

The Alt Right and Tyler Durden's Advice

Robert S. Griffin

www.robertsgriffin.com

In early November of this year, 2016, I received an email message about an all-day conference in Washington D. C. on November 19th sponsored by the National Policy Institute entitled *Become Who We Are/2016*.

CELEBRATE THE ALT RIGHT! The past 12 months might be remembered as the year of Donald Trump . . . the year of the Red Pill . . . and the year of the Alt Right. It was a time when more people joined our movement than ever before and when our ideas invaded the mainstream. *Become Who We Are/2016*—which will take place just after November's presidential election—will give us the opportunity to ask *what's next?*

In this writing, I'll offer some thoughts, or comments, keying off of the elements in the conference notice—celebration . . . the Alt Right. . . our movement, more people have joined it, our ideas have invaded the mainstream . . . the Red Pill . . . Donald Trump . . . become who we are . . . ask what's next. I'll speak to each of the items on this list at some point in these next pages.

I'll start with the idea of celebration. Celebration is great. Every night just before I go to sleep, I think of three things I did that day I can feel good about, and while celebrate is too strong a word for it, I do have a “good for you,” uplifted moment before I turn out the light. The point here, though, is that no matter what you do that's a good thing to do, contrasting, even opposite and contradicting, things are almost always also good things to do. In this case, self-congratulation should be accompanied by rigorous self-and-circumstance analysis and assessment. Integral to that process is the identification of the downsides, the issues, around

you and what you are doing or contemplating doing. Everything involves costs, limitations, problems, and negative as well as positive outcomes. You do yourself a favor if you know what they are when figuring out what's going on in your life and asking, as the conference notice put it, *what's next?*

The conference notice made mention of the Red Pill. If you aren't familiar with it, it's a pop culture reference, from the 1999 film, "The Matrix." The protagonist—played by Keanu Reeves—is given a choice: he can take a blue pill and remain in his life of comfortable delusion, or he can take a red pill, which will bring him into the world of reality. So the Red Pill is a metaphor for living a life grounded in the truth about things. Race realism is a good example of a Red Pill concept. The Red Pill reference in the conference notice is to make the point that the Alt Right sees itself as being rooted in reality.

The Red Pill/Blue Pill distinction is indeed a useful one. However, back to the concern for reality, we need to remind ourselves that the Red Pill is a mental construct, words; it is not the reality it proposes to depict. Reality is almost certainly not as dualistic, a matter of either-or, as the Red and Blue Pill concept implies it is. I feel sure that most if not all people's pills are speckled, some combination of red and blue specks. When someone, including a Alt Right conference attendee, announces to himself and the world that he has taken the Red Pill, what probably went on is that his pill had more red speckles than it did before but that, though he didn't realize it, it still had a lot of blue speckles; perhaps blue speckles were in the majority. There is even the possibility that while he thought his pill was red, it was just about, or totally, blue. I remember believing Freud had it wired, no doubt about it.

What you or I think is what we think; and what we think may or may not be aligned with concrete reality. We have to stay open and humble about what we know, and we have to continually press forward toward reality, the truth about things; that is to say, toward

getting our pill redder than it was before. I've concluded that I'm going to die with more than a few blue speckles on my pill. But I'm committed to do my best to get the blue speckles down as a percentage, because I want to live however long it turns out that I'm allotted on this earth as fully awake and aware as I can manage it.

We also need to keep in mind that while we are looking at ourselves and our worlds through one lens—here it's red and blue pills--we are *not* looking at it through all of the other lenses we might employ, and that some of these other lenses, perspectives, might be good ones, perhaps even better than the one that's occupying our time and attention at the moment. Pete Seeger wrote a song in the late 1950s called "Turn! Turn! Turn!" Seeger drew the lyrics of the song almost word-for-word from the first eight verses of the biblical book of Ecclesiastes.

