

Male Supremacism: Ideology, Movement, and Political Strategy with Alex DiBranco

Inform Your Resistance: Season 2 Episode 3

Koki: This is “Inform Your Resistance” with PRA, Political Research Associates. Tune in twice a month to hear experts, researchers, journalists, academics, and movement strategists explain some of the most significant contemporary threats to democracy from the mainstream and Far Right. With “Inform Your Resistance,” we distill what you need to know most. I'm your host, Koki Mendis, Communications Director here at PRA.

Today, I'm joined by Alex DiBranco for an illuminating discussion on male supremacism and its relationship to misogyny, patriarchy, and sexism. It's manifestation across a broad spectrum of right-wing and far-right movements, from theocratic movements to so-called pick up artists, and how an intersectional analysis of supremacist ideologies and their systems provides us with a roadmap for defeating them.

Alex DiBranco is Executive Director for the Institute for Research on Male Supremacism [IRMS]. Her writings on male supremacism and incel terrorism have appeared in the *International Center for Counterterrorism Journal* and the *Public Eye Quarterly*, a publication of Political Research Associates. She has provided trainings and advice on male supremacist ideology for social justice organizations and has been interviewed about her work by outlets including *NPR*, *The New Republic*, *The Chicago Tribune*, ThinkProgress, and the Southern Poverty Law Center. DiBranco has her Ph.D. in sociology from Yale University.

[00:01:37] **Koki:** Alex, thank you so much for being with us today.

Alex: Yeah, I'm really glad to be here. Thank you for having me.

Koki: Of course. We're going to go ahead and get started. I'm so excited to have an expert with us today on misogyny and male supremacism. So we're going to start

with some big definitional questions. What are misogyny and male supremacism and their relationship to patriarchy? And then what are some of the ways that misogyny figures most saliently and subtly in the social and economic spheres today?

[00:02:07] **Alex:** So, the use of the term “male supremacism” came about for us [IRMS] because we noticed that sexism and even the concept of patriarchy was really not being taken sufficiently seriously in academic work on right-wing studies and in other fields, looking at versions of what's generally called “extremism” or “radicalization.”

And so the term “male supremacism” is intended to draw on people's understanding of the concept of “White supremacism” and what that is, and to understand structures of dominance and oppression that are around gender. That it's not just something that can be dismissed as religious patriarchal traditionalism, and that that means in some way it's okay. Like when groups on the Christian right talk about the anti-abortion movement, that these are supremacist actions.

And so our concept of male supremacism is understanding an ideology in which there is a biologically essentialist belief that there are only cisgender men and cisgender women, that cisgender men are in a position where they are entitled to dominate, subordinate others, in which they erase anyone who doesn't fit that binary, specifically trans and non-binary people. And in which misogyny – this strong version of sexism, the hatred of women, the belief that women are inferior – is a significant motivating ideological force in this.

And when we talk about male supremacism and misogyny, we really shy away from framing it in terms of extremism and radicalization that is very typical for many fields that look at the Right. Because so much of gender-based violence is unfortunately, mainstream: the rates of sexual violence we have, the rates of interpersonal violence, and those are often seen siloed out as something different than extremist violence. But the same belief systems around cisgender men's sexual entitlement, around their entitlement to control, around their superiority are around traditional gender roles, are found in both intimate partner per abuse perpetrators and misogynist incels who are perpetrating mass violence.

And so our approach to this really digs in with the concept of thinking about supremacy as a spectrum. And this is something that also develops from a lot of the work that's been done on institutional racism and that the mainstream core of our society is traditionally racist, it's traditionally patriarchal. And that in truly countering the roots and changing culture in the long term, requires a recognition of where it falls across the spectrum and developing other forms of understanding cisgender supremacy, Christian supremacy.

We're a transnationally focused organization. So in different areas, there are different forms of supremacy. And so conceptualizing what is often taken as sexism, *oh, not a big deal, not very serious* within the framework of, *these are supremacist ideologies, and we need to approach them as such*.

