

ISSN 1751-8229

Volume Eighteen, Number One

## Dark Academia: A Reply to Elias Khoury

Marc James Léger, Independent Schoar, Canada

### Abstract

Author Marc James Léger responds to Elias Khoury's review of his book *Bernie Bros Gone Woke: Class, Identity, Neoliberalism*, which was published in volume 17 of the *International Journal of Žižek Studies*. While Léger accepts the one mistake in the book that Khoury correctly identifies, he takes issue with nearly everything else in Khoury's review, which involves fallacies, misquotations, reductive arguments, misdirection and failure to mention anything that would contradict Khoury's generally false claims. Léger describes the possibility of academic foul play in the context of a public secret directed against him and that he has been struggling against since the late 1990s.

In 2023, the *International Journal of Žižek Studies* published a review by Elias Khoury of my book *Bernie Bros Gone Woke: Class, Identity, Neoliberalism*.<sup>1</sup> With the following I respond to mistakes and inaccuracies in Khoury's review, all of which can be verified by anyone who reads my book. However, I would also with this reply like to publicly state something that cannot be proven, at least, not by me, and that is the fact that since 1998 I have been the target of an ever widening and ever more criminal public secret.

The concept of dark academia is conceived as an aesthetic, or subcultural phenomenon, with, according to Wikipedia, cottagecore, goblincore, hauntology and neo-Victorianism adding to the repertoire. However, dark academia can also be defined according to phenomena that have more in common with what is known as the “dark web,” which involves not only hacking, misinformation, hoaxes and anonymity, but also fraud, terrorism and other illegal activities. Since 1998 I have been a target of dark academia. I have, over the years, had to deal with surveillance, stalking and harassment by people I never met.

A public secret attacks a person who is interested in the world and obliges them to either turn in on themselves, for protection, or to slavishly follow anonymous directives. I chose the former route as that is the correct path in terms of culture, politics, law and well-being. As the public secret against me gradually encompassed broader dimensions, people have attacked my privacy rights, my habeas corpus rights, my ability to hold down a job, and my ability to go anywhere in public with some measure of peace, let alone anonymity. Since 1998, I have been surveilled, followed, stalked, threatened, blackmailed, singled out, raped, poisoned, assaulted and fired from two jobs. I have been harassed and intimidated by all manner of people, from students, colleagues, repairmen, dentists, store workers and delivery people. People have attacked me with verbal threats but also with loud conversations directed at me. I have been predated and flash-mobbed in hundreds of different ways, much of these involving allusions to my reading and online activities. I was at one time poisoned by pharmacists, causing me erectile dysfunction for several weeks.

Due to the public as well as anonymous nature of this secret, I have never taken up any of these problems with the police, though I have been stopped by police on several occasions due to my odd behaviour while avoiding flash mob tourists. I once hired a private detective to do a bug sweep but came up empty-handed. I have never received any overt help in this public matter by colleagues and other professionals. The only explanation given to me over the years is that I am expected to prostitute myself to an anonymous sex mafia, this being something that I refuse to do. I have avoided going public about this for several reasons, but most prominent is the boorish nature of

manufactured controversies, especially those that are concocted by postmodernists in the professions.

In late 2016, I suffered concussion symptoms from a combination of drugging, in an attempted rape, and repeated blows to the head, after I refused someone's sexual advances. This led to bouts of dizziness for many years since then, which could be connected to other causes. I am told by doctors that I may have to live with this for the rest of my life. Since that time, a posting on social media incited people to make aggressive "whack in the face" or "whack to the head" gestures directed at me, which I have experienced almost everywhere I go, including academic conferences and even by doctors in hospital. This phenomenon has persisted since then, along with allusions to the assailant that are imposed on many of my activities. This now has the dimensions of a right-wing collective phantom that I refer to as CRAPHEAD. There is more than one avatar of CRAPHEAD in my neighbourhood and much of my scholarly activity since 2017 has been marred by inanities and obstructions that carry a CRAPHEAD signature.

