



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 18, 2017

“Transgender” Journalist Punished for Revealing “LGBT” Anti-Semitism

In today’s media, not peddling fake news can be hazardous to your career. A left-wing, “transgender” journalist is learning this the hard way, as he has just been disciplined for daring to report on anti-Jewish bigotry at an “LGBT pride” march.

Gretchen Rachel Hammond, a man claiming woman status, broke the story of a group of Jewish women ejected from the “Dyke March” in Chicago on June 24 for having Jewish stars emblazoned on their rainbow flags. Now Hammond has “been reassigned to non-journalistic duties at the paper which ran the original report, the *Windy City Times*,” [revealed](#) the *Algemeiner*, a New York-based Jewish media outlet.



The *Windy City Times* serves homosexuals and lesbians, and, in a sense, served up Hammond for them. As the *Times of Israel* [writes](#) (using feminine pronouns to reference the male journalist):

Hammond, who is Jewish, told JTA [Jewish Telegraphic Agency] that in the wake of her article, she received dozens of threatening anonymous phone calls. She said one caller called her a “kike,” while others told her she should lose her job or said she “betrayed” the LGBT community.

“One of them said, ‘I’m going to get your b[****] a[**] fired,’” Hammond told JTA of calls and text messages she received. “It was vicious. It wasn’t even a request for dialogue. It was, ‘You f[***]ed with us. We’re going to f[***] with you.’ They pretty much blamed me for the whole thing blowing up at them.”

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

The mainstream media has ignored this story, perhaps because it further reveals leftist hypocrisy. The so-called “LGBT” movement, like other tentacles of liberalism, has attacked and destroyed traditional moral boundaries with shouts of “Discrimination!” and “Tolerance!” — while exhibiting intense intolerance and erecting its own boundaries.

Of course, establishing boundaries is inevitable. You can’t have a movement without ideology, and an ideology has a definition, and definitions do a funny thing: They *define*, they limit, they exclude what doesn’t conform to the definition.

Moreover, everyone embraces certain “values,” and stigmas are corollaries of values. If we value something, it follows that its opposite will be devalued. If we value honesty, we’ll devalue dishonesty. If we value an animalistic libertinism (as reflected in modern sexual agendas), we’ll devalue whatever prohibits it — such as Christianity.

Thus, at issue here isn’t just the discrimination against Jews or, if the march organizers can be believed,



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 18, 2017

against “Zionists.” It’s that always implicit in the [alt-sexuality](#) shouts for tolerance was the idea that traditional sexual mores were wrong and not to be tolerated.

This perhaps was just fine with the favorite philosopher of George Soros, Karl Popper. He once wrote, “We should therefore claim, in the name of tolerance, the right not to tolerate the intolerant.” This was supposedly necessary to preserve a “tolerant” society, his theory went.

Yet the call for tolerance is at best a dodge, at worst a confidence game. Saying “Be tolerant” makes as much sense as saying “Be in opposition.” In opposition “to what”? Tolerant “of what”?

Tolerance implies the abiding of a perceived negative. You don’t tolerate a fine car or delectable meal; you relish it. A perquisite for tolerating something is disliking it.

Thus, tolerance is commendable only in two situations:

- when the perceived negative isn’t actually negative, such as when you dislike broccoli but eat it for health reasons.
- when the perceived negative is also objectively negative and can’t be remedied, such as with a stubborn flu.

As for remediable objective negatives, virtue lies only in wiping them out. Our problem today, however, is that we’re awash in moral relativism and don’t determine what is objectively good (what the Truth is) or bad. We thus have no good idea what should and shouldn’t be tolerated.

This is when such decisions are made based on what “feels right” and that seductress of the heart, vice, holds sway. Calls to tolerate vice are then issued. Yet tolerance allows it to exit the closet and enter the culture, which can lead to inurement and acceptance, as I explained in “[The Acceptance Con.](#)” It then can be marketed, and if this is successful enough, virtue can find itself in the closet.

This isn’t just how Hammond lost his job; it isn’t even just how he got it in the first place. It’s also how you end up with a society in which the homosexual agenda can be in schools, but Christianity cannot.

Photo: Sarah Stierch ([CC BY 4.0](#)) via [Wikimedia Commons](#)



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](#)