[00:06:11] **Koki:** Thank you so much for breaking that definition down for us and having a political organizing goal, I think, to helping us understand how male supremacy relates to how we think about sexism and, and often dismiss it, I think that is such a instrumental use of language in organizing and highlighting very clear, distinct political projects that manifest in people's lives.

Thinking more about the ways in which male supremacy manifests, how does it appear and occur and is deployed within disparate movements? So those ranging from like Redpilled pickup artists to even theocratic anti-abortion groups?

[00:06:58] **Alex:** We look at secular and religious versions of male supremacy, and there is a very unifying aspect of misogyny underneath both secular Redpill movements and theocratic anti-abortion movements.

Um, and so this kind of approach to the analysis looking at those kinds of unifying roots helps us to see a lot of the interconnections between these kinds of movements, and in some cases, the transitions of people who have moved from secular pickup artist communities or Redpill communities into theocratic anti-abortion communities.

And while that is a change in their stated religious beliefs, it's not really a change in the baseline misogyny. Whether their misogyny is, as in the pickup artist movement – Roosh V, is a strong example of this, very well known in the pickup

artist movement, advocated for decriminalization of rape – and he now identifies as a Christian and rejects his previous lifestyle.

And yet the entitlement to control of women's bodies is exactly the same in so many ways, that it is still seeing this as a version of superiority. And so we can trace misogyny and male supremacism and how it's utilized in figures like former President Donald Trump, who had a very secular appeal to many of the misogynist secular groups that hadn't been particularly involved in politics previously. The Christian Right actors didn't appeal to them as much. And simultaneously, he also was very willing to cater to the theocratic Right, to the anti-abortion Right, his Vice President, Mike Pence, a very stalwart member of the Christian Right, and so bringing those kinds of things together.

And so I think that we see, then as misogyny is used in these different movements, how it allows for different kinds of organizing. And so the Proud Boys – one of the groups that were the biggest supporters of Trump – used misogyny as a glue to build a multiracial coalition. And so male supremacism becomes the thing that allow them to recruit cisgender men of color, and increasingly anti-feminist conspiracism is a really significant part of movements on the Right.

This isn't brand new. When Anita Hill made her allegations regarding Supreme Court nominee, at the time, Clarence Thomas around sexual harassment in the workplace. And when Hillary Clinton was the First Lady in the 1990s, these were really big mobilization points for what is now the contemporary spectrum of secular male supremacist movements in reaction to seeing women in power, seeing women speaking up against sexual harassment and sexual assault.

And so from 2016 forward – with what Trump represented and then what the Democratic nominee, Hillary Rodham Clinton, represented to them in terms of their beliefs about feminist elites pulling the strings behind the scenes, which is super clearly borrowed from long standing antisemitic beliefs about Jewish people pulling the strings behind the scenes – is something that has really brought this version of male supremacism, it's more secular iteration to a forefront in contemporary rightist and supremacist organizing.

[00:11:18] **Koki:** Thank you, Alex. Those were incredibly demonstrative examples that you provide us. I think you really use sort of case studies to explain the ways in which misogyny is both consistent and manifest in very different – seemingly different contexts, right?

The example of Trump and Hillary's oppositional campaigns really leads me into my next question on the role that misogyny and male supremacism play in the realm of electoral politics, most specifically. So, especially for women running in political races, how do misogyny and male supremacism impact their races? And, thinking about that also in the context of disinformation, and how it's deployed by opposition campaigns to those women's campaigns that they're running.

[00:12:08] **Alex:** So there's a really broad spectrum of how misogyny and male supremacism impacts women candidates, and then particularly women of color candidates and trans women.

Some of it is the – what is often called “everyday sexism,” *just the existence of a woman candidate is a catch-22 because women are not supposed to be too ambitious*, and many things that men—cisgender men—can do as candidates get women candidates branded as *aggressive*, in a negative sense, as *strident*.