Among the most offensive of abuses against me since 1998 has been the effort to damage my scholarly work. Although the public secret phenomenon has made it impossible for me to carry on with teaching, I have managed to maintain my activity as an intellectual, with a dozen books to my credit and about 100 published articles. One essay that I published in *IJZS*, "The Idea of the Party," was in fact scuttled by the journal *Mediations* after an 18-month delay and an absurdist review that seemed to me to have been written by CRAPHEAD.<sup>2</sup> Book and essay reviews by CRAPHEAD is only one of the indignities that have been foisted upon me since 1998. The hacking of my work, in various ways and with coded references, however minor these may be, causes me to waste time and effort in a never-ending barrage of abuses and inside jokes perpetrated by many of the people I work with, even leftists.

Until 2016, it was possible for me to carry on with my public life and scholarly work without encountering too much hostility and hindrance. After the CRAPHEAD phenomenon emerged, transgressions have become more aggressive. Peer reviews by CRAPHEAD involve the following: the inversion of truth; disingenuous comments that draw on my own work and insights to use these against me; nonsense statements; distortions of scholarly material; allusions to the various forms of harassment against

me; comments that have nothing to do with the writing in question but that allude to work I have completed elsewhere, or that is in process. While it is the case that Slavoj Žižek often says he wants more alienation and asks his interlocutors to whip him, I, as a Žižek scholar, do not share these sentiments. I could easily live with less alienation and more comradely interaction. Although I have published a text by the Errorist International in one of my edited anthologies, I prefer that my texts not be hacked with mistakes that are introduced intentionally. I prefer book designs and text editing that does not allude to the sodomy rape perpetrated against me. I would prefer to benefit from the peer review process rather than the opposite. Overall, CRAPHEAD uses cynical humour to attack scholarship, or to dull the edge of my writing. In cases where CRAPHEAD rubbish prevails, the scholarly apparatus is engaged in hoaxing a dissident scholar who is perhaps, in their cynical view, taking Marxism too seriously. Other pretexts allow people to curry favour with likeminded misanthropes. Some people are famous for being famous. The target of a public secret is not famous; it is those who maintain the secret who pride themselves on being, collectively, infamous – infamous for being infamous.

This preamble serves to frame my discussion of Khoury's review of *Bernie Bros Gone Woke*. I do not, with this, seek to smear Khoury through association with the CRAPHEAD phenomenon. What I am saying, given his review, is that it is impossible for me to not make such associations myself. I met Khoury in email after I had sent a book announcement to potentially interested parties in the Democratic Socialists of America. He asked me about my work and I collaborated with him in re-posting a book review and critique of John McWhorter's *Woke Racism* on the *Hampton Institute* website, for which he works as an editor.<sup>3</sup> I found it odd that he sought to review my book for the *IJZS* after he told me in email that he agreed with Gabriel Rockhill's critique of Žižek in *CounterPunch*, and so that adds to the mystery.<sup>4</sup> Khoury's review strikes me as similar to the review of my book *Vanguardia* that was published in the *Marx & Philosophy Review of Books*, which is full of inversions, mistakes and mischaracterizations.<sup>5</sup> The goal of the reviews, in both cases, seems not only to prejudice readers against my work, but to prejudice the place of publication as well. There are not many outlets for Marxist cultural theory and one hates to see them go to

the dogs. The editors of the *Marx & Philosophy Review of Books* defended the review of *Vanguardia*, despite the many inanities that I pointed out to them.

Khoury's review is replete with the kinds of mistakes and innuendo that I identify with the CRAPHEAD phenomenon. Regardless, Khoury makes one important correction to my book, and that is the percentage number that I give to non-white Trump voters in 2020 (Léger 2022a: 8). I wrote 57 percent and Khoury suggested 18 percent as a more correct number. One source I have read has it at 15 percent. The number 57 is Donald Trump's percentage of overall white votes and that could be, assuming that I made this mistake, where I got the number. The real question is how – not why – I made this mistake in my writing. My arguments do not rely on fudging numbers. Although I wish someone had pointed this out to me in the editing process, I take the blame. I have to say, though, that at this stage in the gaming of my existence, my work is hacked routinely, and this could be one instance of that. Even though I tell the people I work with about these problems and that I do not want any mistakes introduced into my work, such things continue to happen. The fact that this goes against my wishes is ignored, and that is enough to indicate its pathological nature.

