of “passion and commitment” that would amaze columnist Tyler Cowen, cited by Brooks. One such minister, the Rev. Dr. Todd Eklof, was so upset by the new regime of insult and smear that he handed out his skeptical book

The Gadfly Papers at a national meeting.

Sadly, the response was the hysteria and kangaroo court of a modern-day witch-hunt, fully documented in Eklof’s current book *The Gadfly Affair*. Yet the ranks of we UU “heretics” are now organized, swelling with each new cancellation. A new book, *Used to be UU*, by Jay Kiskel and Frank Casper actually takes up Eklof’s challenge, calling for the restoration of democracy, from legal due process to voting reform.

To other liberal organizations: You too are vulnerable - take heed.

Reference:

Brooks, David, *This is How Wokeness Ends*, New York Times, May 13, 2021, www.nytimes.com/2021/05/13/opinion/this-is-how-wokeness-ends.html.

On Congregational Polity

submitted by Miles Feldman

On the eve of GA, I came across some interesting stuff: A Comprehensive *Guide to Congregational Covenants*. This pointed to *Alice Blair Wesley's Minns Lecture Series* (recommended) and to *Congregational Polity 101*, which includes the basic principles of congregational polity that Robert Browne, the first Separatist from the Church of England, wrote down as a basis for gathering a church (published in 1542). The section heading Principles are listed below:

First Principle: *Connections with, or emulations of, civil and centralized powers corrupt the church*

Second Principle: *A church is the gathered fellowship of persons united by voluntary covenant*

Third Principle: *The church covenant is grounded inside of a larger, umbrella spiritual covenant*

Fourth Principle: *Only the laity as whole, acting*

in democratic process, can discern whether church decisions, including the selection of ministers, are in keeping with its spiritual commitments

Fifth Principle: *There is no higher authority than the local congregation*

Sixth Principle: *Churches do have obligations to each other which require some form of larger organization.*

Note: this is framed in the form of synods - loose associations, NOT central authority.)

Kind of puts current UUA policy in perspective.

References:

- [A Comprehensive Guide to Congregational Covenants](#)
- [Alice Blair Wesley's Minns Lecture Series](#)
- [Congregational Polity 101](#) (harvard-squarelibrary.org)

Hits it on the Head

A 5-Star Review by Dick Burkhardt of

Cancel This Book: The Progressive Case Against Cancel Culture,

by Dan Kovalik (2021)

This is a principled critique from the Left: “Too many on the Left, wielding the cudgel of ‘cancel culture,’ have decided that certain forms of censorship and speech and idea suppression are positive things that will advance the cause of social justice. I fear that those who take this view are in for a rude awakening” (p x). “Indeed, there is strong evidence that liberal social media accounts have been much greater victims of censorship than right-leaning accounts” (p ix). As someone who is on the economic Left myself, all this certainly rings true.

And when Kovalik gets into politics, he really hits it on the head: “Such tactics give excuses to such institutions as the *Post-Gazette* [a once-liberal Pittsburgh newspaper] to make the endorsement of a right-wing demagogue like Trump . . . This also takes the focus away from our quite-justified demands for social, racial, and economic justice” (p xii), replacing it by a “purely symbolic struggle” which “alienates many people.” “Sadly it is these very people – otherwise known as the white working class – who have been largely forsaken by liberals” (p xiii). That is, think about Hillary’s

“deplorables” comment.

Instead Kovalik, a long-time labor lawyer for the United Steel Workers, reminds us that MLK was one of “America’s greatest working class heroes” when he became determined to “build bridges between the civil rights and labor movements” (p xiv). Du Bois, as a Marxist, had also held out hope that black and white workers “could come together to defeat capitalism.” “Meanwhile Trump seized upon the abandonment of the working class to win the 2016 election” (p xv). “Liberals have also shown themselves as willing to deny science and facts as much as the right to advance their own political goals.”

