

Milo, Free Speech, Nazis, Black Bloc, and more...and more

All,

I'd like to pick up on the Milo conversation because it appears that the first part of the Trump/Bannon strategy has been revealed in the wake of the Berkeley shutdown yesterday. Shortly afterward, Trump [tweeted out](#) "If U.C. Berkeley does not allow free speech and practices violence on innocent people with a different point of view - NO FEDERAL FUNDS?"

I think we should take this seriously and adjust our strategy for confronting Milo accordingly. In this light, I also think we should consider Milo's "Dangerous Faggot" tour as a part of a political campaign against the academy and the left, in a Leninist sense. Protests against Milo demonstrate that the left is intolerant of speech, and is in a sense violating basic constitutional protections. This argument can then be mobilized to pose some tough questions to the administrations of these campuses. Do those administrations refuse to allow far right speakers on their campuses and risk losing federal funding? Do they allow those speakers on campus and risk protests as well as politicizing a generation of middle class reactionaries?



In the past, we've discussed the importance of opposing the far right because not only are they speaking, which is bad enough, but

the speaking is part of their organizing, their recruitment and so on. I'll admit it's seemed a little obtuse: how exactly is Nick Griffin speaking in East Lansing part of a broader organizing strategy? I've understood it as making grassroots connections.

I think there's much more to this strategy in the case of Milo. It's important to remember that Bannon thinks of himself as a Leninist, and he and Milo are personally connected through the most Leninist of organizing strategies, a newspaper. I think that sheds light on this strategy because of the issues it poses to college campuses. The Alt Right wins no matter what happens during Milo's tour. If colleges shut down his events, they can be accused of violating the country's "inviolable" political conventions. If colleges allow him to speak, and the left riots, then the left itself will likely be subjected to much stricter controls on its speech. Either way, Milo's campaign represents an attack on the academy and/or the left, some of the most important intellectual resources for any opposition to the Alt Right, at least if one believes that politics is another way of waging war.

It's also worth pointing out that on-the-ground organizers in Berkeley seem to have recognized that Milo's tour was laying a trap for them to walk into, and that they did. Check out, for example, [this interview](#) on NPR between a UC Berkeley junior who knows what's happening and a naive, liberal graduate student.

Mike S.

All,

In a few hours I will be at a meeting where some of last night's organizers will also be present, and although we're not meeting about the Milo demo, I will discuss it with them.

I am less concerned with Yiannopoulos per se (although what Mike raised is important and needs discussion) than with the question of how to deal with the black bloc. This is a similar question as to how to deal with Weatherman was in the sixties, and it will recur. I will provide details later.

Jack

Mike and All,

Others can (and I am sure will) address this in greater detail. But, briefly:

We should be *for* organizing campaigns that publicize Milo's views and explain why they are foul. We should be *for* protests that further highlight these views and highlight why we denounce them.

We should be *against* demands that he be forbidden to speak. We should be *against* disruptive actions that result in a tiny minority deciding for others what they can and cannot hear.

In other words, we should combat racist, homophobic, xenophobic *ideas* in the *realm of ideas*; we should (generally speaking) be *on the side of free speech*, even speech we disagree with.

Rod

All,

Before everyone jumps on this free speech bandwagon, let me just say: "you have a right to free speech, but not without me yelling and screaming and organizing my friends to shut you down." I'm not for meaningless vandalism, but come on. The liberal press will always blame radicals for ruining their peaceful protests.

Black bloc is a whole separate discussion

Sandy

Sandy and All,

You have the right to 'shut me down' exactly why? Because you have determined that I am 'objectively in the way?' (Perhaps not me, but someone else.)

So the 'Free Speech Movement' really wasn't about free speech, it was about left-wingers right to free speech?

We will build a libertarian society by some self-appointed group deciding what views are acceptable and what views are not? And if they are really not acceptable, why stop at preventing speech? How

about the Gulag?

There ARE human rights. If there aren't, there are only categories. I do not wish to be a slave to someone's categories.

Rod

Everyone,

I agree strongly with Rod. His distinctions (for and against) in the first post, and follow-up points here, are exactly right. In addition to the strategic-tactical reasons, there are principled reasons. Free speech and its associated rights are a precious part of our heritage that many have died for and that are too rare in today's world.

I remember, long ago during my post-college year in Tanzania, East Africa, saying to an African student of mine that some possible action by the U.S. president (don't remember what) was unlikely because, probably, the Supreme Court would rule against him. The idea that there was a part of the U.S. government that could tell the president his action was illegal made an enormous impact. Freedom in several forms is a part of the attraction of "America" (the ideal) to other cultures, and it is NOT a wrong idea or a concession to bourgeois ideology.

