



1

WHY THE PROGRESSIVE LEFT HATES ME

“At the core of liberalism is the spoiled child—miserable, as all spoiled children are, unsatisfied, demanding, ill-disciplined, despotic, and useless.”

—P.J. O'Rourke, *Give War A Chance*

93% of workplace deaths are male.

Rates of rape and domestic abuse are far higher in Muslim communities than non-Muslim ones.

The black community has a huge problem with crime and drugs.

These statements are all facts. Yet in today's America, introducing them to the conversation causes instant outrage, like when I tell cab drivers curry is not a deodorant.

If you discuss these inconvenient truths, you are expected to begin with certain caveats. “I'm a feminist, but...” “The majority of

MILO

African-Americans are law-abiding citizens, but..." "I'll try breathing through my mouth, but..."

Caveats are irrelevant. I refuse to preface any discussion of Islam, for instance, with the usual fake niceties about radical extremists. I prefer to discuss facts directly, and I use exaggeration and bombast, often outrageously.

Challenging the myths of the Left causes them to lose their minds. I puncture their fantasies with attention-grabbing wit and style. I'm also hot, which I'll cover in excruciating detail throughout this book.

What really drives left-wingers up the wall is that I should be one of them. People like me are supposed to be good little metropolitan fags and vote Democrat. Go to anti-war protests and experiment with quinoa and hummus. We're supposed to pretend it's totally believable Rey could pilot the Millennium Falcon with greater skill than Han Solo. Never mind the fact that she learns the Force in like, half a day.

Even before the Left descended into identity-politics lunacy, I wanted nothing to do with them. I wasn't quite the conservative icon I am today either, though. I was doing something different.

I spent my youth in drug-saturated nightclubs in London, losing my virginity in interracial fivesomes with drag queens, experimenting with every depraved form of escapism I could find. And I listened to a lot of Mariah Carey, Marilyn Manson and Rage Against the Machine.

I also studied music theory, Schopenhauer, and Wittgenstein, and I read Margaret Thatcher biographies, shot my dad's guns, and dreamt of meeting George W. Bush. (I did later in life, but by then he wasn't right-wing enough for me.)

DANGEROUS

Little did I know that I was breaking all the Left's rules by reading Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged* and daydreaming that I was the heroically entrepreneurial protagonist, Dagny Taggart.

I came to represent the Left's greatest fear: an opponent who is cooler, smarter, better dressed, edgier and more popular than them.

To understand precisely why the Left hates people like me so much, it's necessary to understand how and why their politics have changed over the past few decades.

WHY ALL THIS STUFF MATTERS—AND PAY ATTENTION AT THE BACK, BECAUSE THIS IS IMPORTANT

In the past, the Left were champions of blue-collar workers against the managerial, big business classes. Jobs, pay, and decent living standards for ordinary citizens were the priorities. A few leftists (Bernie Sanders in the United States and Jeremy Corbyn in Britain) continue this tradition. They are, notably, significantly older than most other left-wing politicians. They are also loathed by much of the establishment in their respective parties.

Why?

Because the mainstream Left today has very different priorities.

There was no reason why the Left had to abandon its old blue-collar base. The industries that employed their voters have largely disappeared, but the voters themselves didn't go anywhere. Indeed, as voters in old working-class heartlands entered economic crises, the Left should have been more attentive to their concerns.

But that didn't happen.

Instead, leftists chose to ignore the former working class, and turn to a very different electoral coalition: latte-sipping metropolitan

MILO

voters, fairytale dwelling antiwar activists, ugly women (sigh), and minorities.

The fact that minorities were only a small section of the electorate didn't bother the Left; they could always import new voters. Zero fucks were given about the rapid influx of cheap labor or the deluge of new welfare recipients. Both of these obvious consequences only added further pressure to the already-beleaguered, long forgotten, working class base.¹⁴

This reminds me of the movie *Scream*, when Sidney (aka Neve Campbell) finds out it was (*spoiler alert*) her boyfriend who was trying to butcher her and all her friends the whole time. Sidney didn't let him get away with it, however. She shot him in the head. After they were so wantonly betrayed, it's remarkable to me that millions of former working-class families still remain loyal to the Left.