There is a lot of disparagement of Hillary Rodham Clinton around her looks. When women of color run, there's a larger risk of being dehumanized, disinformation, and attacks that give them animalistic characteristics. And so dehumanization and conspiracism, then moving into what is considered the more extreme ideological end of things can be a really big factor in building anti-woman candidacies.

And so with respect to Rodham Clinton, for instance, in the early 1990s, the conservative publication, *The American Spectator*, referred to her as the Lady Macbeth of Little Rock. She was seen as pulling the strings of her husband behind the scene; there's a longstanding conspiracy theory about her having had an aide murdered. So, there are, there are all sorts of complicated conspiracy theories that go around the concept of the *feminist elite who are pulling the strings*.

And that re-emerge in different ways that weird things we saw in 2016 about like Rodham Clinton's health, which was, you know, seen as part of some kind of

conspiracist cover up. And even things that don't necessarily seem gendered, like the conspiracy theories and the really strong focus on her email servers, when Trump has so many different appalling statements, histories of harassment and violence and corruption.

And of course now we're in, in the period of all of the investigations of the very many ways in which, you know, he violated state security. And so something like that, with the expectations for women around, you know perfectionism around submissiveness, around all sorts of things mean that something like the email servers, conspiracy theories, and disproportionate focus by media can't really be divorced from that behind the scenes belief in what women's roles are and in the idea that feminists are pulling those strings.

In thinking about women politicians and also the potential chilling effect of the kinds of misogynist and male supremacist organizing we have, I think that Gretchen Whitmer is a really important example of that. That she was really seen as a symbol of feminism by supremacist organizers, and then her being the subject of a kidnapping plot. But also the invasion of the Michigan State Capitol, which was in a lot of ways a precursor to the then attack at the D.C. Capitol around the last election cycle. Recognizing that that kind of conspiracism around feminists pulling the strings, that the significance of it starting in this state with a woman governor who also, you know, gave some of the democratic responses to Trump.

And so it was put in this position of being seen as a feminist elite by the Right and then what was incubated through that, that came out in the appearance of these many male supremacist-driven organizations, organizations and groups and people at the D.C. Capitol. And so that was a particularly stark example at the time, and one that I think is important to continue to keep in mind as we think about how anti-feminist conspiracy theories look.

When they invaded the Capitol, Nancy Pelosi's office was one that they were really looking for; the symbol that she had provided as a democratic woman in power seen as part of this feminist conspiracy theory. And that that is going to be a continued element for any kind of women in politics. And that threat of potential violence can also be really chilling to women who are thinking about their

decisions to be in politics and to stay in politics, and how they can be protected and safe in that.

[00:18:12] I think we also saw when Obama was president that they really ended up having First Lady Michelle Obama really lean into appearing as a non-threatening feminine figure that she was a, you know, a lawyer, a very powerful woman in her own right. And that intersection of being a powerful woman and being a powerful Black woman was seen, I think, as very terrifying in terms of her image.

There were a lot of problematic covers that were published with depictions of the Obamas. And so they had her working on, on issues like healthy school lunches and gardens that are considered more appropriate in the patriarchal paradigm to how women are supposed to be seen as acting. And so there is a constant from just our mainstream core male supremacism to the potential attacks from people like Trump and his followers that makes it incredibly difficult for women in politics.

[00:19:44] **Koki** : This throughline of conspiracy is really interesting. I think it really complicates the ways in which sexism is inadequate for understanding this power imbalance in the way that it, it, it appears. And your example of Michelle Obama is really fascinating.

It makes me think of the Netflix show that she's on, I think, *Waffles + Mochi* where she interacts with small food items that are animated. Really in line with this very neutralizing, unthreatening version of her – and how that's so clearly part and parcel of the political strategy of keeping her, her husband in particular, in a place of prominence. You mentioned the ways in which misogyny and male supremacism disproportionately impacts women candidates of color, but also trans women. And I want to stick with this for a minute.