Tactical issues--in this case, how to relate to a genuine mass protest against Yiannopoulos that then went (or was taken) off-track; more broadly, stance on Black Bloc, which Jack raises--are very important and need careful thought, but we should be clear on principles.

Not incidentally, I'm writing as (I think) the only one of us presently Employed and active as a college professor. Free speech and discussion (including, at times, angry shouting, but when possible conducted civilly) are part of the best (not the only) student culture. If there is going to be a new campus movement (as seems to be happening) we need to be part of the wing that wins people's allegiance through ideas and program.

Combining that stance with effective work in mass action may be tricky at times but that should be our starting point.

Chris

Hi Rod, Sandy and all,

Rod, there is no arguing that you are totally right. However, Sandy's point is well taken when you think about the Nazi's and the KKK. What we did was right and when a group is talking about exterminating and genocide actively, there should be no free speech. So, it depends.

I think with Milo we should get the campus ready for his alt right politics (like Jack and Rod said) explaining what he thinks and stands for and let them, the student body, take care of the rest. If they decide to shut him down so be it.

Roni

All,

I would like to see Roni's point addressed. Are the Nazis and the Klan entitled to free speech? To march through towns calling for what they call for? Or to hold public forums, invoking free speech, off campus? On campus?

Thanks.

Jack

All,

In response to Roni's comment and Jack's question:

The reason I wrote 'generally speaking' in my brief comments to Mike was because I was discussing the Milo/college campus situation he had raised.

I don't believe free speech is a timeless, abstract and 'total' right; even those operating within the framework of the (pro-capitalist, denier of rights) U.S. Constitution, agree with this--every schoolgirl and schoolboy learns that there is a First Amendment, but you can't yell 'fire' in a crowded movie theater. This is not our framework, but I make the point.

If a group of Nazis (etc.) marched into a black neighborhood with racist signs and slogans (and perhaps a call for 'back to Africa'), I

would fully support actions by the people of that neighborhood to physically drive the Nazis out.

The issue therefore requires context and specificity. The problem with fully addressing Roni's point and Jack's question is that countless hypotheticals can be posed, slicing and dicing the question endlessly. That makes full resolution difficult, if not impossible.

Rod

All,

Glad to see rods clarification of free speech as less than an absolute.

I do think "truth" is part of it. I fully support the black lives matter movement disrupting the "free speech" of the police commission meetings, and every other time the righteous rage of the people is confronting the political power structure.

I agree that the Milo on college campuses thing is more nuanced. It is a college campus, where intellectual dialogue is a great and important value, but it is not a classroom discussion, but rather an organized rally to promote a heinous agenda.

I think we can condemn black bloc while still standing with people's outrage.

In struggle,

Sandy

All,

Yes free speech is less than an absolute. Wouldn't it be nice if demonstrably false information, spread as fact, was not protected?

As for Milo, why not invite him to debate?

Robin

Everybody,

I think we need to keep in mind that much (most) of the left today, off and on the campuses, is authoritarian, if not totalitarian. As we know, much of the left is supporting Russian expansionism in Georgia, Ukraine, and elsewhere in eastern Europe on the grounds that Russia has a right to an imperialist "sphere" of influence, as well as holding the thug, Putin, up as some kind of anti-imperialist. They also defend Assad in Syria or hide behind claims that "we" really don't know what happened in Aleppo and/or what the Russian-backed butcher Assad is doing and has done to the Syrian people. On many campuses, campus radicals have pushed "political correctness" to a ridiculous extreme, demanding, for example, that campus administrations ban "extremist" speakers and make the campuses a completely "safe" environment, by setting up elaborate speech codes that essentially outlaw any statement or any action that anybody finds offensive in any way, so-called "micro-aggressions." One dean was fired because of the uproar that occurred after she issued a statement, addressing a campus racial incident that ended with the slogans: "Black Lives Matter", "All Lives Matter." Apparently, she wasn't aware of the campus left's PC code that to say "All Lives Matter," even after saying "Black Lives Matter," was/is racist. I doubt that any of us could survive in places like that, since, for example, I don't like (among other things) affirmative action. This is why I personally describe myself as "on, but not of, the left". I despise much (most) of the left in this country and around the world, which is why I believe we need to distinguish ourselves as much as we can from them.