To everything
There is a season
And a time to every purpose, under heaven
A time to be born, a time to die
A time to plant, a time to reap
A time to kill, a time to heal
A time to laugh, a time to weep . . .
A time to build up, a time to break down
A time to dance, a time to mourn
A time to cast away stones, a time to gather stones together . . .
A time of love, a time of hate
A time of war, a time of peace
A time you may embrace, a time to refrain from embracing . . .
A time to gain, a time to lose
A time to rend, a time to sew
A time for love, a time for hate
A time for peace, I swear it's not too late

I'm not advocating anything here, saying that Ecclesiastes might be a better frame of reference than "The Matrix," nothing like that. I'm just suggesting that there are a lot of ways to look at

your life—there’s pills, there’s race, there’s peace, there’s love, all sorts of ways—and while you are doing whatever you are doing, keep your eye open for them.

Now to Alt (Alternative) Right, this categorization, this title. It’s quite new, the last few years, and it’s gotten really big just this past year. It presumes to provide a nomenclature, a label, that identifies, ties together, brings together, a lot people and activities that have the same basic outlook. What anybody or any collectivity, any entity, calls himself/herself/itself is of major importance, because it shapes how they see themselves and what they do, and it affects how others see them and behave toward them. That fact, that reality, has prompted me to take a look at this Alt Right concept, to break it down, to see what it is and what I think about it and how I personally fit within it. In this writing I’ll capitalize Right and any term including it, Right Wing, etc., to distinguish the cultural/political sense of the word right from its other meanings--entitlement (free speech, etc.), accuracy, appropriateness, and morality and ethics. To keep things consistent, I’ll also capitalize Left.

I’ll start with the term Right. Two things about it of note: First, Right is on one end of the ideological/cultural/political spectrum. There’s right, center, and left, and Right is over on the side; it’s not in the middle. Second, it is pejorative. If somebody says you’re a Rightist, or a Right Winger, most likely they aren’t paying you a compliment. There is the Berkeley Center for Right-Wing Studies at the University of California at Berkeley. You can check out the Center’s web site, or you can take my word for it that its title legitimizes attacking people, organizations, and activities. In sum, Right is a red flag.

And there’s the Alt (Alternative) part of Alt Right. The inclusion of the word alternative in a designation connotes that there are two or more ways of looking at something and/or doing something, and that this individual or group is one of those ways; that is to say, he/it is *a* way, not *the* way. I’m trying to think of any

other movement, any corporation, anything, that has deemed it a good idea to attach Alternative to what it calls itself, which underscores that it isn't the only game in town. How about Alt Progressives (to distinguish themselves from the other Progressives)? Would that be a good idea, do you think? Or say you are Steve Jobs starting a computer company. There are already Altair 8800s on the market (I looked it up). Jobs is thinking, what do I call my company? I know, Alt Altair 8800, because my computer is an alternative to the Altair's out there now. But then he thought, I should try to establish my own identity, plus I don't want people thinking about Altair 8800s every time they consider buying my product--so I'll go with Apple. See my point?

I'm having major trouble figuring out why people would identify themselves in a way that sets them up to be marginalized and demonized--we're getting booted in our backsides enough as it is without choosing to wear Alt Right kick-me signs--and that punches up the fact that they are but an option. With the Alt Right title, we are announcing that, indeed, we are a Rightist movement, and ceding the central ground, and the whole Left half of the spectrum, to those who oppose us. We are implying that to accept our ideas and join up with us you have to see yourself as Right Wing and to a greater or lesser extent feel outside the mainstream society, and most people don't.

One way to be successful at anything is to look at how others who have been successful at this same thing went about it. Three successful movements in recent decades have been the black civil rights movement in the 1950s and '60s, the modern feminist movement, and the gay rights movement.

I'll start with what these three movements *didn't* do. None of them called themselves the Alt Left. Martin Luther King didn't say, "As a member of the Alt Left, I offer—as the best alternative, really—that there be racial integration in America." Feminism

didn't bill itself as a Leftist movement. Gay marriage wasn't pitched as a Left Wing alternative. These successful movements were careful to stay away from any self-labeling that might be problematic for them. "I'm a Communist, but don't let that get to you, just listen to my good ideas"--none of that. Hubert Humphrey was a proud liberal and it got him the vice-presidency and a presidential nomination, but the people in these three groups saw that that handle wasn't doing to work for them and shunned it.