Given the continued prominence of anti-trans organizing and renewed attempts at rolling back LGBTQ rights, how can we apply an understanding of misogyny to understand culture war framing of contemporary politics? And are there ways in which the Right pits groups against each other using misogyny as a wedge?

[00:21:02] **Alex:** So I mentioned earlier groups like the Proud Boys – Patriot Prayer is another example – that are using misogyny and the biologically essentialist understanding of what cisgender men are and what their role is to bring men of color into their organizing coalition.

White supremacism is a really core element of the roots of these groups. They refer to it as “Western chauvinism,” is one of the current popular terms, but it gives them the ability to make a shift in order to be able to recruit a broader swath of people to their current goals in ways that, for instance, blatant White nationalist organizations like Aryan Nations don't have that opportunity.

And it's also a necessity as gender has become more of a focus of conspiracy theories and supremacist organizing that anti-feminist conspiracism has become a lot more significant and that anti-trans attacks and related types of attacks on gender fluidity, the attacks on Drag Story Hour, which has been something that we have been looking at a lot at the Institute for Research on Male Supremacism. This has shifted. The makeup of a lot of supremacist organizations—that traditionally women make up a larger part of White nationalist organizing. There's even what Matthew Lyons has referred to as “quasi-feminism” in neonazi groups in the ‘80s and ‘90s attempting to say that White women could be race warriors in their own right.

The newer rise of secular misogyny over theocratic misogyny has upended that a little bit. In theocratic misogyny, as long as predominantly White women—although there has been multiracial organizing by the Christian Right as well. Before Trump, they were really working to make inroads with the Latino immigrant population based on the Catholicism and conservative Catholicism of that population and using abortion as kind of a wedge issue.

But they always relied on women – like Phyllis Schlafly, for instance another, another focus of, I think it was a Hulu TV show recently, so people might be more familiar with her – to take leadership roles in the movement, in the defense of the White race. And as long as they stayed within their expected kind of role, then they were treated with what we call “benevolent sexism,” the version of sexism that's sometimes called chivalry that puts White women on a pedestal as long as they

fulfill their expected role as wives and mothers. And the other side of that is “hostile sexism,” which is for any women who step out of line. And culturally, we have aspects of both of these. It's been called by psychologists, “ambivalent sexism,” the like two versions of how women are seen.

The secular misogynist movements that have grown more significantly – the men's rights activists, the Redpill, the misogynist incels, even groups like the Proud Boys – are doing different things with gender. Feminists are a bigger focus, in terms of the major threat that they see. For many of these groups, there is a belief that just all Western women, all White women are just irredeemably tainted by feminism. And so none of them can really be allies in misogynist organizing.

[00:25:36] There's been, for Proud Boys for instance, there were groups like the Proud Boys' Girls, and there's a lot of controversy about that, a lot of lack of acceptance. And so in doing this, and also other versions of disparaging women as inferior, wanting to go back to removing the right to vote. The various versions of sexual harassment and violence that are really at the core of the sexual entitlement that's in a lot of these belief systems means that they don't draw on White women as organizers and especially the stay-at-home moms that have made a really significant element of the Christian Right. So they're pitting people against one another in different ways.

Specifically with respect to gender essentialism, we have definitely seen in recent years that attacks on trans people and trans youth – and also things that are seen as related, things that teach or expose young people or adults to fluidity, like Drag Story Hour – are a newer focus for where supremacist organizing is creating its hostility around.

This, after things like same sex marriage, which used to be a really big motivational force for the Christian right, has moved along. The anti-trans attacks are both secular and religious. They come from both types of movements.

[00:27:29] Biological essentialism has both secular and religious versions. And so they're able to come together around that. There's a really significant problem with TERFs – the term for trans exclusive radical feminists is what it stands for – but

women who consider themselves liberal, democratic, feminist, but who are anti trans.