As for the campus left today, please see the following article:

<http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/12/campus-protests-1960s-213450>

Ron

All,

Anarchists Respond to Trump's Inauguration, by Any Means Necessary

<https://nyti.ms/2k72s95>

Jack

All,

Here's an interesting article in the Independent about this very topic, and it shares Ron's approach with a lot of good reasons... It's definitely worth reading.

Why the Anti-Trump Resistance Movement Should Not Initiate Violence, by Michal Steven Smith:

<https://indypendent.org/2017/02/01/why-anti-trump-resistance-movement-should-not-initiate-violence>

Mary

Mary

great article. totally agree. we need all of us

meanwhile, Republican state legislatures are busy with new legislation to make protest illegal

which underlines why our protests must remain non-violent

and why i think women need to take on leadership roles, in a very conscious way, and men need to support that

Robin

Everybody,

I'm sorry if I haven't made myself clear, but, except for one (minor) point, I definitely do NOT agree with the article Mary posted and whose approach she seems to think I share.

1. I do NOT think we are in a "pre-fascist" period. I see no sector of the ruling elite that is currently in favor of any kind of attempt to eliminate bourgeois democracy and replace it with a fascist regime. In addition to a mass popular mobilization against Trump, I believe significant sectors of the ruling class are now either actively organizing against the Trump administration or else moving into opposition. This includes top executives in Silicon Valley and other elements in the corporate elite, large sectors of the federal bureaucracy (starting with the State Department), important

segments of the judicial establishment, along with the governing elites of at least 16 states and many cities. They do not agree with Trump's travel ban, his plan to build an impenetrable wall on the border with Mexico, his proposal to slap a 20% tax on imports (which may spark a trade war), his plans to junk NAFTA and other trade deals, his attempts to bully individual corporations, his proclaimed desire to junk NATO and other military alliances, let alone his rude, disruptive, and embarrassing phone calls to foreign leaders, which have forced other figures among the elite to run around to explain to foreign representatives that they shouldn't take the president's behavior seriously.

2. I do NOT consider the members of the Black Bloc to be somewhat misguided "brothers and sisters." I vehemently oppose their stupid and violent tactics, which I believe are counterproductive to building, expanding, and uniting the developing mass movement. Moreover, I believe the approach of the Black Bloc reveals the authoritarian, even totalitarian, tendencies of much of the left, their belief that they have a monopoly of the Truth and that this gives them the right to compel others to agree with them. Although members of the Black Bloc may consider themselves to be anarchists, they are anything but that. Instead of pursuing libertarian goals, they look to the arch-authoritarian Weatherman faction of SDS (later the Weather Underground), who despised the vast majority of the American people and were militant supporters of brutal one-party Stalinist dictatorships, as heroes to be emulated.

3. I do NOT believe we are facing "socialism or barbarism." As I've written elsewhere, I see this slogan as a less-than-honest attempt to maintain the validity of the Marxian claim to have discovered a logic of history, an immanent dynamic of capitalism, that will impel the working class to rise up, overthrow capitalism, and replace it with socialism, at a time when it should be clear to all those not completely deluded by Marxist ideology that such a proposition is no longer sustainable. If it is to be a truly free society and not a form of state capitalism, socialism cannot be something that is ordained (or almost/sorta/kinda ordained). Socialism is an ethical goal that must be consciously chosen and striven for by the vast majority of the world's people if it is to be brought into existence.

Ron

Friends and comrades,

I am mostly in agreement with points one and two of Ron's comments, not three--which I won't go into again at this time. (But I have been criticized on anarchistnews.org for being *too "moralistic,"* by Stirnerite individualist anarchists. Go figure.)

Let me add: many anarchists and radicals were deeply impressed with the "no free speech for fascists" line in the anti-fascist struggles. They "learned" to generalize this to "no free speech for anyone who disagrees with us." An argument for "free speech" needs to take this into account. On a more theoretical level, many anarchists were directly or indirectly influenced by the "insurrectionist" trend, as opposed to the mass struggle trend of anarchism. They do not think about how to build a popular movement, or to build a radical wing of such a movement.

I recently had an exchange with some Canadian anarchists. They are angry at a left journalist who is touring Canada, giving support to Assad of Syria, in the name of "anti-imperialism." In this they are quite justified. But their conclusion is "we encourage people on any of this tour's stops to disrupt Bartlett's spouting of dictatorship." This is not even a question of fighting with the right, but of promoting physical suppression of left-wing views. I wrote a couple of comments (just opposing suppression of left views, not getting into larger issues.)