All three successful movements went straight for the center, the mainstream of American life, where they knew the action is; they didn't come on as fringe types. They used language and arguments and approaches that resonated with the mass public. And they most certainly didn't present themselves as an alternative. What they were for was *it*, period. It was *the* true, decent, fair, equitable, just, good, moral thing to do. It was *the* American thing to do. What they advocated was the right thing, the *only* thing, to do if you wanted to be respectable. To be against what they were insisting upon—their pitches were couched as imperatives—was no less than shameful. If you were unable to go along with it, you were obliged to get over on the side and out of the way—the Right side, over there, that'd be good.

These successful movements attended to the manner in which they presented themselves. They knew how to play to their audience(s). They adhered to the four rules of show business as I called them in an article I wrote for my personal web site.¹ By show business I wasn't referring just to people in the entertainment industry. I was talking about anybody engaged in showing something to someone with the intention of getting that person's approval or acceptance. Politicians, movements, and people with Facebook accounts are in show business. The four rules of show business:

1. Confirm your audience's preconceptions. Basically, endorse what they already know and prefer, all the while getting your points across. Do it in an engaging way and add new wrinkles

here and there, but the core message to people is, or seems to be, “You’ve got it right.” And stay within their frame of reference. Don’t come on with topics and ideas in a way that seems totally foreign to people. Your presentation gets through to your audience, you know enough, you are on top of things, you’ve got it figured out already.

2. Make your audience feel good about themselves. Somebody else is dumb, wrong, out of it, misguided, malevolent, anachronistic, and so on, but not your audience. They are cool and on the side of the angels. They are better than those yoyos over there, and there really isn’t anything they have to change about themselves, do differently, anything like that (though maybe there really is). They can pat themselves on the back and have a restful night’s sleep.

3. Keep things simple, clear, and unequivocal. No complications. No ambiguities. No contingencies—this if this happens and this other thing if that happens. No loose ends, no contradictions, no uncertainties, no dilemmas. No equally weighted competing claims [no alternatives]. Nothing unresolved. Certainty.

4. Be personally appealing and use appealing people as part of your show. This is a complicated rule, because different audiences find different people appealing or attractive. Since I’m going to be focusing on the Burns documentary [the article was about a seven-part PBS documentary on WWII by the documentarian Ken Burns], I’ll offer that Tom Hanks-type likeability is appealing, attractive, to the older, middle class PBS/NPR audience—solid nice guy, don’t need to lock your door around Tom Hanks, capable but no big threat, in your league, makes you feel good about yourself. (Tom Hanks has a wise-cracking side—exclude that. For those old enough to remember him, the actor Jimmy Stewart is a better example of what I’m getting at than Tom Hanks.) Some middle class types find irony and cynicism appealing—Stephen Colbert, “The Simpsons,” “South Park.” Some of all classes and racial and ethnic identities take to “bad boys” (and girls): rap “artists,” L.A. rehab cuties, NASCAR rebels. Some go for Oprah-types, those with I’ve-gone-through-what-you-are-going-through personas. Perhaps it is enough to say that different people like different qualities in people and that if you want to go over with

some group, figure out what and whom they like and give it to them. So if you are putting on a PBS show, decide what types of people are going to be watching and put in front of them the kind of people they take to. You might not want Robert Downey, Jr. to be on your World War II show.

Those front and center in the black civil rights, feminist, and gay rights movements were appealing, reasonable, credible, comforting, and likeable; that is to say, they put across a good show for the public.

An aspect of good show business I didn't get into in the article is associating your show with attractive, convincing, and emotion-and-sympathy-evoking images—I guess they could be called in today's parlance memes. Some examples: The civil rights movement got a lot of mileage out of the image of four little black girls who were killed in a KKK church bombing in 1963 in Birmingham, Alabama. The gays had Ryan White, an Indiana teenager who became HIV/AIDS infected from a contaminated blood treatment—that is to say, he wasn't gay; Americans watched Ryan die and it tore at their heartstrings. The gay movement also has had the casts of “Will & Grace” and “Transparent,” which personalized, humanized, and legitimized its arguments. The Alt Right has Pepe the Frog, which goes over big among young men with gleams in their eyes and affinities for Twitter, and that's good, but Pepe comes across as a scary menace to the general public, and that's not good.