Since my politics are socialist and critical of identity politics as well as victim politics, a great many would like to make me eat my words and make me, in turn, a victim of oppression. I am placed in scenarios where I am asked to swear fealty to politics and ideas that I do not subscribe to. Accepting the blame for this number 57 error, I acknowledge that it is a glaring mistake and assure readers that I have no need for such a number to finesse my arguments in this book or elsewhere. It is odd that this mistake comes in a sentence that uses the phrase "first as tragedy then as farce." Perhaps that is why this review was sent to the *IJZS*. Mystery solved? All said, that is one mistake I would change if I could.

What Khoury makes of this mistake is not incidental since it is hardly essential to my argument. With regard to Trump, this mistake, or hack, takes attention away from the fact that in 2020 Trump increased his support among all major minority groups and lost support among white male workers, who were presented by liberals after the 2016 election as his natural constituency – those blue-collar workers in the rust belt that were left behind by de-industrialization and that do not identify with the Democratic Party's

exploitation of identity politics, which neoliberal and postmodern identitarians are more than glad to champion. These facts were indeed part of my argument, and this one mistake is seemingly enough to throw off an entire book's argument. It is not that Khoury makes all that much out of it, but rather that it seems to have been delivered to him, or anyone else, on a plate.

Given that I have written critically elsewhere about the Center for Working-Class Politics (CWCP) study on *Commonsense Solidarity: How a working-class coalition can be built, and maintained*, which Khoury was affiliated with as editor, and which he and I discussed in email, it is understood that I do not subscribe to the Democratic Party strategy of replacing universalist politics with a demographics-based strategy.<sup>6</sup> Khoury's review, in that regard, does not do anything to win people over to my argument since it does such a poor job of presenting my views accurately, except for a few broad lines here and there, like my criticism of "woke" politics, which is a more contentious term now that Republicans have latched onto that word in their version of the culture war. One can only imagine that neoliberal and new social movement activists will double down even more forcefully on this term, as has been the case with some journalists and entertainers. This is the bait that should not be taken, fighting a right-wing culture war with pseudo-left culture wars, which keeps left politics well to the right of radical universalism.

Regarding some of the particulars of Khoury's review, people like himself who refer to me as Marc Léger, or Marc-James Léger, and not Marc James Léger, try to make my name into a two-word name rather than a three-word name. Like the word "to" that is hacked routinely in my writing, the number two is coded as gay. In this regard, people sometimes refer to me by my second name, James. I am obviously not against the number two and I do not deny Lacanian psychoanalysis when it comes to self-contradiction, but I also do not like people aggressively gangsterizing my existence or making me into the whipping boy of a nihilistic subculture, as one colleague correctly explained this phenomenon. There are other, more theoretical issues involved, like my rejection of the kind of binary and metaphysical thinking that is prevalent on the anarchist left. Dialectics does not mean "third way" compromise. In very mundane terms, we all understand Claude Levi-Strauss's structuralist lessons about how tribalism

works through dualism. While I would not want to play the number two against the number three, my author name is Marc James Léger. In addition, when all I hear is two this and two that from people that I collaborate with, when I am asked to repeat myself for no good reason, I understand that this is culturalism of the not very interesting or progressive sort. What kind of people work collectively to harm a progressive leftist with the hope that this individual will eventually become a reactionary or a sycophant?

