Twitter Thread by James Lindsay, king of your mom



James Lindsay, king of your mom
@ConceptualJames

I dare anyone to read Critical Race Theory: An Introduction for themselves and try to believe this idiotic distortion. The book is both horrifying and laughably shallow. Read it yourself. You'll see. Last time I read it, I literally laughed out loud repeatedly at how stupid it is

> The current attack on CRT is based on a caricature virtually unrecognizable by actual race scholars. B. Mason @alsoacarpenter gives a careful, detailed rebuttal of the main arguments interacting w/ Carl Trueman\u2019s recent article on the subject. Part 1: https://t.co/bjhz27AUed
>
> — Todd Benkert (@toddbenkert) January 19, 2021

I have screenshots of some choice material, but I have to admit that I stopped taking them because it's virtually all of the book that's transparently bad and ridiculous. Maybe I need to start sharing them anyway.

You can read the whole book for yourself in about four or five hours. It's neither long nor difficult. It's transparently awful and stupid, and it makes a person wonder what people like Bradley Mason are on about trying to bullshit you away from recognizing that.

Here, they say they're skeptical of rights.

This is after saying in the first paragraph that they diverge from the Civil Rights Movement and oppose the liberal order, equality theory, legal reasoning, Enlightenment rationalism, and neutral principles of constitutional law.

Crits are also highly suspicious of another liberal mainstay, namely, rights. Particularly some of the older, more radical CRT scholars with roots in racial realism and an economic view of history believe that moral and legal rights are apt to do the right holder much less good than many would like to think. Rights are almost always procedural (for example, to a fair process) rather than substantive (for example, to food, housing, or education). Think how our system applauds affording everyone equality of opportunity, but resists programs that assure equality of results. Moreover, rights are almost always cut back when they conflict with the interests of the powerful. For example, hate speech, which targets mainly minorities, gays, lesbians, and other outsiders,

is almost always tolerated, while speech that offends the interests of empowered groups finds a ready exception in First Amendment law. Think, for example, of speech that insults a judge or other authority figure, that defames a wealthy and well-regarded person, that disseminates a government secret, or deceptively advertises products, thus cheating a large class of middle-income consumers.

Moreover, rights are said to be alienating. They separate people from each other—"stay away, I've got my rights"—rather than encouraging them to form close, respectful communities. And with civil rights, lower courts have found it

Look at how stupid the questions for deeper exploration are. It's literally making the case for propaganda over truth and then accusing white people of being the only people who confuse the two.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR CHAPTER III

1. Why is it that most of the current crop of legal storytellers are black or brown (Bell, Delgado, Patricia Williams, Matsuda, etc.)?
2. Do white people tell stories, too, but deem them not stories at all, but the truth?
3. If one wanted to change another person's mind about something, say, the death penalty, what would be more effective, an array of statistics or a good story or movie?
4. "Once upon a time . . ." Do stories (at least ones that are well told) cause the reader or listener to suspend disbelief, and, if so, is this a good or a bad thing?
5. Suppose you have a particular account of the world. For example, as a result of experience you have come to believe that virtue is almost always rewarded and that people generally get what they deserve. Social handouts and welfare just make matters worse. Someone tells you a story about a welfare recipient who used her allotment to raise her children, then went to school and became a Ph.D. and owner of a start-up computer company. How do you react?

Here, they argue that liberalism (the systems in the West) can't solve the problem and that "everything must change at once," i.e., a revolution is necessary. Combine this with their skepticism of rights and equality. They also argue for subjective standards they'd control.

chapter 5). They also explain some of the crits' impatience with liberalism. The reader will recall that CRT takes liberalism to task for its cautious, incremental quality (see chapter 2). When we are tackling a structure as deeply embedded as race, radical measures are required. "Everything must change at once," otherwise the system merely swallows up the small improvement one has made, and everything remains the same.

Ignoring the problem of intersectionality, as liberalism often does, risks doing things by half-measures and leaving

major sectors of the population dissatisfied. Classical liberalism also has been criticized as overly caught up in the search for universals, such as admissions standards for universities or sentencing guidelines that are the same for all. The crits point out that this approach is apt to do injustice to individuals whose experience and situation differ from the norm. They call for individualized treatment—"context"—that pays attention to minorities' lives instead. This deficiency is apt to be particularly glaring in the case of "double minorities," such as black women or gay black men, whose lives are twice removed from the experience of mainstream Americans.

Some observers hold that all minority races should com-

More stupid questions for exploration. It's a good time to remember that this is a textbook for young, impressionable minds, not for savvy grown adults who have a firmer foundation after having cut their teeth on the world a bit.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR CHAPTER IV

1. An Asian lesbian has been raising her hand at a meeting of white feminists planning a march to protest the "glass ceiling" in corporate management positions. When she is finally recognized, it turns out she wants to know when the group will discuss racial discrimination in the garment industry.

   Is she being divisive?
2. Suppose the group responds that the agenda should reflect only items that concern women "as women," and not ones that have to do with small factions.

   Is the group implicitly adopting a white agenda?
3. Should minorities make an effort to "fit in" in social and work situations? Why or why not?
4. If blacks or Chicanos sit at separate tables in the cafeteria, is that self-segregation? Should whites politely ask if they can join them?
5. Should minorities make an effort to do business with minority firms? Assume that Firm A and Firm B offer the same product or service, but one is run by Mr. Gonzalez and the other by a person whose ancestors came over on the *Mayflower.* Which one should the person of color patronize?