It is at ***Fuck Assad, Fuck his Western Lackeys: An anarchist statement on Eva Bartlett's Hamilton presentations***

<http://anarchistnews.org/content/fuck-assad-fuck-his-western-lackeys-anarchist-statement-eva-bartlett's-hamilton>

Solidarity,
Wayne

Hi

I strongly agree with Ron's point #1.

However on the Black Bloc, could you point to some sources Ron on the Weather's influence on them? I was not aware of this...

My understanding is that the Black Bloc type folks today are influenced by insurrectionary anarchism, Crime thinc, other layers are influenced by Tiqqinists, other layers are into communization theories.... It should be noted that anyone can mask up so it is very heterogeneous in one sense. There is no membership.

Can you explain what about them is authoritarian, totalitarian, and monopolizers of the truth?

I do consider Black Bloc comrades for many reasons.

Here is a good history of the Black Bloc and a critique:
<https://viewpointmag.com/2012/02/12/on-the-black-bloc/>

In reply to Wayne on Insurrectionary Anarchists not building a mass movement. The insurrectionary anarchists so to speak in NYC are one of the most important scenes in building defense groups, and emergency response networks throughout Brooklyn. Tonight they have someone from Minneapolis giving a talk on General Defense Committees.

Shemon

Wayne,

As you know from my previous post, I am in agreement with all three of Ron's points.

Regarding point #3, which you disagree with (but opted not to pursue), I will only say that *if there are only two options, and we know what they are* (socialism or barbarism), then there is a blueprint for history. I don't think there is; I think Marxism thinks there is. I think this concept is intrinsically totalitarian, and I also think it is intrinsically linked to points #1 and #2.

Your other comments open up a new arena for discussion, one in which I disagree with both you and Ron.

I do not consider myself an anarchist. Nor do I consider myself, in any sense, a Marxist. I haven't found a 'label' that fits.

I supported the formulation 'revolutionary democratic socialist' in the movement leaflet discussion, because: 1) I believe a revolution, of some type, is necessary to end capitalism and create a liberated, just, humane society; 2) 'Democratic' is a differentiator from Stalinism/Marxism, though an imperfect one, to be sure; 3) socialism is what you and I think it is (though goodness knows, most people think it something different). I shy away from libertarian because I keep running into people who are confused, since it currently has a very different meaning. I am open to swapping 'democratic' for 'libertarian'--I find nothing *principled* in this distinction, and am surprised that you do. These are labels.

In your discussion, you point out that there is a strong trend among anarchists that you and I would consider totalitarian ("no free speech for anyone who disagrees with us"). You also point to another strong trend in anarchism-- 'insurrectionist anarchism' -- made up of people who do not believe in building a mass movement (or, put another way, people who are terrorists in the style of the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries). There are also other trends within anarchism that you and I would agree don't reflect our politics. My point? In searching for a label, I find this one wanting. While it does express a 'fuck you' (i.e., oppositional) spirit, I think it says less (that I agree with) than it says (things I agree with).

I look forward to exploring these issues with you and others. In the end, I don't think the label matters; however, I think it frames a discussion of means that do matter.

Rod

Shemon,

SO informative and interesting, Shemon. Let the discussion continue. I have no personal experience with the black bloc tendency, so I am just listening for now.

Sandra

Shemon.

It is a bad habit of mine (and perhaps a few others) to throw off comments without explaining the background. This trait is

encouraged by the nature of email. At least we aren't doing tweets!
It would take a lot to go into it thoroughly, about the weaknesses of the Black Bloc, as it has evolved. I do not believe that the movement is dominated by a consciousness of the need to win over vast numbers of the population, to build a big radical wing of the popular anti-Trump movement. Of course I could be wrong, and, as Shemon says, the BB is an extremely heterogeneous milieu. Most of them are subjectively revolutionary anarchists and important to talk to.

Shemon mentions the influence on the BBers of Crimethinc. I have written two essays on Crimethinc, the first being a criticism of its attack on democracy of all sorts, the second on the need to win over masses of people by raising radical demands:

Are Anarchism and Democracy Opposed? A Response to Crimethinc

<http://anarchistnews.org/content/are-anarchism-and-democracy-opposed-response-crimethinc>

Response to Crimethinc's "Why We Don't Make Demands"

http://www.anarkismo.net/article/28353?search_text=Wayne+Price

Shemon also mentions the influence on the BBers of the Tiquanists. I have also written a critique of that approach:

"The Coming Insurrection"?

http://www.anarkismo.net/article/18041?search_text=Wayne+Price

Solidarity,
Wayne

All,

Insurrectionary anarchism. I thought it was pretty well accepted that Weatherman was considered one source of inspiration. Here's a link to a web page with various such references.

