



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on September 16, 2019

Published in the September 16, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 18

## Right-Wing Terrorists?

In the current political wave of the ongoing culture war, there is good news and there is bad news. The good news is that the Left has run out of new material and is using the same old stuff over and over again. The bad news is that — having used the same old tactics so many times — the Left has honed them to a razor’s edge and uses them with great efficiency. Perhaps nothing better demonstrates this than the lie repeated so often by the liberal media that maintains that mass shootings are all the work of “right-wing” fanatics. It is so patently false that it simply boggles the mind that anyone would claim it or that anyone else would believe it; but the Left — having cultivated that lie to the level of a received truth — pushes it out again and again after (nearly) every mass shooting.



Evidence of the mendacity of that claim is indeed legion. The space of this article does not allow this writer to unpack all of that evidence, but fortunately, it is unnecessary to do so: A look at only the two most recent shootings will easily demonstrate that such shootings are more likely the work of those who have drunk too deeply from the poisoned well of leftist thinking, and not that of “right-wing” fanatics.

In its typical style, *Business Insider* took the lie even further, claiming in a headline also dated August 5, “All of the extremist killings in the US in 2018 had links to right-wing extremism.” The implication is easy to see: The shootings over the weekend of August 3 and 4 are a continuation of the “trend” from 2018. Ergo, the claim that “Right-Wingers Are America’s Deadliest Terrorists” is true. That, of course, assumes that two things can be demonstrated: First, that *exactly zero* people were killed in 2018 by anyone influenced by leftist thinking, and second, that the shootings in El Paso, Texas, and Dayton, Ohio, were the work of right-wingers.

If — based on the fraudulent claim that “all of the extremist killings in the US in 2018 had links to right-wing extremism” — one accepts the implication that the “trend” is continuing, it may be reasonable to conclude that “Right-Wingers Are America’s Deadliest Terrorists.” Conversely, if the premise is false, so is the conclusion.

On that note, even the “study” cited by media groups such as *Business Insider* in claiming that all of the 2018 extremist killings were the work of right-wingers clearly states that that is not the case. In fact, as a January 28 article by *Breitbart* points out, the “study” — based on limiting the scope of what is considered an “extremist killing” — actually admits “that political ideology was a motive only in a minority of the killings — and, moreover, that the proportion of ‘extremist’ killings attributable to political motives actually declined in 2018,” and that in at least one example — the Parkland school



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on September 16, 2019

Published in the September 16, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 18

---

shooting — the “study” concedes that “it is not clear” whether the shooter’s political ideology played any role at all.

To use that flawed and exaggerated “study” — by the far-left Anti-Defamation League (ADL), which really should consider renaming itself considering the lengths to which it goes to defame anyone to the right of Clinton or Pelosi — to propagate the lie that (first) right-wingers are responsible for all of the “extremist” killings in 2018, and (second) that that non-existent trend is continuing, is completely dishonest.

Ignoring that basic logic, other media organizations and outlets have likewise seized upon nearly every mass shooting to paint the shooters as right-wing, conservative, Trump-supporting, racist radicals intent on purging America of foreign blood.

For instance, the *New York Times* — forever poised to attack the Right — ran article after article claiming that the shooting in El Paso, Texas, was the work of a right-winger under the influence of President Trump and conservative talk-show hosts. While not actually making that claim about the Dayton shooting (for reasons we shall show), the *Times* bent over backward to imply that was the case.

On August 7, the *Times* used President Trump’s visit to El Paso in the wake of the shooting there as an opportunity to attack not only the president and his policies regarding illegal immigration, but conservatism in general. Under the headline, “Trump Comes to Console. El Paso Says No Thanks,” the *Times*’ Simon Romero and Rick Rojas wrote that President Trump’s “racist” rhetoric of painting illegal immigrants as a threat to the nation led to the shooting.

And on August 11, the *Times* ran a headline claiming “The El Paso Killer Echoed the Incendiary Words of Conservative Media Stars.” The thinly veiled political screed that the *Times* passed off as an objective article claimed that the Right’s reasonable concern over an invasion of illegal aliens at our southwest border was directly responsible for the carnage of the El Paso shooting.

But is it so? Let us examine those claims, unpacking the most recent two mass killings, since they were the springboard for the media’s claims.