Khoury's review suggests that the 2020 Sanders campaign "tried appealing" to the biggest element of woke politics: the Professional-Managerial Class (PMC). My book rather argues that PMC thinking was endemic to the strategy that the Sanders team adopted, especially in the 2020 campaign, which is borne out by the advertisements I study in chapter 3, which go unmentioned in Khoury's review. Who it is that those ads were meant to reach is another matter and I do not speculate about reception. Khoury then says that the PMC is not the petty bourgeoisie. This is false. The reason the PMC is in fact part of the petty bourgeoisie, though different from the so-called old petty bourgeoisie, or old middle class of peasants and small owners, is described by him in the next sentence: "They do not own means of production." The joke here is perhaps meant to be on me insofar as I do not control the means of publication of my work. Contrary to what Khoury writes, I do not say that because the PMC occupy a contradictory class location that they are "truly a class unto itself," as he writes. That claim belongs to Nicos Poulantzas, Barbara and John Ehrenreich, and Erik Olin Wright. This argument contradicts the classic Marxist position on the issue, which these authors acknowledge, and which I agree with. The PMC can be a class in itself, a class apart, understood in a sociological sense, but it cannot be a class for itself. Oddly, Khoury sent me his review a few days after I had written and presented a paper on the petty bourgeoisie that mentions this very idea.

The boastful suggestion by Khoury that more philosophical rigor would have allowed me to better explain the logical and theoretical incompatibility of class and identity politics misses the point of my argument and my work, which are enunciated in two theorems in *Bernie Bros Gone Woke* (Léger 2022a: 10). I put these in italics so that they would not be missed by reviewers like him. Not only are these elaborated throughout the book, but in the introduction and first chapter especially. I do not speak

of incompatibility between class and identity, which is a harangue I had to deal with in the peer reviews of the two books I have worked on for the publisher Routledge. I rather use class analysis and universality to question and critique identity politics. This is elaborated in the section on post-politics that mentions Žižek, and in the section on Nancy Fraser's concept of progressive neoliberalism (Léger 2022a: 16). This, in fact, is where you can find the elaboration of the logic and theory that Khoury pretends does not exist. He does not share any of this knowledge with his reader and makes it seem as though I come across empty-handed when that is rather his doing. I also made a point in *Bernie Bros Gone Woke* of not repeating in this book arguments I have engaged in, and contemporaneously, in other books, which is something that is mentioned in the preface. Since he, as someone I have in my email list, had been appraised of these other books, this could have been mentioned.

Exactly how Khoury thinks I could have philosophically tightened my argument is not said. The author Olúfẹ́mi O. Táíwò is mentioned in this regard, but his book was not available when I wrote *Bernie Bros Gone Woke*. Some of Táíwò's ideas I have cited elsewhere but I do not see how his writing would displace or improve upon the work of authors like Ellen Meiksins Wood, David Harvey, Adolph and Touré Reed, Barbara and Karen Fields, Alain Badiou, Slavoj Žižek, Vivek Chibber, Walter Benn Michaels, and a few others, who are fundamental to my work. As it happens, the ideas of this author were referenced by what came across to me as yet another CRAPHEAD avatar at the 2022 Universities Art Association of Canada conference that I hosted. If Khoury was serious about Táíwò, he could have made an argument that would evaluate the latter's work against the insights of any one of those authors that I do cite, but such a cross-comparison would require the kind of work that is not performed in Khoury's far more slapdash review.

The mainstream coalitions that Khoury speaks of on the American left is indeed an important issue. For me these would be a mass movement of the left and not mainstream coalitions designed to prop up the Democratic Party side of the two-party duopoly. That much is clear to anyone who reads my book. I discuss the destruction of this mainstream New Deal coalition in chapter 1 in the historical overview of the Democratic Party. More importantly, for this book, I discuss the prospect of radical and



anti-Democratic Party coalitions (Léger 2022a: 173-5). I also give plenty of analysis of why the kinds of new social movement coalitions that would vote for candidates like Sanders are not being built, which has to do with the tendency to reject socialism and socialist parties on the social democratic, new social movement, postmodern, ultra and identitarian left. For whatever reason, almost everything I have to say on the subject is presented by Khoury as nothing but lacuna.