With the fall of Roe, there was an op-ed in the *New York Times* that was blaming trans women and inclusive language for somehow being why we lost Roe. And so that kind of, you know, pitting groups against each other that makes just absolutely no sense whatsoever, amongst other things, because trans men are the people who are accessing abortions and who are included in language around talking about pregnant people.

And so the whole concept of trans women as a really hostile focus is something that is a strong element, previously not so much in the United States, more so in like the United Kingdom and some other countries. But now seems to have really taken much stronger roots in the U.S. as well.

And this is why we also like the concept of supremacism as our sort of ideological framework because we can talk about different types of supremacism and its intersections. And so we certainly see TERFs as male supremacists in what they are doing, even if they don't view themselves this way, but also very strongly want to name cisgender supremacism as what is at stake in that as well, and to be able to tease out these various intersections of different versions of supremacism. And how that really deep biologically essentialist belief, which is a concept that one of our fellows, Blu Buchanan at the Institute for Research on Male Supremacism talks about a lot, has really shaped how, how many of our present day gender and reproductive movements play out.

[00:30:15] **Koki:** Thank you, Alex. You really paint a very comprehensive picture for us and underline the ways in which supremacism, specifically male supremacism, sometimes feels incoherent. but is very clearly in lockstep across right-wing movements. And I think what you've done for us and our listeners today is really underline why this is such an important ideology to understand.

[00:30:57] You've mentioned a few times your work with your colleagues at the Institute for Research on Male Supremacism. I'd like to pause and ask you to talk a little bit about your work at IRMS, and give our readers a sense of if they're

wanting to continue to learn about male supremacism, misogyny, and ways to counter both, what sort of resources they could access with you at IRMS.

[00:31:21] **Alex:** So the Institute for Research on Male Supremacism was founded in 2019 by myself and five of my colleagues who are working on different aspects of misogynist and male supremacist ideology. In large part because of both in academia and in many non-academic research organizations and even social justice organizations, a lack of attention to male supremacism and specifically to secular versions of misogyny with the multiple acts of mass violence perpetrated at that point by misogynist incels with the role of groups like the Redpill in supporting Trump in the 2016 election and really wanting to bring a stronger attention to this version of supremacism.

IRMS is a virtual transnational organization. And so it's open to fellows and mentees around the globe. And it really acts as an opportunity for them to join a community and network of people who are doing similar kinds of research when they are usually isolated in their own institutions.

And the work that comes out of this community on a vast range of different versions of male supremacism in different geographies is really significant. And so our website, theIRMS.org, has um, our fellows and mentees, has a lot of the media that they've done, publications.

IRMS itself has worked on some collaborative publications. There's a piece published at *New America* that really dives into concepts of male supremacist and misogynist incel ideology and violence and what we see as intervention points.

So another unique niche that IRMS aims to fill is – along with what I discussed earlier, moving away from the language of “extremism” and “radicalization” as not really encompassing how core and mainstream supremacism is – to also attempt to have our interventions not be 11th hour, not be focused on a concept of moving people from an extreme to maybe a slightly less extreme, but still sexist and racist and transphobic version, which is what happens with a lot of former's programs, but reorienting our thinking towards comprehensive consent based sex education to the cultural impact of drag hour in libraries, to thinking about these kinds of

interventions that, incidentally for the past 50 odd years — educational systems, sex-ed, LGBTQ inclusive content in schools, now Drag Story Hour — are really significant focuses of right-wing organizing.

[00:35:01] And this often gets framed as a distraction. That culture wars are somehow less important and are distracting us from the real issues. And one of the projects that IRMS is really invested in is understanding that the reason that these educational spheres and this programming that opens up different conceptions of gender, are under attack, is actually because they are at their core deeply anti-authoritarian and deeply anti-supremacist. And that to be exposed to, instead of abstinence only education with its biologically essentialist stereotyping, with its lack of consent, with its dehumanizing kind of concepts, to be exposed to comprehensive sex-ed, to be exposed to people who demonstrate different ways of showcasing gender, identifying gender.