All three of these successful movements had radical, strident, in-your-face components. The black movement had H. Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Huey Newton and the Black Panthers, and Malcolm X and the Nation of Islam. There were the radical feminists. The gays had the ACT UP group. Arguably, all of these more hard-edged individuals and organizations contributed to the cause, and none of them were condemned or expelled by the core, more respectable, elements in the movement. But the point in this context is that the more acceptable people and

organizations in these movements didn't openly embrace or identify with them. They didn't have an overarching movement title—say, Alt Left—that linked them to these more confrontational and threatening personages, groups, and activities. They basically stayed clear of their rough-and-tumble compatriots and went about the business of making their own appeals. Martin Luther King represented himself and his organization, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, nothing more than that.

A last point, these successful movements avoided identifying themselves with, or linking their fates to, individual politicians or a particular political party. These successful movements kept the focus on the cause, not politics. Martin Luther King didn't talk about Lyndon Johnson; he talked about civil rights for black people. The gay rights movement didn't intertwine itself with, say, Bill Clinton to the point that if Clinton wasn't your man you were disposed to think that gay rights wasn't your cause. The women's movement kept the attention on women's interests, not the Democratic Party, and if you were on their side, whichever party you favored, wherever you were on the political spectrum, welcome aboard. Certainly individuals within these movements were active politically, but the movements as movements, and their leadership, stayed on message, whether it was black civil rights, women's rights, or gay rights.

So far I'm been questioning the wisdom of taking on an Alt Right identity. I also wonder about its accuracy. Are we, or enough of us anyway, Rightists?

I'll begin with myself. In the last fifteen years, I've written three books about race from the perspective of European, white, Americans, and have produced perhaps a hundred articles for periodicals dealing with race, and I've maintained a personal website of my writings, a good percentage of which have dealt with race, and I've advocated for white people. To be sure, I've been called an extremist and an outlier by those who oppose what I have expressed as a way to discredit and marginalize me, and

frankly, they have done a very good job of it. But in my own mind I don't see myself as a fringe sort, on the cultural/political Right, anything like that.

I've never really labeled myself as anything, but if I had to, terms that come to mind are centrist, American traditionalist, core American, white advocate, Jeffersonian, or simply a Republican. I admire conservative philosopher Russell Kirk, Senator Robert Taft from back in the 1940s and '50s, and Calvin Coolidge—those aren't fringe people. I've gotten a great deal from individualist philosopher and novelist Ayn Rand. I've gained a lot from Gore Vidal's writings. At the moment, I'm in the middle of Nicholson Baker's new book on his month as a substitute schoolteacher, *Substitute*.² I check out ESPN.com the first thing in the morning. In my own eyes, I'm conventional, middle of the road, the guy down the street from you. I see nothing radical in caring about the status and fate of white people. Right, or Right Wing, or Alt anything, doesn't fit me, it's not me. Others can do as they will, but I'm not taking on those identities.

And, if I may be so bold, I see some central figures in the white racial movement who seem to be being put in the Alt Right camp, or are putting themselves in it, or are being associated with it, somewhere in there, who are centrists like me—not Right at all. I'll cite three examples here, and they can correct me if I'm off base.

There's Jared Taylor, founder of this site, for one. His remarks at an Alt Right press conference on August 12, 2016, included this:

What is the Alt Right? It is a broad, dissident movement that rejects egalitarian orthodoxies. These orthodoxies require us to believe that the sexes are equivalent, that race is meaningless, that all cultures and religions are equally valuable, and that any erotic orientation or identification is healthy. These things we deny. The Alt Right is also skeptical of mass democracy. It opposes foreign aid and foreign intervention—especially for “nation building.”³

I ask myself, what is Right about this? It comes off to me as core, conventional, accepted, common sense thinking in America from its founding all the way up to recent decades, at which time point powerful forces altered the through line, the basic direction, the central narrative, of this country. America was founded on the idea of equal individual rights, not egalitarianism. Historically, this nation has recognized that people and groups are different from one another, including qualitatively different; some are better and worse than others. Until recent times, the sexes weren't viewed as equivalent, nor was race considered meaningless—and science still hasn't gone along with those cockeyed notions. The Founders were very skeptical of mass democracy, which is why we pledge allegiance to the flag and to the *republic* for which it stands, not to the *democracy* for which it stands. Foreign intervention, nation building?—entangling alliances, George Washington.