Divide and conquer through storytelling. Not at all sure why it says an African American would not be able to recover. Totally stupid analysis. It's like they confuse themselves, but more evil.

in so far as their experience and treatment can be analogized to that of blacks.

Imagine, for example, that Juan Dominguez, a Puerto Rican worker, is told by his boss, "You're a lazy Puerto Rican just like all the rest. You'll never get ahead as long as I'm supervisor." Juan sues for workplace discrimination under a civil rights–era statute designed with blacks in mind. He wins because he can show that an African American worker, treated in similar fashion, would be entitled to redress. But suppose that Juan's coworkers and supervisor make fun of him because of his accent, religion, or place of birth. An African American subjected to these forms of discrimination would not be able to recover, and so Juan would go without recourse.

The black-white binary is said to operate in everyday culture as well. Imagine that a group of liberal television executives says to each other, "Let's have a minority sitcom." The group is well meaning, but their thoughts immediately go to a program whose central characters are a black family. Later, on second thought, they might add an Asian maid or a Latino teenager who is a friend of one of the family's children. But the essential framework for the program is apt to center around African American problems, in-jokes, and situations. Similarly, history textbooks may devote considerable space to the tremendously significant issue of slavery, but overlook or devote scant treatment to the intense persecution of Chinese in California and elsewhere.

Look how they analyze "white." So stupid. And it's actually worse, but I restrained myself from taking screenies of every page in this section.

B. Critical White Studies

Another emerging area of critical investigation is the study of the white race. For several centuries, at least, social scientists have been studying communities of color, discoursing

learnedly about their histories, cultures, problems, and future prospects. Now a new generation of scholars is putting whiteness under the lens and examining the construction of the white race. If, as most contemporary thinkers believe, race is not objective or biologically significant, but constructed by social sentiment and power struggle, how did the white race in America come to define itself? Scholars such as Ian Haney López, Alexander Saxton, Theodore Allen, and David Roediger address various aspects of this issue. The physical differences between light-skinned blacks and dark-skinned whites, just to take one example, are much less marked than those that separate polar members of either group. Why then do we draw the categories the way we do? Addressing this question includes examining what it means to be white, how whiteness became established legally, how certain groups moved in and out of the category of whiteness, "passing," the phenomenon of white power and white supremacy, and the automatic privileges that come with membership in the dominant race.

So. Transparently. Stupid. And arrives at the conclusion that all whites are complicit in racism, which is preposterous and insulting to both logic and human dignity.

minorities. So, is affirmative action a case of "reverse discrimination" against whites? Part of the argument for it rests on an implicit assumption of innocence on the part of the white displaced by affirmative action. The narrative behind this assumption characterizes whites as innocent, a powerful metaphor, and blacks as—what? Presumably, the opposite of innocent. Many critical race theorists and social scientists

alike hold that racism is pervasive, systemic, and deeply ingrained. If we take this perspective, then no white member of society seems quite so innocent. The interplay of meanings that one attaches to race, the stereotypes one holds of other people, and the need to guard one's own position all powerfully determine one's perspective. Indeed, one aspect of whiteness, according to some, is its ability to seem perspectiveless, or transparent. Whites do not see themselves as having a race, but being, simply, people. They do not believe that they think and reason from a white viewpoint, but from a universally valid one—"the truth"—what everyone knows. By the same token, many whites will strenuously deny that they have benefited from white privilege, even in situations (golf, summer jobs, extra-credit assignments, merchants who smile) like the ones mentioned throughout this book.

Classroom Exercise

Apparently the Democratic Party gets to decide who is and isn't the "right" race. LOL. "If you don't vote for me, you ain't Black" isn't new.

Another aspect of the construction of whiteness is the way certain groups have moved into the white race. For example, early in our history Irish, Jews, and Italians were considered nonwhite—that is, on a par with African Americans. Over time, they earned the prerogatives and social standing of whites by joining labor unions, by swearing fealty to the Democratic Party, and by acquiring wealth, sometimes by illegal or underground activity. Whiteness, it turns out, is not only valuable, it is shifting and malleable.

A recent manifestation of white consciousness is its exaggerated form seen in white supremacy and white power groups. With these organizations, white solidarity presents problems and dangers that black solidarity does not. When members of a minority group band together for social and political support, most observers will see that as a natural and proper response against majoritarian pressures. But

what if members of the majority race band together to promote their interests at the expense of those very same minorities? The recent formation of Aryan supremacist and skinhead groups stands as a constant reminder of how easy it is for quiet satisfaction in being white to deteriorate into extremism.

"White privilege" refers to the myriad of social advantages, benefits, and courtesies that come with being a mem-

More stupid questions.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR CHAPTER V

1. If an African American asserts that because of slavery, blacks truly are exceptional and should be given priority over other groups in jobs and social programs, is he or she asserting a form of property interest in blackness? (See Cheryl Harris, Whiteness as Property, 106 Harv. L. Rev. 1707 [1993]).
2. Does white privilege exist? If so, give an example. Is there such a thing as black, Chicano, or Asian privilege?
3. If slavery is the central, foundational element in blacks' history in the United States, what serves that function for Latinos? For Indians? For Asians?
4. If it is legitimate for a school to have a black or Latino student organization, is it equally legitimate to allow white students to form a white student organization? And use student fees to fund it?
5. Would it not be logical for blacks, Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans to unite in one powerful coalition to confront the power system that is oppressing them all? If so, what prevents them from doing so?