As their electoral coalition changed, so too did the Left's politics. They became *less* concerned with pay, *more* contemptuous of old industries, and *venomous* towards the cultural values of their old voters. Barack Obama's infamous 2008 quip that former working-class communities "cling to guns, or religion, or antipathy toward people who aren't like them, or anti-immigrant sentiment, or anti-trade sentiment,"¹⁵ epitomized the new attitude of the Left.

Leftists have always been well practiced at turning social classes against one another. But the working classes can prove frustrating to socialists intent on class warfare. Marxists were particularly perturbed when, during World War I, the European working class (with the exception of Russia) chose to fight for King and Country instead of rise up against their masters. This is understandable to a certain extent, socialist leaders like Marx had never done a day of work in their life.

DANGEROUS

In the 1920s, the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci had an idea for a new form of revolution—one based on culture, not class. According to Gramsci, the reason the proletariat failed to rise up was because old, conservative ideas like loyalty to one's country, family values, and religion, held too much sway in working-class communities.

If that sounds redolent of Obama's comment about guns and religion, it should. His line of thinking is directly descended from the ideological tradition of Gramsci.

Gramsci argued that as a precursor to revolution, the old traditions of the West—or “cultural hegemony,” as he called it—would have to be systematically broken down. To do so, Gramsci argued that “proletarian” intellectuals should seek to challenge the dominance of traditionalism in education and the media, and create a new revolutionary culture. If you've ever wondered why you're forced to take diversity or gender studies courses at university, or why your professors all seem to hate western civilization, blame Gramsci.

In the 1950s and 60s, a group of European expatriate academics known as the Frankfurt School married Gramsci's idea of cultural revolution to the idea of a new revolutionary vanguard: one made up of *students*, feminists, and minorities, many of whom felt excluded from mainstream western culture and sought to change it. Their ideas would provide much of the intellectual ballast for the cultural upheavals of the 1960s, and the subsequent transformation of the Left. Andrew Breitbart wrote about them extensively in his bestselling book, *Righteous Indignation*.

The New Left, as they came to be called, were responsible for the early stages of the Left's pivot away from traditional class politics and towards the divisive, politically-correct world of gender, racial,

MILO

and sexual politics we know today. They were the ones responsible for making issues like abortion, the reversal of gender roles, “racial justice,” pacifism, and multiculturalism into major platforms of the Left. If they could keep their “rainbow coalition” acting and voting as a bloc, and focus all their hatred on the weary white male working class, then political dominance would soon be assured. Thus began the reign of identity politics.

These sneering students who joined the New Left in the 1960s became the professors who are teaching you today, rebelling against the over-protective, military-minded, and somewhat austere World War II generation. Novelist and former noted liberal John Updike wrote of the disdain he saw from “Cambridge professors and Manhattan lawyers and their guitar-strumming children... privileged members of a privileged nation... full of aesthetic disdain for their own defenders... spitting on the cops who were trying to keep the USA and its many amenities intact.”

Cultural Marxism, nurtured by the Frankfurt School, struck a chord—even though, for the most part, these young baby boomers didn’t realize where their ideas were coming from. Rock musicians, the standard-bearers of young boomer culture, became fierce advocates for pacifism, feminism, gay rights, and all the other causes of the New Left.

There is, of course, another reason the New Left was so successful in the 1960s: a lot of their arguments made sense. There was racism to be fought, structural, institutionalized and legal racism. Sexism in the workplace was rampant—even worse than on *Mad Men*. And gays were oppressed, by conservatives and liberals alike.