Jared's paragraph, and Jared generally, I know him and his truly remarkable work well—and I mean this as a compliment—is as American as apple pie. Alt Right? I don't think so.

Another presenter at this same Alt Right news conference was Peter Brimelow, author and founder of VDARE.com. Peter, at significant personal cost, has courageously and with great effectiveness brought attention to the negative, even disastrous, impact of the current immigration patterns on America. Peter was one of just three people in front of the journalists at the news conference, though in his remarks he did seem to distance himself personally from the Alt Right:

It happens that immigration is one of the issues that the Alt Right is deeply interested in. And because of that I have a number of writers who are members of the Alt Right, very prominent members, obviously much younger than I am: James Kilpatrick, Alexander Hart, and Washington Watcher, for example. These people all live in Washington. They work in institutions in Washington. They may be your colleagues. They may be sitting next to you at this conference. But they do not

wish to show their faces. These are people who have careers, who have families to support and so on, and they simply cannot speak out on this issue of public policy and expect to go unpunished in the Land Of The Free. So that's why I am here—to speak for them. I'm too old to care!⁴

If I read Peter's comments correctly, he was there to help some people out. He doesn't see himself as a Rightist, and that makes sense to me, because he isn't. He's smack dab in the middle of the spectrum. I pieced together this quote from one of Peter's writings and the statement of purpose for VDARE.com he authored:

John Jay in The Federalist Papers wrote that Americans were “one united people, a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs.” . . . The National Question is, in short, an examination of how long the U.S. can continue as a coherent nation-state in the face of current immigration policy. . . . Human differences are not social constructs. It is only with an honest consideration of race and ethnicity, the foundations of human grouping, that human differences can be explained and their social consequences understood, whether those differences are philosophical, cultural or biological. VDARE.com stands on the side of science in publishing coverage of the ongoing discovery and research in the realm of human differences. The racial and cultural identity of America is legitimate and defensible . . .⁵

There is nothing Right Wing about any of this. It's the people that disagree with Peter that are fringy, not Peter.

And, the third example, there is Kevin Macdonald, who is a speaker at the upcoming Alt Right conference. Dr. Macdonald, who is the editor of The Occidental Observer and its companion journal *The Occidental Quarterly*, had a distinguished university career as a tenured full professor and now holds the esteemed rank

of professor emeritus. In an impressive number of books and short writings during his university years and still, Kevin has produced informed, documented, insightful, and groundbreaking analyses and critiques of Jews as a collectivity and Jewish-gentile relations. Predictably, this activity has resulted his being subjected to unwarranted and cruel attempts to dismiss him as an irrational, malevolent anti-Semite and relegate him to a peripheral and ineffectual public identity and existence.

A big problem with an Alt Right identification for Kevin is guilt by association: it puts him in a category and with people who also write about Jews within which, with whom, he doesn't belong, and that serves to grease the skids for those who want to discredit and marginalize him ("He's one of *them!*"). A prime illustration of this phenomenon, a very visible part of the Alt Right is The Daily Stormer web site.⁶ A sampling of its recent articles:

"Greasy Neocon Kike David Frum Says Whites are Losing Race War"

"CBS Jew Les Moonves Makes Ridiculous Excuses for Decline in Monkey Ball [National Football League] Ratings"

"I'll Put an Ass Up Your Boot" – Filthy Jew Terrorist Max Boot Goes Off the Rails on Twitter"

"Rampaging Old Grizzled Kike Ginsburg Apologizes to Evil Negroid Kaepernick."

"Diabolical Kike Dan Senor Deletes Pussygate Tweets After Being Accused of Leaking Tape."

"Weasel Shill Paul Jewsef Watson Says ISIS Hurts Jews."

My humble advice to Kevin is that he hang tough as a visible and vocal, respectable and legitimate, figure in the main arena of American and international discourse and debate, where he deserves to be and is very much needed. A part of that, in the talk

at the upcoming conference, go the Peter Brimelow route: refer to the Alt Right as “them,” not “me.”