Khoury criticizes my book for not defining identity politics. While it may be true that I do not have an all-purpose definition, which I would not find helpful for all cases, I am clear to distinguish what I am saying about identity politics from the use of that term by the Combahee River Collective. Because I address these issues in Marxist terms, it may seem to people who rely on hackneyed definitions and politics that there is something missing. The onus was nevertheless on Khoury to relate to readers what I do say about identity issues. I do not know what it would mean to say, as Khoury does, that the Sanders campaigns were subject to PMC “capture.” The term is Taiwo’s and not mine. My argument relates rather to control by capitalist interests, not the PMC. What I argue is that as the PMC is itself being decimated by the same global processes that affect the working class, the emphasis on identity in politics will further hinder socialist efforts. As for the thinking of the Sanders campaign, I do address what his 2016 and 2020 teams were thinking: one of these a member of his 2016 advertising team, his manager for both campaigns Jeff Weaver, and 2020 election strategist Chuck Rocha. Rocha’s strategy of “cultural competence” was not designed to “recruit members of marginalized groups,” as Khoury puts it. To begin with, Sanders had a policy platform that was by and large universalist. Reaching the grassroots of *working people* was the basis of his campaign, financed through small donations. In some places, language and cultural differences require “cultural competence” to get people to know the candidate, caucus and turn out the vote. This is not the same thing as recruiting members of marginalized groups, as he puts it, which is something that Clintonites do, or people like Biden, who played a Spanish song on his smartphone to flatter an assembled crowd of Latinos.

With regard to the blanket statement, I make that Barack Obama was worse on many issues than George W. Bush, again, Khoury is aware, and I mention it in my

preface, that I published a book on the Obama portraits, with one entire chapter addressing the record of his administration. The claim is in any case less controversial than simply a truism on the left, and I doubt that most readers, unless they are die-in-the-wool New Democrats, would have his reaction. We all know how in many cases the Democrats enact policies that are the dreamwork of conservative think tanks. Khoury then writes: “[Léger] characterizes the choice between Trump and now-President Biden as one of ‘discrimination [versus] anti-discrimination’.” It is a characteristic of CRAPHEAD to turn everything into yin-yang dualisms and inversions, which is why I believe that the mistake with the number 57 could have been hacked in, making a “white” number into a “black” or non-white number, and with the chessboard symbolism that this implies. What I actually write is: “whether Biden would be an improvement on Trump or a continuation of Trump policies, save for the replacement of discrimination with anti-discrimination, is the crux of the matter for the nominal left around the Democratic Party” (Léger 2022a: 143). This is part of a section that analyzes how people on the Bernie of Bust left were perceiving the choice of Biden after Sanders had quit the nomination race. The argument reinforces Fraser’s discussion of progressive neoliberalism and the general contention made by liberals like Mark Lilla that the Democrats have by and large abandoned any possibility of labour and class reforms for a social policy focus on anti-discrimination as the only site where progress can be made. When this happens, everything does indeed become framed in terms of culture wars. That is not my politics. That Khoury seek to criticize me and this statement from the left, by saying that Biden has perpetuated discriminatory policies, simply reinforces my overall thesis, which is that anti-racism within neoliberalism is a mirage, or rather, a politics of the PMC. But it also brings in issues about the Biden administration that could not have been known at the time the book was written and that were not in any case the purview of the book. The fact that Biden has a bad record on race issues I do mention (Léger 2022a: 199). Khoury also says nothing of the last of four chapters and the conclusion, with the latter proving to be more than accurate on the issue of the lab leak conspiracy and the January 6 coup attempt.

As for “the book’s sourcing,” Khoury mentions only one reference, an article that I cite authored by Tulsi Gabbard. He uses this to make a blanket statement on the rest.