The tragedy is that instead of granting life to the inherently divisive doctrines of Cultural Marxism, these problems could easily have been

DANGEROUS

solved with the milder tradition of Classical Liberalism. Indeed, in 1950s Britain, it was classical liberal politicians of the Wolfenden Committee who began the process of decriminalizing homosexuality. Marxists played little if any role in it. By the end of the 1960s, when the New Left were still on the fringe, their milder allies in the social liberal movement were already well on their way to winning America's most important cultural battles: Jim Crow was dismantled, and the Civil Rights and Voting Rights acts were passed.

For better or worse (it was definitely for worse), the New Left became the defining youth movement of the 60s and 70s, and although initially perceived as radical, its ideas would eventually come to dominate modern culture. The counter-culture of the 1960s became the prevailing culture of the 1980s. By the 1990s, a decade in which, despite the LA riots and the OJ trial, we could all watch *The Fresh Prince Of Bel-Air* without agonizing over white supremacist tropes in the Banks household, the New Left had become the establishment. It was now difficult to argue that any social group in the West lacked equality under the law. Indeed, thanks to the persistence of government redistribution plans and the early growth of affirmative action, some groups were already getting favored treatment—a sign of things to come. But the New Left still achieved complete control of media, academia and the arts, just at the point when they were no longer needed.

Metropolitan elites of today's leftist political class follow the intellectual legacy of Gramsci and his contempt for working-class, traditionalist culture. The knee-jerk endorsements of feminism, Black Lives Matter, and gay identity politics are in no small part related to this Marxist tendency to back the "revolutionary class" against the

MILO

“oppressors,” regardless of facts. Another by-product of 1960s leftism is the unabashed hatred of white males, who are (correctly) identified as the architects of western culture.

For the New Left, white men are the cultural counterpart to the economic bourgeoisie class in classical Marxist theory—a class of oppressors that must be overthrown by the oppressed. The influence of the New Left is seen most clearly in universities, where efforts to “deconstruct” the pillars of western civilization, from classical liberal humanism to the mythical “patriarchy,” proceed just as Gramsci would have wanted.

By the early 2000s, in firm control of the baby boomer’s cultural consciousness, the New Left was on course to become the new cultural hegemony. Conservatives, preoccupied with defeating the Soviet Union and reviving the free market, failed to grasp the gravity of the Left’s cultural revolution. On the Right, culture wars were only fought by *social* conservatives, spearheaded by evangelical Christians, who obsessed over unwinnable fights like gay marriage, and alienated young people with hare-brained censorship campaigns against rock music, comic books and video games.

When social conservatives started going after *Harry Potter* for “promoting witchcraft,” it became embarrassingly clear which side had won the culture wars. And it’s *culture* that matters. “Politics is downstream from culture,” as Andrew Breitbart used to say. Politics is just a symptom, which is one of the reasons I spend more time on college campuses than I do in Washington, DC.

If you’re reading this and you’re in college, or you recently graduated, you can lay the blame squarely at your parent’s generation for handing culture to the regressive lunatics and SJWs. The previous

DANGEROUS

generation of conservatives failed completely in their attempts to save academia, the media and the arts. In many cases, they didn't bother to fight at all, preferring to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on think-tanks and magazines complaining about the problem while doing absolutely nothing to fix it, as brilliantly set out in a well-known 2016 essay in *The Claremont Review of Books*.¹⁶ FOX's Tucker Carlson is refreshingly harsh on this point, describing the conservative establishment as "overpaid, underperforming tax-exempt sinecure-holders."¹⁷ Liberals, meanwhile, were setting up university departments, organizing activist groups and installing themselves in Hollywood and New York City.

By 2010, the argument that racism, sexism, and homophobia still ran rampant in western society started to look absurd. I suspect the reason gay marriage became such a *cause célèbre* for the Left during this period is because it was, for them, the last clear-cut legislative battle that could be easily fought and won.

Like carnival magicians, the Left kept voters distracted, so they didn't notice they were being taxed oppressively, regulated minutely and manipulated in countless other ways.