But what actually constitutes “free speech” – where do we draw the line? Here Kovalik suggests “speech that offends, but does not interfere with another’s right of participation, should not be banned or otherwise suppressed” (p 2). This seems right on track to me since it would eliminate call-outs for “micro-aggressions” and other false claims of “harm” due to ideological or linguistic differences or a simple faux pas. Kovalik even quotes Ibram Kendi that an “anti-racist” is “gonna allow both themselves and other people to make mistakes.”

But Kovalik wants far more – to turn “free speech” into more effective communication. He points to a recent study that found “the practice of non-judgmental, in-depth conversations with voters about their experiences and struggles was 102 times more effective in actually convincing voters than brief ‘drive-by’ interactions” (p 3). Even more startling, he cites the story of Daryl Davis, an African American who . . . befriended members of the KKK” . . . convincing “200 Klan members to give up their robes” (p 4) over 30 years. Whereas confronting or canceling such people typically results “in racists simply doubling down on their bigotry.” In other words, the “deplorables” are not so deplorable once you get to know them.

In fact, Kovalik cites studies that “unionization and activity – which requires workers of

all races, genders, and backgrounds to work together in common cause – inevitably made workers less racist and sexist” (p 6). And when it comes to politics, his personal knowledge backs this up: Union “members would support a progressive candidate like [Bernie] Sanders because of his policy positions, such as Medicare for All, but not Hillary Clinton, whom they viewed as a liberal elitist who looked down on them and whose husband, Bill Clinton, negotiated many of the free trade agreements that led to the mass flushing of industrial jobs out of the United States” (p 8).

For much of the rest of the book Kovalik documents particular cancellations and their other abuses of power. This starts with Molly Rush, a revered, elderly peace activist in Pittsburgh, over her reposting on Facebook of “Looted nothing, Burned nothing, Attacked no one, Changed the World” (p 15) under a picture of MLK. This led to vicious social media attacks by some blacks and their white allies, even though the quoted statement was true and represented a legitimate protest against the nighttime violence in some cities, violence which eventually led to a huge loss in public support for Black Lives Matter.

In addition, Kovalik cites journalist Michael Tracey of “‘riots’ motivated by consciously insurrectionist ideology – consisting of arson attacks and other actions intended to maximize chaos – appearing to have been largely instigated by left wing activist whites” (p 24). In Seattle we know such types as “black bloc anarchists” for their clothing, not their race. Noting that people-of-color businesses were often targeted, Kovalik says that the “indifference of white progressives to this loss might itself be seen as a manifestation of racism and white supremacy, but few dared to call it such” (p 24). And that “it is deemed heresy in the ‘woke’ left to even discuss the episodes of white protest condescension toward Black leaders” (p 28), especially those who protested property destruction. He

points out that even Lenin advised that “violent acts against people and property . . . tend only to turn off and alienate the masses” (p 25).

A closely related kind of persecution cited by Kovalik is illustrated by certain kinds of diversity trainings, such as the 800 company trainings over 30 years studied by Dobbin and Kalev. “This study showed that diversity training tends to enforce racial stereotypes and to lower sympathy toward poor whites” (p 18), breeding resentment, especially among whites of modest means, “that they somehow benefit from ‘white supremacy’ even while struggling to makes ends meet.” In fact, I know that other studies show that the white working class in the US has suffered over the last 40 years substantially greater reductions of income and status than their black working-class cousins. But Kovalik notes that “employers can have the benefit of virtue signaling by pretending to do something for racial justice and gender equality . . . and the consultants themselves can cash in.”

Kovalik reiterates the observation of others, like John McWhorter, about the religious nature of the BLM protests, though he doesn’t cite its ideological source in Critical Race Theory. He says that the BLM protests that he witnessed “were indeed more religious in nature than they were political. They seemed more about white protesters going to somehow purify themselves than about achieving any particular political ends” (p 33). He contrasts this with the plight of the many poor whites living in “abject poverty and squalor in this country who would be surprised to hear that the system is rigged in their favor,” noting that in Alabama and West Virginia “a high proportion of the population is not served by public sewage and water supply services” (p 37).