On the same subject that Gabbard's article discusses, I also mention Hillary Clinton's book *What Happened*, as well as Jeff Weaver's book. To notice these overlaps is to pay attention to what a book is as a complete proposition, its stance and argument, that is, rather than isolating one item with which to characterize the entire research apparatus. If one was to do that, a better and more illustrative example could have easily been found. The fact that Gabbard made a correct statement in this case, published in *The Hill*, does not require that she have formal training in historical or political analysis, as Khoury suggests. Gabbard is a politician and was an elected representative from 2013 to 2021. Whether or not her politics are correct or opportunist did not prevent her in the 2020 nomination race to have some foreign policy positions that made sense, which is something I mention in the book where I compare her to Andrew Yang. These are the kinds of politicians that turn policy platforms into political products that are detached from a comprehensive political vision. Moreover, it is more recently, after the book was written, that Gabbard has demonstrated positions that won her the enmity of the left. In the 2020 race she was better known for her anti-war position, not that I was ever taken in by Gabbard. Khoury's criticism is here again opportunist as it takes ideas that could only be known after the fact and that pander to popular left perceptions to "criticize" work that he does not bother to relay in any of its best qualities to the reader. Furthermore, with regard to this article published in *The Hill*, many of the sources in the book are mainstream journalistic sources, which are necessary when one is writing about contemporary issues. Nothing about this suggests a lack of scholarly material. News items were used where needed, and scholarly sources were used where appropriate. In no way do I endorse the libertarian politics of someone like Gabbard and anyone who reads my book or knows my work would understand this. In short, Khoury does not make a fair and general assessment of my overall use of sources. What is made to sound like positive or useful criticism is in actuality unprincipled and hackneyed diversion.

As for Sanders not winning the nomination, I do not blame the corporate media, as Khoury says in his review, so much as, in the days after the South Carolina primary, the Democratic Party establishment. I am very precise on that issue. I do say that the media was largely responsible for Trump's election in 2016. As for criticizing the media,

however, I do not know how he could review my book without mentioning the work that went into my analysis of Sanders campaign advertisements and the issue of political advertising as such, which is not very well understood by politicians, perhaps because it does not reinforce their self-image as knowledge holders.

Towards the end of the review, Khoury becomes even more arch and banal. He misspells the name of Conor Friedersdorf, and this, in another section on the Bernie or Bust tendency, with a quote that mentions the Koch Brothers, and a mention that this comes halfway through the book. Khoury says that I am at my most entertaining and delightful in some takedowns but the subtext here, as I read it, is just that – subtext. The mention of the Koch brothers could refer to my book *Vanguardia*, where I contrast the children of Marx and Coca-Cola and the children of Gramsci and Pepsi. The gaffe in the spelling of Friedersdorf's name is possibly an allusion to the countless instances of hacking and misspellings of people's name in my work, and the halfway mark possibly refers to the slash aesthetics and allusions to sodomy that have been used elsewhere to humiliate me, with this problem affecting at least four of my book covers. The Bill Maher monologue that is mentioned criticizes purists on the left who do not want other people's money, and this, as Maher makes an 'L' symbol with his hands on his forehead. This L7 symbol, meaning "squares," possibly refers to the failed efforts by my peers and strangers to regime change my sex life. Whether or not Khoury thinks that my use of this quote was genuinely clever, the subtext aspect is not mentioned, and so, as innuendo, the reader is engaged through postmodern elitism and irony. If Khoury's words are genuinely meant as support for me in my personal struggles, and I do not believe that is the case, it leaves out the socialism without which none of it makes sense. Khoury adds that I say that Maher "lacks" "an adult understanding of politics" when in fact what I write about Maher is the following, opposite statement: "How can someone with an adult understanding of politics shift their support from a democratic socialist to an establishment neoliberal?" (Léger 2022a: 144) Khoury's statement is a clear misrepresentation of my exact words. It is designed to prejudice people who use children and adults as hipster code language for gays and straights. His following sentence, "These roasts are music to the ears of people sick of corporate programming

and tired of academia's unwillingness to confront it aggressively," could read as dog whistles to people who identify gay sex with political radicalism.