Seriously, you have to hand it to them. These guys put the work in. I do admire leftist's energy levels. If I had to spend all day screaming and crying, stewing in my anger, blaming made-up concepts like the "patriarchy" for my failure and defending Barack Obama, I'd be exhausted.

Modern American liberals took Orwell's "Two Minutes Hate" from 1984 and turned it into 24 hours. The "Two Minutes Hate" is a daily ritual in which every citizen must watch a video depicting the Party's enemies and direct hatred toward them. For two minutes. CNN has

MILO

published several articles comparing Trump's presidency to Orwell's dystopian fantasy, sanctimoniously oblivious to their own offenses.

How do they keep those hatred levels up? Maybe I've stumbled onto the real reason they love Starbucks so much.

WHY THE LEFT HATES *YOU*

Because of their intellectual pedigree in the angry, victim-centric doctrine of Cultural Marxism, the Left is committed to defending a worldview which arranges women, minorities, and gays in a league table of oppression, with straight white men as the eternal oppressors at the top of the list, followed by gay white men, followed by straight white women, all the way down to paraplegic black immigrant Muslim transsexuals at the very bottom. Straight white men are the new "bourgeoisie," the group oppressing everyone else.

The academic phrase for this is "intersectionality." Intersectionalists are the ones responsible for dreaming up new, ever more bizarre categories of oppression. These fun people believe there are "intersecting" categories of oppression: it's not enough to just talk about the oppression associated with being a woman, one *must* also talk about the oppression associated with being a *black* woman, a *black disabled* woman, a *fat black disabled* woman, a *fat black disabled Muslim* woman, and so on.

In plainer English, different people's lives suck for a bunch of different reasons. The progressive Left has constructed entire university departments just to parse that sentence.

The "Intersecting Axes of Privilege, Domination and Oppression" lists fourteen categories of oppressed groups with a corresponding "privileged group" for each one.¹⁸ There's whites (privileged) vs.

DANGEROUS

people of color (oppressed), “masculine and feminine” (privileged) vs. “gender deviants” (oppressed), attractive (privileged) vs. unattractive (oppressed), credentialed (privileged) vs. nonliterate (oppressed), and even fertile (privileged) vs. infertile (oppressed).

Our bias in favor of people who can read and write, is, according to the Axes of Privilege, “Educationalism.” Our bias in favor of the fertile is “Pro-natalism.” Our bias in favor of men who look like men and women who look like women is “Genderism.” Heaven help you if you’re a literate, attractive, straight white man who looks and behaves like a man. According to the categories of oppression dreamed up by intersectional theorists, nothing and no one could be more privileged.

This is why, despite facing their own unique problems, men, and especially white working-class men, are routinely ignored by the new leftist political class—because regardless of the data, straight white men can never be the victims of anything. Any attempts to address their issues are usually met with outrage and condescension. In 2016, when the British Conservative MP Philip Davies gave a speech at a conference on men’s issues, the reaction of feminists in the left-wing Labour party was to demand he be suspended from his party. As for whites, any attempt to organize is usually received by the mainstream as the revival of Nazism, despite the fact that much of such organizing activity today comes as a direct response to a culture that appears to hate them.

I’d prefer a world with no identity politics. I’d prefer we judged people according to reason, logic and evidence instead of barmy left-wing theories about “oppression.” But if you *are* going to divide everyone up, you have to accept that straight white men are going to want their own special party too. If we are to have identity politics, we must have identity politics for all.

MILO

Straight white boys in college aren't Neo-Nazis for resisting Black Lives Matter and feminism or for advocating for their own identity groups: they are simply responding—entirely logically—to what they've been told about how the world works. It just so happens they have been born into a group that invented the best and worst stuff in history, so they have to deal with that legacy.