And this is something that PRA's recent researcher, Heron Greensmith has talked about previously in an article by Tina Vasquez at *Prism* about the inherent anti-authoritarian nature of these programs, and that this is really where we could be developing generations of people who are not going to support a candidate like Donald Trump or the copious Christian Right candidates that we tend to get because their framework of what is humanity is different.

And so IRMS attempts to live at this intersection where we are informed by many of our researchers come out of the Right Wing studies, extremism, radicalization fields, but also from gender studies, intersectionality studies, race and ethnicity studies, social movement studies, and bringing those fields together and refocusing an attention on gender as a very significant element of supremacist organizing, but also biological essentialism, which is not only gender-based, but also race-based and so beliefs about the attacks on critical race theory, which have grown up very significantly.

Again, something that goes all the way back to the 1970s that you have these campaigns that are simultaneously attacking things viewed as sexually immoral and multicultural, which is a very negative term for the Right. And so having these kinds of interventions that put misogyny, transmisogyny, misogynoir, and its

intersections with other forms of supremacism at the forefront of how we're thinking about culture and structural change in the long term and attempting to really bridge that and to intervene also in many of these fields that are in extremism studies, in right wing studies, in countering violent extremism studies and practitioner work, just very disproportionately dominated by cisgender White men and bringing alternative perspectives into that work, perspectives informed by understandings of colonialism and supremacism and new ways of thinking about authoritarianism.

So that is the project basically of IRMS and what people can see and learn more about in our publications and by following our fellows and mentees.

[00:39:13] **Koki:** I love interventions that encourage practicing democratic skills, practicing anti-authoritarianism in places that are understood as being not about politics, right?

So, sexual education programs as a way to dismantle supremacism and complicate biological essentialism as, like, such a concrete, doable intervention. I really appreciate when the practical application of understanding forms of oppression are achievable within, you know, smaller scale community contexts. So thank you for that, Alex.

You talked about some of the tangible interventions and resources available with IRMS. I wonder if you could talk a little bit about the ways in which a social justice movement more broadly can incorporate an understanding of misogyny and male supremacism, encountering these ideologies, organizing against them and building a feminist future in their place.

[00:40:22] **Alex:** We actually, and I personally, have been hopeful about the changes that have been apparent in some of the social justice and monitoring kind of organizations since IRMS was founded in 2019. Groups like the Southern Poverty Law Center have more attention to male supremacism than they did previously. I've contributed to Western State Center's toolkits for parents and students on White nationalism, updating their sections on misogyny. So groups that are already doing really powerful kind of intervention work in especially the

K-through-12 spheres, bringing conceptions of male supremacism more deeply into their work.

I think that the main thing that I still would like to see is that a lot of these sort of small growing organizations that are increasingly under attack or poised to do the kind of generational interventions that we need, like Drag Story Hour, like EducateUS which is the c4 wing of SIECUS that EducateUS works on lobbying for comprehensive sex education, that these kinds of organizations be more integrated into social justice organizing and that we have performers and educators as part of our mobilizations, that we have the librarians, and we have the artists in what we're doing. There are lots of great groups in reproductive justice that exemplify this kind of approach. Forward Together is one that I think of that has really spotlighted a lot of creativity in its work.

And so I think for social justice organizing, reorienting some of our thinking outside of the campaign-by-campaign model is an important element of this shift. Most of the organizations and interventions I've been talking about are starting with people who are kindergarten or preschool or toddlers.

And expecting then change that is going to happen when they are at voting age. And I know it's very difficult to make decisions about short and long term interventions, especially in a period that already has so much heightened authoritarianism, conspiracism, dehumanization. But social justice movements are in many ways, so far behind infrastructurally, and in terms of these kinds of generational interventions, that supremacist and rightist groups really decided in the 1970s that the educational system was the place that they needed to intervene.