<https://sites.google.com/site/occupologist/weatherman>

Also: while as Shemon says the black bloc is heterogeneous -- and that's important -- I know that several in the Oakland core have

look to the author of the SDS white skin privilege document -- Noel Ignatin -- for mentoring. I can provide more information on this off list.

In Occupy Oakland, the insurrectionist anarchists acted in a de facto anti democratic manner. The general assemblies were scripted in advance. Passing a motion only required a simple majority, but overturning a passed motion required a 90% super majority. This was consciously used to thwart democratic functioning -- if 51 people approved a motion at the end of a meeting when attendance had dwindled, it would be almost impossible to overturn it.

Furthermore: what do we say when tactical decisions arrived at democratically are overturned by a group that marches in and takes matters into their own hands? If you like, I can give you example dating back several years. If one believes in the theory of the act, as they do, then that's not a concern. But it should be to us.

Jack

Shemon,

I have no authoritative (citable) sources about the Black Bloc/Insurrectionalists' view of the Weathermen, only personal conversations, direct and indirect. In fact, in the years I spent in the anarchist movement - at gatherings, conferences, and in personal conversations - I was (unpleasantly) surprised to learn how many young anarchists of a variety of persuasions were totally deluded about - in fact, in awe of - the Weathermen. All they knew about was the bombings, the Brinks robbery, the underground, etc., and very little about their actual politics; their hatred of white people (including themselves, for their "white skin privilege), their romanticization of Third World countries, their intense attraction to Stalinist movements and regimes, etc. I personally knew quite a few of the Weathermen, including Mark Rudd, Ted Gold (I was one his roommates for a year, until he kicked me out because of my politics), Naomi Jaffe, and Dave Gilbert, and I can personally attest to their attitudes. More specifically, I can describe how they evolved from a hyper-theoretical left-liberalism to the extreme fanaticism at which they wound up. As a trend, I see the contemporary Insurrectionalists (as opposed to, say, Malatesta, whom I

respect) as political opponents, along with Stalinists, within the movement. They, along with what I see as the general authoritarianism of much of the left, are one of the reasons I describe myself as being "on, but not of" the left.

I think that people who believe that systematic violence (breaking windows, trashing cars and small businesses, carrying out robberies and bombings) outside of the immediate context of a mass popular insurrection, is the appropriate strategy generally reveal strong authoritarian/totalitarian tendencies, that is, the desire to impose their views on other people through violence and coercion, rather than persuasion. I also think Wayne's anecdote about the Canadian anarchists suggests the same thing.

Wayne

Everybody,

On the question of our attitude toward free speech for people like Milo, I urge people to read, think about, and comment on Mike S's discussions of the issue, rather than criticizing him for suggesting that the Klan and Nazis have the right to free speech. Until people know more about the Alt-Right and what they say, I think that a campaign to discredit them ideologically, rather than merely disrupting events, makes sense, although I doubt we'll have much influence about this in the movement.

Ron

All,

FYI!

http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-black-bloc-20170212-story.html?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=twitter

Roni

All,

Excellent argument for why violence at protests is a bad strategy by Professor Keeanga Tamahtta-Taylor: because the violence brings police presence, and those police are then primed to be violent

themselves, making it difficult or impossible for certain groups of people to participate in those protests: immigrants, families with children, black people, men in particular

and anyone else who would rather not be in a riot

she says-- as we all have said-- that we need a mass movement if we are to succeed

Heard this on the intercepted podcast

Robin

Everybody,

For those who may be interested in some names from the past:

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2017/02/25/the-captive-mind-of-trump-true-believer-david-horowitz.html>

Ron

All,

In the article Ron cites, the author quotes David Horowitz, ex-leftist, now reactionary:

Horowitz concludes that in order to win the struggle for America's future, "conservatives must begin every confrontation by punching progressives in the mouth." Elsewhere in the book [on Trump], Horowitz writes: "Republicans must adhere to a strategy that begins with a punch in the mouth."

Me: In George Orwell's 1984, the agent of the totalitarian state declares: "If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face --forever."

Wayne

March 4
Everybody,

For some enlightening news about voucher programs for schools,

see:

<http://www.latimes.com/business/hiltzik/la-fi-hiltzik-devos-vouchers-20170228-story.html>

Ron

March 8

Hi All,

Here are some pictures of demo's around the world I found on line.