Popular culture, dominated by the Left, is instructive. Movies are filled with petty, mean-spirited jabs at straight white men. There's a huge trend in movies that seek to channel white guilt over slavery, like *Django Unchained*, *10 Years A Slave* and *MLK*. In the wake of #OscarsSoWhite this is only getting worse, as Hollywood bends over backward to avoid being called racist again (*Moonlight* was a terribly boring film and never would have won Best Picture if it weren't for white appeasement). The straight white male villains in these movies get progressively more sadistic and irredeemable. Strangely, there are no movies about Ottoman or Middle Eastern slave-owners. I suppose we'll have to wait for Muslim guilt to become a thing.

With straight white men replacing the bourgeoisie as the hated oppressor class of the Left, they've become fair game for smug champagne socialists in entertainment and the media. That's why you routinely see movies, stand-up routines, songs and *Guardian* columns about straight white men that would be classified as "hate speech" if they were directed against any other group in society.

White men can't dance, jump or sexually satisfy their partners. These are all socially acceptable jokes. Call an Irishman a drunk leprechaun or an Italian a made man, and you'll have no problem. But if you dare joke that black people are loud, Asians can't drive, or Latinos steal, you'll face the full force of triggered Twitter mouth breathers.

DANGEROUS

The new, identity-driven Left doesn't hate *only* white men. One of the consequences of replacing the old working-class/bourgeoisie dichotomy with the myriad identities of intersectional theory is that everything has become much more complicated. Yes, straight white men are the *most* oppressive, but how do you order everyone else? Are Muslims oppressing women, or are women oppressing Muslims? Is a disabled black man oppressed more than an able-bodied black woman? And what do we do about white men who are, for the sake of argument, extraordinarily gay, but also rich, popular authors of best-selling books about free speech?

The result of dividing their political coalition into a hierarchy of victim groups is a tragicomic battle for the bottom (insert cheap dick taking joke here). Each group fights to be more oppressed than the others. You see this on social media all the time; “white feminists” attacked by intersectionalists for not being ethnic enough, and thus not being oppressed enough. Or, they are criticized for being too ethnic, aka “cultural appropriation.” Probably.

Since the 1970s, social psychologists have been aware that emphasizing differences between groups leads to mistrust and hostility. In a series of landmark experiments, the psychologist Henri Tajfel found that even wearing different-colored shirts was enough for groups to begin displaying signs of mistrust. So guess what happens when you tell everyone that their worth, their ability, their right to speak on certain subjects and—shudder—their “privilege” is, like original sin, based on what they were born with, rather than any choices they've made or who they are?

Here's what you get: the modern Left. Blacks fighting gays fighting women fighting trannies fighting Muslims fighting everyone else. It's

MILO

the iron law of victimhood-driven identity politics. Someone has to win, and everyone else has to lose.

Progressive identity politics ignores basic human realities. If you live authentically as yourself there will be repercussions. Not everyone will like you. Some people may even want you dead. As Friedrich Nietzsche said, “Man is the cruelest animal.” This is a fact of life and it is not changed by all the abuse and harassment policies in all of Silicon Valley. Progressives will never understand this.

Identity politics is universally attractive because it enables failures and weaknesses to be spun as the products of oppression and historical injustice. Personal responsibility is removed from the equation. Primary victims of identity politics in reality are the designated “oppressor class,” for whom it can be humiliating and deeply unfair.

The modern leftist movement has argued itself into a position where people can be discriminated against on the basis of gender, skin color and orientation. Take MTV’s *White People*, a “documentary” highlighting a handful of cherry-picked examples aimed to demonstrate “white privilege” in action. It’s an hour of television designed to produce discomfort in those with the wrong skin color. Or Netflix’s *Dear White People*, another pathetic dose of race-baiting.

White men can only survive in this new landscape through self-flagellation and groveling apology for what they are, by promoting how they’re “woke,” a “male feminist,” or a “straight ally.” (See: Macklemore.) “Straight white man” has become a socially acceptable form of insult. It’ll be a while before we see *Dear Black People* on our screens, much as America’s police officers might have something to say to that community.