In the wee hours of Sunday, August 4, 2019, 24-year-old Connor Stephen Betts opened fire outside a bar in Dayton, Ohio, killing nine people — including his own sister — and injuring 27 others. Almost as soon as the media attempted to paint Betts as a “right-winger,” the story began to fall apart, as voter registration records and social-media posts showed him to be a registered Democrat who favored the likes of Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders. He also had ties to Antifa and had posted on social media that he hated Trump and ICE (Immigration and Customs Enforcement) and wanted to “kill every fascist.” His friends were quick to defend this murderer against accusations that he was a right-winger. The *Dayton Daily News* quoted one friend of Betts, Will El-Fakir, as saying that Betts was “definitely not a right-leaning person. His political views definitely leaned to the left.”

*Photo credit: AP Images*

*This article appears in the September 16, 2019, issue of The New American.*

He may be a killer and a psycho, but *please* don’t besmirch his name by calling him a “right-winger.”

As soon as that information came to light, the liberal media — usually quick to discuss the racial makeup of the victims of such shootings — ignored the fact that six of the nine people killed by Betts were black. One is left to ponder the response of those same media groups if Betts had expressed



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on September 16, 2019

Published in the September 16, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 18

---

support, instead of hatred, for President Trump.

As it is, Betts — who was killed by Dayton police 32 seconds into his shooting spree — was a hard-core leftist who was also mentally ill. His fixation with violence and death was certainly fed by his regular diet of socialist and anti-American ideology — much of which he consumed as part of his experience as a college student.

A former girlfriend wrote in a [medium.com](#) post that she met Betts “in our Social Psychology class at Sinclair College” and began a “polyamorous” relationship. For the uninitiated, that means they were both free to sleep around. She was actually engaged at the time, though her fiance was aware of her promiscuous nature. She wrote that she and Betts both suffered from “mental illness” and “bonded over depression humor” since “joking about personal mental illnesses is one of the biggest coping tools in the mental health toolbelt.” To put in the for-what-it’s-worth column, all that joking didn’t seem to help Betts. Apparently, the course work for a psychology degree at a liberal college only made matters worse for this troubled, sick, young man.

On their first date, he shared a video of the October 27 synagogue shooting in Pittsburgh. She couldn’t hear it because of the loudness of the bar, so, “Connor gave me the play-by-play of what was happening. Even then, I did realize that that was a weird thing for a first date, but not too weird given the context of our class. In our Social Psychology class, we regularly got off-topic to talk about serial killers, Ted Bundy was a hot topic given all of the media attention he was getting. A psychology student being fascinated in the horrors of humans is not an abnormal thing. It weirded me out because it was definitely not my focus on psychology, but it wasn’t a weird thing in general.”

Here’s a tip: Yes, it was a weird thing in general. Is it any wonder that a mentally ill young man, whose moral compass is so out of whack that going on a date with a girl who is engaged and “polyamorous” seems normal, and who shows killing-spree videos on *any* date (much less a *first* date), and deals with his mental illness by making a joke of it, would slip a cog and murder people?

While there appear to be many reasons for his actions, none of them can even be loosely linked to conservative or “right-wing” ideology. His thinking, his politics, and his morals were all part of the philosophy of the Left.

A mere 13 hours before the shooting in Dayton, Patrick Crusius turned a Walmart in El Paso, Texas, into a killing field, leaving 22 dead and another 24 injured. He was heard shouting racist slurs as he deliberately targeted Hispanics. In the immediate wake of the shooting, the media went all in, declaring Crusius a “right-wing” extremist who was influenced by President Trump’s “talking points.”

Those phrases come directly from media reports published after the shooting. In fact, the liberal news site [CrooksAndLiars](#) managed somehow to work all of that into one article’s headline, claiming on August 5 that the “El Paso Shooter’s Manifesto Uses Trump And Right Wing Talking Points.” That piece of political propaganda thinly disguised as a news report included such fictions as “his ‘manifesto’ hate screed is filled with talking points and terminology used by Donald Trump at his Nazi MAGA rallies and FOX News hosts like Tucker Carlson and Sean Hannity.”

And also in the for-what-it’s-worth column, the same liberal media that selectively quoted the Crusius manifesto to make him appear to fit their pre-selected picture of him are the same media that refused to publish his manifesto *in toto*. The reason for attempting to keep their readers from reading his manifesto appears to be the simple fact that it blows their picture of him as a “right-winger” completely



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on September 16, 2019

Published in the September 16, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 18

---

out of the water. The manifesto — which can be found online with a quick search — shows that his ideology is actually that of the Left, not the Right.