The three examples just mentioned—Taylor, Brimelow, and Macdonald—and there are a number of others that space prevents me from citing, have the potential to be as attractive to people in the center and Left as they are to people on the Right. Earlier, with the “Turn! Turn! Turn!” reference, I suggested keeping your eye open to other ways to look at things than the one you are employing at any given moment. While we are looking at things in Left-and-Right terms, which ends up with us declaring we are Right, we might consider looking at things in best-and-worst (or better and worse) terms, that lens, and declare ourselves best, or better anyway. That’s what the three successful movements did. They didn’t say they were Left or Right, which would have defined themselves out of the central arena in American life and alienated the people who didn’t identify with whichever side they chose in the Left-Right dichotomy. It doesn’t cost anything to create options; we can always reject them. What are some options from other frames of reference than Left/Right—e.g., better/worse, American/un-American, good for whites/bad for whites, or some other? Or get creative: tea party is a good label. Coming up with names for a movement is a good thought experiment—which can, indeed, end with the conclusion that it is better not to have a single overarching name.

I don’t want to leave the impression from the preceding section that I think the Daily Stormer and its founder and principal writer Andrew Anglin should be condemned or pushed away. To the contrary. I see Anglin as serving a positive function in the white racial, or Alt Right, whatever you want to call it, if you want to call it anything, movement. He is blowing holes in the long-standing taboo against speaking with anything but reverence and deference toward Jews and blacks. He’s a living example that you don’t have to walk on eggshells and kowtow around them. His style isn’t my style, and I don’t think his approach goes over well across

the board, with the general public, but for my money, he deserves a place at the table. I'm just suggesting that you think twice about sitting next to him at that table when people can see you.

In the Anglin category, at least in my eyes, is the attorney Mike Cernovich and his internet activism. Cernovich specializes in tweets ("PC is for PUSSIES" "If the alt-right is racist, is Israel too?" Seth Rogen is tabbed "Cuck Rogen"). A *New Yorker* magazine article reported that this past September, Cernovich's tweets were seen more than--get this--one hundred million times.⁷ Says Cernovich: "I'm for strong borders, including keeping out Islamic terrorists." From his hashtag #HillarysMigrants: "Remind people that Angela Merkel, George Soros, and Hillary Clinton—they are in it together. Post pictures of them together." "Pure trolls are amoral," Cernovich shares with an interviewer. "They post swastikas not out of allegiance to Nazism, but because they enjoy riling people."

"To beat a person," Cernovich asserts, "you lower his social status." That comment especially hit home with me. I'm very intrigued by the idea of beating someone by lowering his social status. The comic Mel Brooks and "Saturday Night Live," two examples that come to mind, have made effective use of ridicule and mockery against those they disfavor. There are people new to the scene with the talent and guts to do this kind of thing from our side of the debate, Anglin and Cernovich being two of them. To them and anybody else with this capability and bent: welcome to the fray.

President Trump, how about that. I didn't expect him to win (to be precise, he didn't win the popular vote, but he did win where it counts, in the Electoral College). I had mixed feelings about him during the campaign, and still do. On the plus side of the ledger, he brought issues to the front burner in American politics that no one else has—including the rampant and officially sanctioned violation of immigration laws; the argument for economic nationalism; the problems with our interventionist, militaristic,

Middle East-obsessed foreign policy; and the tyranny of PC. He transformed the Republican Party's agenda and wrested control of it from the factions formally in power. He very effectively debunked Hillary Clinton as a hustler and con artist. And he was courageous. If I thought the television images of him at a public rally were live, I wouldn't watch for fear that he would get shot in front of my eyes. I'd flash on the memory of Bobby Kennedy that last night at the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles and hit the clicker. Important in this context, Trump wisely stayed clear of labeling himself as Right, or even conservative. He didn't exclude support coming from the center and left of the electorate. He sold his ideas as being good for a broad range of people. My point in this writing is that is how it's done when it works.