DANGEROUS

The future of the progressive movement will be akin to the nightmarish community of grievance-bloggers on Tumblr, where minorities, both real and imagined, engage in an endless competition for supreme victimhood status. Welcome to the era of Minority Wars.

If you're gay, they'll ask what your skin color is.

If you're black, they'll ask if you're a woman.

If you're a woman, they'll ask you to stop worrying about Muslim rapists, you racist.

If you happen to fit into every conceivable minority group, heaven help you if your opinions do not precisely follow political orthodoxy.

Donald Trump, and Margaret Thatcher before him, were both right when they said identity politics and name-calling is what people do when they don't have any arguments left.

The modern Left is an ouroboros, the ancient Egyptian serpent that eats its own tail, constantly consuming itself in a twisted, never-ending cycle of victimhood, hatred and name-calling. No matter how nice they are to you when they're focusing on your particular group's causes, leftists will always, in the end, find a way to shame you about some alleged "privilege."

And if they can't win by public shaming, they rage and flounce off, or at least threaten to. What an entertaining spectacle it was, watching all those celebrities walking back their promises to leave the country if Donald Trump was elected. To the typical actor, threatening to leave the United States over the election was just another set of lines to read. A Trump presidency was supposed to be as likely as Trevor Noah ever having successful ratings.

Did you notice that these whiny celebs uniformly threatened to move to overwhelmingly white countries? Imagine the chutzpah and

MILO

obliviousness it takes to call working-class Americans racist while you plan to move to Canada if your candidate loses. At least Snoop Dogg promised to move to South Africa, although, it's hardly the Congo down there. I'm guessing what Snoop had in mind was a nice gated complex with other rich westerners.

Aside from Snoop Dogg, if it wasn't Canada, it was New Zealand, Australia or another primarily white, English-speaking country. Why not Mexico or the Gambia? Guatemala doesn't have a Whole Foods, so Lena Dunham had to cross it off her list.

SO WHY DOES THE LEFT HATE US?

"Scab" was a derogatory word used by the unionized workers of the old Left to describe strikebreakers: people who, during a strike, decided that feeding their families took priority over an abstract idea of left-wing solidarity.

The Left loathed scabs with a passion far exceeding their hatred for the bourgeoisie. After all, the bourgeoisie were just protecting their own interests. By not following the Left's marching orders, scabs were allegedly betraying theirs.

Once branded a scab, you and your family were scabs for life. No amount of denial or explanation could expiate it. The word scab was (and for some is) akin to a swear word. A cursed word. It wasn't Twitter that gave name-calling its power: social media just added mass scale and mob mentality to an earlier leftist strategy to adorn the untouchables with scarlet letters. No prizes then, for guessing why the Left hates me so much. I'm not one of them. I don't fit into the box they demand of me. I don't fit into any fucking box. "I am large, I contain multitudes."

DANGEROUS

My existence infuriates them, not only because I debunk their myths with style, wit and humor, but also because their usual smears don't work on me. Feminists can't accuse me of suspect motives, because I'm not interested in women except in an academic sense. I can't be accused of being homophobic—only that laughable charge of “self-hatred,” which, come on, I love myself, a lot.

In short, I'm the Left's worst nightmare: a living, breathing refutation of identity politics, and proof that free speech and the truth wrapped in a good joke will always be more persuasive and more powerful than identity politics.

I'm also particularly terrifying to the Left because they see in me a repeat of the 1980s, when workers across Britain and the United States turned to Reaganism and Thatcherism. In the age of Trump, the Left are worried I might not be the only dissident minority. They're afraid *you* might agree with me. Because if you're reading this, there's a good chance you might have realized the Left doesn't have your best interests at heart, because your heartbreak isn't sad enough.