Among the grievances listed in his manifesto, Crusius cites the “takeover of the United States government by unchecked corporations.” Reality check: Is that language and sentiment from the conservative Right or from the liberal Left? Asked another way (to respond to the above media claim), does it sound like he borrowed that from “talking points” by Donald Trump, or does it sound like it was regurgitated from any of a plethora of speeches delivered by that darling-of-the-Left Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.)?

In fact, while the liberal media attempted to simplify his targeting of Hispanics by casting it as rank racism, the real reason for his choice of targets also fits neatly in with leftist thinking about both corporations and the environment. For, in his manifesto, Crusius goes on to decry the evils of pro-corporatism, writing, “Procorporation = pro-immigration” (i.e., because big corporations want cheap immigrant labor). He then goes on to attack America itself as a blight on the environment. He wrote:

Of course these migrants and their children have contributed to the problem, but are not the sole cause of it. The American lifestyle affords our citizens an incredible quality of life. However, our lifestyle is destroying the environment of our country. The decimation of the environment is creating a massive burden for future generations. Corporations are heading the destruction of our environment by shamelessly overharvesting resources. This has been a problem for decades. For example, this phenomenon is brilliantly portrayed in the decades old classic “The Lorax”. Water sheds around the country, especially in agricultural areas, are being depleted. Fresh water is being polluted from farming and oil drilling operations.

Consumer culture is creating thousands of tons of unnecessary plastic waste and electronic waste, and recycling to help slow this down is almost non-existent. Urban sprawl creates inefficient cities which unnecessarily destroys millions of acres of land. We even use god knows how many trees worth of paper towels just wipe water off our hands. Everything I have seen and heard in my short life has led me to believe that the average American isn’t willing to change their lifestyle, even if the changes only cause a slight inconvenience. The government is unwilling to tackle these issues beyond empty promises since they are owned by corporations. Corporations that also like immigration because more people means a bigger market for their products. I just want to say that I love the people of this country, but g\*d d\*\*n most of y’all are just too stubborn to change your lifestyle. So the next logical step is to decrease the number of people in America using resources. If we can get rid of enough people, then our way of life can become more sustainable.

He follows up by saying that he hopes and believes that his massacre of immigrants will serve as “the right incentive” for “the Hispanic population” to “return to their home countries” and ameliorate the extra burden they place on the environment.

Again, does this sound like a right-winger or a liberal environmentalist? Ironically, in 2018, a left-leaning source, Politifact, quoted Alan Lipmann, professor at George Washington University Medical Center and founder of the Center for the Study of Violence, debunking a claim by a Republican representative that the preponderance of mass shooters are actually left-wing. He said, “There’s absolutely no evidence to show that mass killings are motivated by political ideologies of any type” — of course, with the notable exceptions of the last two mass shooters and the Christchurch shooter, who



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on September 16, 2019

Published in the September 16, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 18

---

was Crusius' role model.

Crusius began his manifesto with the words, "I support the Christchurch shooter and his manifesto." As we will now see, that manifesto was also rife with leftist ideology — especially that of rabid environmentalism.

While the Christchurch shooting was not in the United States and therefore does not directly fit into the claims of the liberal media that it is "right-wingers" who are to be feared as the worst of terrorists, it does fit in *indirectly*, because Crusius — a supposed "right winger" — cited the Christchurch shooter and his manifesto as a motivating factor for his shooting spree. "Right-wingers" don't cite leftists, stating their support for them and their ideas.

The manifesto 28-year-old Brenton Tarrant posted online before his massacre at two mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand, can also be found online and shows that his ideology — which the media also claimed was "right-wing" — is one of a mixture of communism, socialism, and what he calls "Eco-fascism. He plainly states in the manifesto, "The nation with the closest political and social values to [his] own is the People's Republic of China," and that he chose to kill Muslims because of their high birthrates and high immigration rates, which he saw as a strain on the environment. He wrote that immigration/birth rates and climate change "are the same issue" and stated, "Kill the invaders, kill the overpopulation and by doing so save the environment." These are the same sentiments expressed in the Crusius manifesto.

So, yes, Crusius modeled himself after Tarrant. Both of them — purported to be "right-wing" extremists — were acting out of leftist ideology in seeking to save the environment by killing outsiders.

It turns out that both of the recent mass killings used as a pretext by leftist media to cast "right-wingers" as the greatest danger to America were actually the work of leftists. In other words, the Left set the stage for those shootings and then blamed them on the Right.

Typical.

*Photo credit: AP Images*



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on September 16, 2019


Published in the September 16, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 18

## 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.