Carol Mason's work on the Kanawha textbook controversy is something I would recommend people looking up, if they're not familiar with it. It was a really influential incident for the then-brand new Heritage Foundation and thinking about how it wanted to intervene in culture and led to their long term interest in taking over school boards, in investing in local community organizing. Things that we think probably we should see more of in leftist organizing, and yet often isn't really fully conceptualized in terms of how important the school boards, the library boards, the local kind of level is to where this generational change starts.

[00:44:30] Abstinence-only education really started to get significant government funding in the 1990s and then under Bush in the 2000s. And so we have generations of children in which many of the children are exposed to curricula that basically teaches them that a person like Donald Trump, who has a history of sexual harassment and sexual violence, that what he defended as “locker room talk,” is what they have been taught to believe is just how men are.

And so thinking about making those kinds of interventions in projects that will both have, you know, an immediate impact, supporting stuff like Drag Story Hours, but also thinking about our long term change and that without making decisions and interventions that are going to support long term cultural and structural change organizing, we're going to continue where we've been kind of for the last 50 years where every decade that goes by, we fall farther behind.

African American Policy Forum and their work on critical race theory attacks and which are actually just attacks on any form of accurate racial, you know race and ethnicity education or anything remotely racial justice oriented is not actually critical race theory, which is a legal framework, but we won't get into that.

But these kinds of organizations that work on banned books as well, that I think that they are just incredibly important in our organizing, and also for a recognition that the Right and supremacist groups, they often work across an intersection of issues. They don't view their attacks on abortion or sex-ed as separate from their attacks on critical race theory. They apply the playbooks of one to the other. In social justice organizing, too often, that organizing is siloed. That we have queer justice and then we have reproductive justice.

[00:47:01] And I remember, you know, even 10 years ago at Creating Change, one of the biggest LGBTQ conferences, that the idea of recognizing reproductive justice and LGBTQ justice organizing – and I'm using the terminology that they're using at the time primarily – was like a new thing to be talking about.

And then again looking at something like the attacks on racial justice education and needing to recognize that this is the playbook they've been using to attack sex

ed and to attack also any versions of trans inclusive education or protection of trans youth.

And so I think that it's really leaning into the reality of intersectionality in our movements, seeing how they come together and recognizing and, you know, for people who are already doing really powerful organizing, that is around gender justice and reproductive justice and racial justice. And recognizing that what they're doing—not to fall for the framing that even happens from the Democrats, that culture, if it's a culture war, it's somehow less important. That the culture is what shapes us and our society, and that what they are doing is the front lines of anti-authoritarian work and to recognize and value that in themselves. And then, you know, hopefully to get funders and other organizations to recognize and value that in them as well.

[00:48:46] **Koki:** What a clear-eyed, comprehensive strategy for a disparate social movement left to lean into intersectionality and, and play the long game ultimately. If that's not a call to action for our movements, I don't know what is.

Thank you so much, Alex. I really appreciate all the brilliant analysis that you bring and the ways in which you so clearly identify the disparate sectors of the Right that have this male supremacist ideology at their core and really centering that male supremacist ideology as an important, um an important ideology for us to organize against. So thank you so much for taking the time to speak with us today.

[00:49:27] **Alex:** Yeah, I'm really happy to be here. Thank you for having me.

[00:49:32] **Koki:** Thank you for listening to “Inform Your Resistance” with Political Research Associates. Today's episode was hosted by me, Koki Mendis. Sound Design and Mixing by Alicia Crawford. The podcast is produced and fact-checked by Olivia Lawrence-Weilmann and Jack Giesecking. Harini Rajagopalan created our communications and marketing materials, and Frank Lawrence created our music. If you haven't already, rate, review, and subscribe.

And the best thing you can do to help us is tell your comrades about the pod. Resisting authoritarianism is better with friends. Until next time!