Just as leftist's old base abandoned them to become conservative-voting “Reagan Democrats” in the U.S. and “Essex Men” in the U.K., so too will a new wave of dissident women and minorities break apart their coalition.

The Left's deepest wish is that we rebel minorities didn't exist. Nothing terrifies them so much as the thought of their cherished identity classes going off the reservation. That's why they reacted so hysterically, or in many cases, so silently, to Gamergate's #NotYourShield. It's also why *Clueless* actress Stacey Dash literally lost her social life (and wrote a book about it) when she came out

MILO

as all-in Republican. And it's why I, an obnoxiously proud gay man, continue to be called homophobic.

The Left champions the powerless, and fights the powerful. In itself, that's not a bad thing. Many of the basic luxuries we take for granted today like two-day weekends, eight-hour workdays, and basic occupational health and safety, were won by leftist worker's rights movements. Other more important achievements, such as the end of lynching in the American South, were won by left-wing activists who instinctively detest injustice.

The dark side of this instinct, however, is the hatred of people deemed too successful or well-off: the "privileged." "Puritanism," wrote H.L. Mencken, whose lifetime spanned the first progressive era, is the "haunting fear that someone, somewhere, might be happy."

Who could possibly *hate* happiness?

Those who are denied it themselves.

Morally authoritarian movements are attractive to ugly, miserable, talentless people. It offers an outlet for their hatred of the successful and good-looking, and anyone who looks like they might be enjoying themselves. Rush Limbaugh famously described feminism as a way for ugly women to get attention and enter the mainstream.

On my travels around campuses, I observed happy, well-groomed, ambitious and intelligent Milo fans, as well as the greasy blue-haired social justice apparitions protesting outside. My time on campuses exposed a massive flaw in the Left's plans for world domination: they've taken for granted their lock on the youth constituency.

The Left needs ideological shock troops to propagate its ideas, and none have been more useful to them than impressionable young people, who eagerly take up left-wing causes out of their natural

DANGEROUS

inclination to make an impact on the world, before the realities of raising children and paying a mortgage set in.

The Left convinces young people that they're going to be heroes. In reality, they're like foot soldiers in the intellectual equivalent of the Somme; running at machine guns armed with bayonets.

Bored American youth are indoctrinated into wacky, flimsy ideas that never stand up to the real world, leaving them disappointed, disillusioned, and angry.

Their grip on the minds of young people is weakening, and I am happy to be a leading cause. My efforts to support millennial gamers, and then my "Dangerous Faggot" tour, rapidly mobilized a new breed of dissident student. And now I've written the textbook on how to fight back against cultural lunacy.

To quote esteemed author Michael Walsh, "The only weapon they have is our own weakness... It is our wish to be seen as reasonable, as proportional, as judicious, as measured [*all leftist terms*] that hinders us from taking decisive action against them."

For too long, conservatives have relied on pundits whose audience is primarily over 60. In the case of FOX News, it's over 70. Do you really think anyone who isn't two score into senior citizen discounts wants to have Charles Krauthammer, Stephen Hayes, Frank Luntz, Rich Lowry or Karl Rove on their television screen?

Young people have always been instinctively anti-establishment, and that's where I come in. There is no other libertarian or conservative pop culture figure who comes close to the purchase I have with Generation Next, who are sick of being lectured to by the increasingly nannying Left. America's young conservatives and libertarians are looking for heroes. I'm happy to oblige.

MILO

Without an endless supply of eager young activists, the Left is nothing. And I am hoovering up those young people and spitting them out as mischievous, dissident free speech warriors who don't give a damn about your feelings. For hundreds of thousands of students, simply reading this book has become the ultimate statement of rebellion. To them I say: Milo Merchandise is also available, while supplies last.

You've seen how liberals respond when their backs are against the wall: with hate, because they've forgotten how to argue, all the while trumpeting their own moral superiority. Well, here's something I've learned during my time in America: aggressive public displays of virtue are where the morally deplorable hide.