<http://www.nbcnews.com/slideshow/strike-women-march-around-world-n730821>

Roni

March 9

Everybody,

Here's a snapshot of attitudes toward transgender issues in rural Texas:

<http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Society/2017/0308/Small-town-mayor-offers-different-window-on-Texas-transgender-debate>

Ron

March 10

All,

Just got back from Cuba at midnight last night. Lovely, fun people and the greatest of all types of live music. Their economic system is in shambles. The 60% of the people who work for the state, including all of the doctors, engineers, etc get a salary of \$20-\$70/month, while people working in the new private sector (including tour guides, private drivers, and restaurant owners) are earning tens or even hundreds of times as much. For instance, a tour guide might make \$1,000 a week in tips from Americans and Europeans. Even after taxes (the new and dreaded word in Habana) it is a crazy differential. Will be fascinating to watch what happens.

Sandy

March 16

Everybody,

Here's an insightful look at the dynamics inside the Trump administration re Mattis and McMaster:

http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/war_stories/2017/03/the_powerlessness_of_mattis_mcmaster_and_tillerson.html

Ron

March 16

There is an interesting discussion on this issue by Sam Farber--not an anarchist but a radical socialist.

<https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/02/garton-ash-free-speech-milo-yiannopoulos/>

He makes the following point, referring to the proposed Skokie march of Nazis some years back (Skokie being a most Jewish neighborhood in Illinois):

"The ACLU claimed that because the march did not pose an intended, likely, and imminent danger of violence, it counts as constitutionally protected speech. This clarifies an important distinction between the antiracist left and the more broadly liberal ACLU. For groups like the ACLU, violent intimidators should enjoy the same free speech rights as racist persuaders like Jensen, Hernstein, and Murray until the speech becomes dangerous. For the antiracist left, violent intimidators are categorically different from racist persuaders.

The relationship between groups like neo-Nazis or the KKK and democratic social movements is one of open belligerence rather than ideological struggle. Violent intimidators are not trying to persuade, but to intimidate. Their language is the language of violence. As far as the social movements are concerned, the otherwise reasonable rule that speech is protected until violence appears imminent should not apply to these violent intimidators: instead, that principle allows them the choice to select the time, place, and manner most favorable for their violent actions."

I think this principle may be applied in current cases.

Wayne

March 20
Hi All,

The Dems are having a real hard time! Take a look. On the other hand Sanders folks are solidly ELECTORAL!

<http://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/democrats-vs-trump/democrats-beware-sanders-movement-turns-midterms-n735301>

Roni

March 21
Everyone,

Here's an edited-down interview I did about a year ago for "OutCasting," a radio show aimed at and conducted by LGBTQ youth. It covers my own bio and LGBTQ history and lasts about a half hour. There's a "play" bar at the top under the heading.

Chris

<http://mfpg.org/index.php/outcasting/87-outcasting/outcasting-episodes/200-outcasting-0035-lgbtq-history-a-discussion-with-gay-elder-christopher-z-hobson>

March 24

What the youngsters are reading these days.

https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B2LFN5LtxTz3TzJya1VDSjVnWDA/edit?usp=doclist_api&filetype=msword

Shemon

March 24
Everybody,

The latest polls show that Trump's base is eroding. Yay!

http://www.slate.com/blogs/the_slatest/2017/03/22/new_quinnipia

[c_poll_shows_trump_s_numbers_sliding_60_percent_find_him_dishonest.html](#)

Ron

March 26

The following was sent to me by my brother. It includes a report on the health status and general morale of the US white working class, which is worth looking at.

<http://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/new-research-identifies-a-%E2%80%98sea-of-despair%E2%80%99-among-white-working-class-americans/ar-BByCdsY?li=BBnb7Kz>

Wayne

March 26

Wayne,

Thanks for forwarding that. I particularly like the line that said (roughly): "The economists said that there is no obvious solution, but a starting point would be limiting the use of opioids." That really gets to the heart of things, doesn't it?

Ron

March 27

Hi Folks,

I continue to be concerned about those who continue to rally around Trump despite all that he represents... And, to be even more depressing, here's a video of Chris Hedges' analysis of what's happening and the potential escalation of the state, police forces, etc. and what that could lead to... Here's the link:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Na_jAtxpmiI&t=4s

And here's another one he does that focuses more on the role of the Christian right & their fascist beliefs (aligned with his book, American

Fascists... Here's the link:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TfhEWFMeT0o>

Hope you're all doing well...

Mary
