



Biden's COVID Relief Is the "No White Men Need Apply" Bill

Coca-Cola's recent instruction to employees to "be less white" may turn out to be good advice — if the current federal COVID-19 bill is any indication. For it's chock full of blatant anti-white discrimination. It hurts many women, too, for a reason most wouldn't guess.

A violation of the principle of equal treatment under law, the bill is "equity" — the new euphemism for racial discrimination — on steroids. Providing examples, the *New York Post's* Betsy McCaughey (hat tip: writer Jack Kemp) [reports](#):



AP Images

[Section 1005 of the bill offers "socially disadvantaged" farm owners](#) total debt forgiveness of up to hundreds of thousands of no-strings dollars per farmer. But white men needn't apply. The bill's definition of "socially disadvantaged," drawn from elsewhere in federal law, limits aid to racial groups who faced historic discrimination.

Newly elected Sen. Raphael Warnock (D-Ga.), who proposed the measure, says it will make up for years of discrimination. Sorry, senator, but this is discrimination.

Discrimination likewise mars the bill's aid to restaurants. It grants restaurant owners up to \$5 million per facility to offset losses caused by lockdowns. That's a lifeline for restaurants barely hanging on.

Here's the hitch: Only women, veterans and owners of "socially and economically disadvantaged" concerns (again, defined racially elsewhere in federal law) may apply during the program's first three weeks. Most white males go to the back of the line, even if their needs are more pressing.

... Many of New York's dairy farmers are facing bankruptcy, because the restaurants that accounted for half the demand for their products aren't buying. Yet the farm aid in the relief bill won't reach many of these farmers; most are white men.

(The kicker here is that minority-owned farms are in less debt on average than white-owned ones are.) Moreover, "Section 4201 of his relief bill sets aside more than \$1 billion of loans for minority-owned businesses," McCaughey also informs. "As if they're the only ones struggling." (Whites still get to pay an inordinate share of the taxes, though.)

McCaughey points out that the above constitutes reparations masquerading as "relief." And we can similarly characterize another Democrat measure McCaughey mentions, one we could dub the [Robert Mugabe bill](#): It would give 32 million acres of farmland to black farmers during the next decade. Whites get nothing.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 26, 2021

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

Much can be said about these racist bills. Consider the notion of giving aid to “racial groups that faced historic discrimination.” A relief bill is meant for just that: “relief” — not from “historic” injustices against people long dead but from some immediate, pressing problem. Furthermore, people don’t live in history and aren’t groups; they exist in the present and are individuals.

Yet under racial discrimination models, an upper middle class black individual is prioritized over a relatively poor white Appalachian individual. And a privileged woman such as Kamala Harris with a slave-owning ancestor is prioritized over a white man, with no slaver history, who came here fleeing persecution in Cold War Eastern Europe.

In reality, devising today’s policy based on past discrimination is like treating a sick man with a remedy suited to a disease a different person died of 100 years ago. It cures nothing in the past or present.

Moving on, while the COVID bill purportedly prioritizes women, we could ask if it really helps them. Consider that white male business owners generally have wives and daughters who rely on them. So when you hurt white men via discrimination, you hurt those women as well.

Also notable is that the females most reliant upon men for income are *traditional* women, stay-at-home moms. Yet the women benefitting from affirmative-action type programs are often single women. So, really, this anti-male discrimination doesn’t benefit “women.”

It inordinately benefits *single* women at the expense of hearth-and-home-oriented mothers devoted to raising the next generation. Progressive?

(That is, if anything that hurts society can be viewed as benefitting anyone.)

Oh, just coincidentally, I’m sure, white men are the major group least likely to vote Democrat, and married white women break GOP by a healthy margin, too. So a dirty little secret here is that this and other racially and sexually discriminatory bills enable Democrats to redistribute wealth from their opponents to their base.

Note also that insofar as you damage married white men financially, you increase the chances that their wives will have to leave the home and get jobs to help make ends meet. This reduces the number of children such couples will have on average, and American whites already have our country’s [second-lowest fertility rate](#), well below replacement level.

So if you were a suspicious sort, you’d almost think this was a conspiracy to shrink a non-Democrat voting bloc and that, when leftists talk about “erasing whiteness,” they’re not just speaking metaphorically.

But that’s the Democrats’ Orwellian Amerika: War is peace, freedom is slavery, equity is discrimination — and unity is division.



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.



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.

[Subscribe](#)