It should be said that all of this concluding innuendo around the Maher quotation, as I read it, would have to be deciphered by an anonymous mass public, where this public secret against me has developed into a culture war that I am expected to fight blindfolded and with my arms tied behind my back. In other words, I am told in so many ways that I do not have the power to reject what has been decided against me. Aside from those mistakes and mischaracterizations of Khoury's that I have clearly identified here, the additional innuendo in the Maher section is not something that I can prove. However, since this sex war has become not only transgressive but violent, I feel that I do not have the luxury to ignore it. Khoury writes: "In his eyes, it was ultimately a media-backed coup that installed Biden as the presumptive nominee ahead of Super Tuesday." That's not true. I do not say anything of the sort. As mentioned, I refer to the Democratic Party coup, not a media coup. However, a media coup of sorts has been generated against me in the various and ongoing CRAPHEAD phenomena that I have no means to fight against without the equally anonymous support of individuals here and there. The failed effort since 1998 to regime change my sex life has not been undertaken without recourse to illicit criminality. For these reasons, I openly state my misgivings about the misdirection in this review.

Khoury has asked me and the *IJZS* to also review my edited book *Identity Trumps Socialism: The Class and Identity Debate after Neoliberalism*.<sup>7</sup> I have asked him not to do so. I call on others to engage in intelligent and even provocative and radical criticism that is genuinely challenging, that is more humorous than cynical, and that does not involve collaboration with right-wing collective phantoms like CRAPHEAD. CRAPHEAD is not avant-garde art on the margins. CRAPHEAD is micro-fascism and possibly also full-out fascism. The fact that progressive people no longer know how to distinguish left from right, or do not care to know, is the result of culture and politics that have developed through postmodern nihilism. This is not culture war; it is class war against the working class and against socialism. Avant-gardism, as I have argued, is not fascist. It does not target individuals and make them into sacrificial scapegoats for the benefit of politically divided identity groups. Radical practices of over-identification, as I

have described them, are not enacted to terrorize or enslave economically sanctioned and socially maligned individuals. I accept fair criticism of my work and I would be naïve to not expect opposition from anti-communists, but I do not accept as comradely criticism that confuses the left with nefarious reaction.

## Notes

1. Khoury, E. (2023) "Review of Marc James Léger's *Bernie Bros Gone Woke: Class, Identity, Neoliberalism*," *International Journal of Žižek Studies* 17:1, 1-4. See also Léger, M.J. (2022a) *Bernie Bros Gone Woke: Class, Identity, Neoliberalism*, Leiden: Brill.
2. Léger, M.J. (2019) "The Idea of the Party," *International Journal of Žižek Studies* 13:3, 0-27.
3. Léger, M.J. (2022b) "Woke Antiracism: It's a Gospel According to John McWhorter," *The Hampton Institute*, available at <https://www.hamptonthink.org/read/woke-antiracism-its-a-gospel-according-to-john-mcwhorter>.
4. Rockhill, G. (2023) "Capitalism's Court Jester," *CounterPunch*, available at <https://www.counterpunch.org/2023/01/02/capitalisms-court-jester-slavoj-zizek/>.
5. Petts, J. (2020) "Review of Marc James Léger, *Vanguardia: Socially Engaged Art and Theory*," *Marx & Philosophy Review of Books*, available at [https://marxandphilosophy.org.uk/reviews/18007\\_vanguardia-socially-engaged-art-and-theory-by-marc-james-leger-reviewed-by-jeffrey-petts/](https://marxandphilosophy.org.uk/reviews/18007_vanguardia-socially-engaged-art-and-theory-by-marc-james-leger-reviewed-by-jeffrey-petts/).
6. Léger, M.J. (2021) "Working-Class Politics at the Margins," *Blog of Public Secrets*, available at <https://legermj.typepad.com/blog/2021/11/working-class-politics-at-the-margins.html>.

7. Léger, M.J., ed. (2023) *Identity Trumps Socialism: The Class and Identity Debate after Neoliberalism*, London: Routledge.