Despite his victory, which I know I'm supposed to be happy about, I have real problems with Trump the person--I just can't get with him—and truth be told, I'm worried about my retirement investments. And there's how Trump squares with those four rules of show business I quoted above, which could give him problems as he tries to implement his policies. To illustrate one of my concerns in this regard, consider two of his public utterances emanating from the mouths of other prominent people:

Ronald Reagan in his 1984 presidential debate with Walter Mondale: "Look at those hands, are they small hands? 'If they're small, something else must be small.' I guarantee you there's no problem. I guarantee."

Martin Luther King, August 23rd, 1963:

Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom ring. And when this happens, and when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, "Free at last! Free at last! Thank God Almighty, we are free at last!" . . . Oh, and one more

thing: always remember, it really doesn't matter what the media write as long as you've got a young and beautiful piece of ass.

A little more than week before the election, my twelve-year-old daughter Dee went Halloween trick-or-treating—yes, I know, she is maybe a little old for that, but she's still into it—with her friend from school, Meredith. Afterwards, over a bowl of chili (the girls were in another room trading candy), Meredith's mother Christine--bachelor's degree, suburban—brought up the big election coming up in just over a week. I usually stay clear of political talk, but this time I bit: “Well, whether he wins or loses, Trump is raising some important issues, like immigration and--”

“HE'S REPULSIVE!” Christine bellowed. “Grabbing women by the . . . Megyn Kelly, blood coming out of the wherever . . . Seriously, do you want Dee to be in the same world with that vulgar lowlife orange beach ball? I mean, really Robert.” I have to admit I agreed with her.

In any case, end of conversation. The lesson: I'd rather not make my pitch about the issues facing America in general and white people in particular to educated woman carrying Donald Trump—President Trump, my gosh--on my back. And that surfaces a serious issue, because white racial activism, this whole set of activities and approaches now being lumped together under the Alt Right rubric, has not had a good track record with women, educated women especially. I'll be interested to see how many women are in attendance at the Alt Right conference on the 19th. I note that none of the six speakers listed on the notice I was sent is a woman, and I'm trying to remember the last woman I've read in a white racial outlet.

I spent my working life around university students and I think I know them well, and of course I'm generalizing here. Based on my experience, I'm not enthused about making a case through Donald Trump for the vision Jared Taylor so articulately set forth in the paragraph I quoted above (opposition to egalitarian orthodoxies, and the idea that the sexes are equivalent, that race is

meaningless, that all cultures and religions are equally valuable, and that any erotic orientation or identification is healthy, and skepticism about mass democracy, and opposition to foreign intervention). Simply, Trump is not college students' kind of guy (or mine, sorry).

University students don't so much want to win, or to be great (again). Rather, they want to be decent and fair and just. (That is why the idea of social justice resonates so well with them.) They want to be good people. They don't want to be on one end or the other of the social/cultural/ political spectrum; rather, they want to be safe and accepted and respected in the middle of wherever they are, in the dorm or in the community; they want to belong. They want to be seen as being OK people, both in their own eyes and in the eyes of others. Political correctness in universities matches up well with students' basic impulses.

To be sure, sarcasm and talking oneself up and a tough guy persona plays well with some college students, but what plays most effectively across the board with them is sincerity, respectfulness, niceness, and humility. I'm from Burlington, Vermont and way, way back I took a community education course from a very young Bernie Sanders. Bernie was an unemployed single parent then, barely getting by on unemployment benefits. He was tall and upright, not hunched over as he is now, and he had an abundant mound of dark curly hair. I can't remember what the course was about; perhaps labor history. I do remember Bernie saying pretty much the same things he is saying now. During the course, he didn't strike me as the brightest person around, or the most informed, but one thing that stood out about him was his sincerity. Bernie truly believed in what he was saying. And he connected with me in a respectful way; he didn't come off as a self-consumed hot shot. I got the distinct impression that I mattered to Bernie. He was kind to me in that course. He was a nice guy. All these years later, it could be that the young people who flocked to Bernie this past election cycle responded to the

same qualities I experienced in him those many years ago. The obvious point, what I'm describing in Bernie isn't Donald Trump.

And there is the young man who helps me with my retirement money: 28, graduated from the university six years ago, goes to a health club regularly, newly married, thinking about starting a family, looking to buy his first home. I'll keep it brief and just offer that what I've said about women and college students applies also to him.

