



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 19, 2013

Liberal CNN Panelists Defend Murderer Dorner

“Modern liberalism is moral dysfunction.” When I recently [made that statement](#) after citing leftist social-media support for murderer Christopher Dorner, some readers thought I’d gone overboard. Surely, the twisted rooting for a paranoid killer on Facebook and elsewhere is just the rambling of an odd minority; there are radicals “on both sides” and one in every bunch, right? But now more evidence has surfaced vindicating my statement that such feelings aren’t at all unusual among the passionate left — evidence provided courtesy of the “professionals” at CNN.



The network’s Brooke Baldwin hosted a [panel discussion](#) on Dorner’s support involving MC Lyte of Café Mocha Radio; BuzzFeed sports editor Jack Moore; Lauren Ashburn, editor-in-chief at The Daily Download; and frequent O’Reilly Factor guest Marc Lamont Hill. The consensus?

Dorner’s actions were understandable.

What follows are relevant excerpts of the conversation. When Ashburn — the only guest shocked by the support for the murderer — said that there has been tremendous waste (lives, police manpower, etc.) because of Dorner’s actions, Hill replied, “There’s no waste here, though; this has been an important public conversation we’ve had about police brutality, police corruption, about state violence.”

This is a bit like saying that wars can be beneficial because they help the economy (which is [also a myth](#)). Mr. Hill, was Sandy Hook not a waste because it sparked a conversation about guns? Perhaps it would have been good if Dorner killed 400 people instead of 4. Then we could’ve really had a talk.

Hill then said, “As far as Dorner himself goes, he’s been like a real-life superhero to people. Don’t get me wrong; what he did was awful; killing innocent people is bad. But when you read his manifesto, the message he left, he wasn’t entirely crazy; he had a plan and a mission here.”

So did Adolf Hitler, Pol Pot, and Mao.

Hill continued, “And many people aren’t rooting for him to kill innocent people; they’re rooting for somebody who was wronged to ... to get some kind of revenge against the system. It’s almost like watching *Django Unchained* in real life; it’s kind of exciting.”

Yep, just get the popcorn and soda and sit back. You don’t even have to spring for a theater ticket.

What you’re seeing here is The Liberal Mind Unchained. It’s kind of sickening.

When Baldwin then asked, “Do you think this should serve as a catalyst for a conversation, talking about ‘racism’ in the LAPD?” Lyte (in the head, I suppose) chimed in “Absolutely!” Moore then said, “But I think there’s also something to it [the support] in that the narrative of Christopher Dorner doesn’t.... I mean, in some ways it resembles a Denzel Washington movie where someone is wronged and stands up for himself and goes down in a blaze of glory. It’s hard for it not to turn into a movie.”



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 19, 2013

Ashburn then said that such grievances should be addressed through the law, at which point Hill interjected, “Not if the law is broken! Not if the law is broken!... The proper channels don’t work.”

I wonder, can conservatives apply this to Democratic politicians who violate the Constitution, the supreme law of the land? I mean, if the proper channels don’t work...

Shortly thereafter Lyte lent her support, saying “Absolutely. Um, everyone’s making a point that needs to be heard, I’m sure.” She then took at face value Dorner’s claim that he was fired from the LAPD for reporting police brutality and said, “It’s [the support is] an uproar because people are being brutalized.”

Note here that the nonjudgmental liberals take ideological soulmate Dorner’s claims at face value, including the claim that he was wronged. It doesn’t matter that he was an obviously unhinged man who, [according](#) to an ex-girlfriend, was “severely emotionally and mentally disturbed,” “twisted,” and “super paranoid.” This mentality isn’t hard to recognize, either, if you’ve ever dealt with a paranoid individual. Such a person will imagine out of left field that you did him dirty and then make taking vengeance an all-consuming, tunnel-vision goal. You do not want to be on a paranoid’s radar screen. It would be a measure of justice, however, if that’s exactly where the CNN panelists would one day find themselves (though it’s unlikely they’d make the connection and learn anything).

We also can only imagine what Dorner might have done had he been allowed to remain on the LAPD. And had he engaged in police brutality, the same leftists now impugning the LAPD in his defense would be doing so in his condemnation.

The truth, however, is that two factors are in play here. First, in the cases of Hill and Lyte, who are both black, there is the “black code”; this includes the injunction “Thou shalt not criticize another black person” — especially in front of whites or when he can be seen an opponent of society.

But then there is what’s characteristic of all leftists: a pathological inability to condemn one’s own. When Republican congressman Mark Foley was found to have engaged in sexual impropriety, he had to resign, and his conservative constituents were so disenchanted that a Democrat won his seat; when GOP senator Larry Craig was guilty of same, he wouldn’t run again as it would only have resulted in a primary loss. Contrast this with Democrat politicians such as Gerry Studds (there’s a reason his name sounds like a porn star’s), Barney Frank, and Bill Clinton, all of whom could remain in office for as long as their little reprobate hearts desired. Why, Noam Chomsky even defended the Khmer Rouge while they were in the midst of killing off a third of Cambodia, and leftists generally don’t even muster passionate denunciations of Joseph Stalin. But there’s a reason for this. I think you’ll find it interesting.

It’s always hard to condemn those to whom we have an emotional attachment or whose actions we find emotionally pleasing. The perfect example is a mother who is told her son committed heinous crimes and then goes into denial, saying “He’s a good boy.” Yet we’ve all experienced this phenomenon. Just think about how it’s harder to take a friend to task for a minor transgression than it would be an enemy, or how there’s generally a reluctance to criticize those next to us in the phalanx of a cherished cause. But what increases the chances that you’ll stifle emotion and stand on principle?

You first must have principle to begin with. When you believe in Truth — either explicitly or just in the sense of operating under the assumption that there is a transcendent “right” — it will be your yardstick for behavior and decision-making. This is when the head can intervene and begin to compete with the seductive heart. It’s when you’re more likely to tell an errant friend, “Look, you know I like you, but what you did there was wrong.” What, though, if you’re a relativist and thus don’t believe in



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 19, 2013

transcendent morality? What then will be that yardstick for behavior and decision-making?

There is only one thing left: emotion.

Sure, the consensus “values” of the wider society may influence you — but in a relativistic age they’ll largely be the product of emotion, too — and you certainly will see them as such absent a belief in Truth. And then why should you defer to other people’s emotions? You’ve got your own, and other people aren’t gods.

This is why liberals — who are defined by relativism — are so emotion-driven (think of Clinton and “I feel your pain”). And it is why they will virtually never condemn those they like. After all, what is there to inform that an emotional attachment is wrong when emotion is all there is? A yardstick cannot fail to measure up to itself, and the head won’t likely trump the heart when the heart is the governing part.

And this is why liberals are so dangerous. To use a play on a Ben Franklin line, liberals are passion that governs, and they never govern wisely.

A failure to believe in Absolute Truth is, by definition, denial of moral reality. And to tolerate people so delusional in control of government, the media, and academia is to allow the transformation of your land into a mental asylum writ large.

[Contact Selwyn Duke](#), [follow him on Twitter](#) or log on to [SelwynDuke.com](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.