Kovalik observes, “I guess there will always be people who will respond to the stick, who will voluntarily wear a hair shirt as penance for sins they didn’t know . . . they had . . . but for how long?” (p 38). So for him the

BLM protests were a “huge lost opportunity.” And, as to the effects of unjust cancellations, J.K. Rowling is quoted: “People find it far easier to forgive others for being wrong than for being right” (p 39). I’ve seen this in my own Unitarian Universalist Association, where many accusers behind a major witch-hunt just bore down harder rather than apologize and move on. Indeed, Kovalik cites a study of Politically Correct Authoritarian personality types, who shared the same triad of pathologies, whether on the Left or the Right: Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy” (p 46). In fact, these radicals on the Left and Right “feed off each other, with the one hardly able to exist without the other.”

To sum it up, Kovalik observes that “A number of people refer to such cancellations as the New McCarthyism” (p 42). He points to the McCarthy era cancellation of the famous African American singer and activist Paul Robeson, who “had an incredible rapport with these members of the white working class [the miners of Wales]” (p 43). He concludes that the cancellation “movement, as currently constituted, knows how to destroy . . . not to create, and this is the problem” (p 49).

Next, Kovalik takes a dive into the classism behind cancel culture. He quotes Thomas Frank: “Why do Americans despise liberals?” “That liberalism has become a politics of upper-class bullying and of character assassination is an impression that’s daily becoming more and more difficult to avoid” (p 54). The diagnosed attitude, from River Page, is that “those among us who are prosperous are so because of their moral superiority” with virtue signaling, “by focusing almost entirely on issues that will not burden their wallets, such as flying a rainbow flag for supporting LGBT rights or putting up a ‘Black Lives Matter’ sign in their yard while . . . ‘essential workers’ . . . are treated more like ‘expendable workers’” (p 52).

Kovalik concludes that “while the ‘woke’ revolution will not be televised (actually it is,

quite a bit), it will receive corporate sponsorship” (p 63). Meanwhile Ajuma Baraka, of the Black Alliance for Peace, “expressed disappointment . . . that the protests over the summer did not address . . . the most pressing problems facing all Americans, but especially African Americans” (p 74). Democratic pollster Danny Barefoot found a deep “distaste for the slogan ‘defund the police’” (p 77), a “horrible error” that many think was a key factor in the failure of the “blue wave” in the November 2020 elections.

Being in touch with miners, Kovalik observes that “many living in the Iron Range voted for Trump, not because they are racist, but because they believed, and for good reason, that Trump helped save the mining industry in the region, something the Democrats made no pretense of doing” (p 80). But “all the democratic socialists who won [in November, 2020] ran on platforms that included the very popular Medicare for All and a Green New Deal” (p 83). In fact, “preliminary numbers indicated that 26% of Trump’s . . . share came from non-white voters – the highest . . . for the GOP . . . since 1960” (p 86), declining from 2016 only for white males, while the increase for non-whites came from those without college degrees (the working class). Thus Kovalik concludes that “finding common ground is more within reach than we are told” (p 89).

Then class and history get even more attention, citing the case of the eminent black Marxist Adolph Reed, himself recently canceled for not toeing the party line. His observation is that “lasting victories were achieved . . . when working class and people of all races fought together, shoulder to shoulder, for their rights” (p 95). Yet Reed fears that “antiracism [as popularized by Kendi] in the 21st century may be used for the same purposes as racism in the 20th century – to divide the working class” (p 93). Kovalik finds that ‘wokeness’ “is nothing more or less than a form of elitism in which the better educated look down on the less educated” (p 103), a view shared by black scholars like John McWhorter, even Cornel West in more measured terms.

Further chapters focus on the hypocrisy of US imperialism, the scurrilous attacks on Bernie Sanders and Tulsi Gabbard, the plight of dissidents in the university, historical censorship, and attacks on defenders of Palestine. In other words, Kovalik marshals a vigorous, insightful, and thorough response from the Old Left to the hypocrisies and elitism of today’s Radical Left. The radicals’ cancel culture has not only failed to defeat Trumpism, but paved the way for Trump’s victory in 2016 and the conspiracy theories that now prey on the abused masses.