If a movement is to be successful, it will have to attract the kinds of people I have just mentioned: suburban mothers, university students, and the decent young fellows working at Fidelity and forming families and establishing positive reputations and places in the community, or older, coaching their sons' Little League teams and attending their daughters' piano recitals. More people may have joined up with the Alt Right than ever before, but who are they, and just as important, who *aren't* they? I don't know, I'm just asking.

If this is a time to take stock, I'll offer the suggestion that we should have taken advantage of the Trump candidacy by noting where we agree with him, but not getting so cozy with him that we alienate the people who have problems with him.

I suppose the Alt Right label and the Trump candidacy did result in greater visibility for this movement, whatever it is to be called, if it has to be called anything, and its ideas may well have, as it was phrased in the conference notice, invaded the mainstream. But the question is, what kind of visibility has it been, and what form did those invasive ideas wind up taking? I don't hold to the notion that all publicity is good publicity. I have a concern that the Alt Right/Trump thrust this past year or so has too often been the occasion for those of us on this side of the cultural/racial divide, Alt Right and Trump adherents or not, getting smeared. It seems I read a lot of the following sort of thing, and I worry that some of us are unwittingly setting up all of us for it:

. . . anti-Semitic, racist against blacks and Hispanics, sexist, and bigoted against the disabled, and ready to hold the door while Pepe the Frog feeds his opponents, including a large contingent of conservative and liberal Jewish journalists subjected to unimaginable invective by the Alt-Right, into the ovens.⁸

There's a branding problem with the Trump connection and the Alt Right label, and putting our heads in the sand and pretending it isn't there isn't going to make it go away.

I'll end with a reference to "Fight Club," a film that came out the same year as "The Matrix," 1999. The scene, two young men who haven't met before (or they don't think they have; it's complicated) sitting next to each other on an airplane: The Narrator (played by Edward Norton); and Tyler Durden (played by Brad Pitt).

Narrator: Tyler, you are by far the most interesting single-serving friend I've ever met... See, I have this thing: everything on a plane is single-serving.

Tyler Durden: Oh, I get it. It's very clever.

Narrator: Thank you.

Tyler Durden: How's that working out for you?

Narrator: What?

Tyler Durden: Being clever.

Narrator: Great.

Tyler Durden: Keep it up then. . . . Right up.

Lately, there seems to have been the enlistment of a good number of clever guys into the cause, and I'm with Tyler Durden, if cleverness is working for them, they should keep it up—Right up, with an emphasis on Right if that's what they want. We need clever guys, we really do. I think this whole business comes down to each of us doing what works for us as the unique individuals we are. It's obvious that the Alt Right label and Trump, despite his accomplishment (or was it that Hillary was so bad?), don't work for me, so I'm not doing them. But if they work for you, absolutely, keep it up, or do something else; whatever best gets

you through your life, whatever squares with your being, whatever you think is the most ethical thing to do, do it. From this perspective, then, rather than *Become Who We Are*, leaving open the possible inference that we are all alike, a better title for the November 19th conference would be *Become Who You Are*.

End Notes

1. “Ken Burns’ Show Business,” in the writings section of my website, robertsgriffin.com.
2. Blue Rider Press, 2016.
3. Jared Taylor, “Remarks From the Alt Right Press Conference Last Month,” posted at <http://www.amren.com>.
4. Peter Brimelow, “At That Alt Right Press Conference: I’m Glad My Young Wife Is A Texan And Knows How To Shoot,” posted at <http://www.vdare.com>.
5. Drawn from two sources: Peter Brimelow, “Time to Rethink Immigration,” originally published in *National Review* magazine, June 22, 1992; and the statement of purpose for VDARE.com authored by Mr. Brimelow. Both are available at <http://www.vdare.com>.
6. <http://www.dailystormer.com>.
7. Andrew Marantz, “Trolls for Trump,” *The New Yorker*, October 31, 2016, pp. 42-46.
8. Peter Lee, “Trump: We Wish the Problem Was Fascism . . . But It Is Really Racism,” posted on *The Unz Review*, October 19th, 2016. <http://www.unz.com>