



Condemning Intersectionality: Online Conservative News Media and Intersectional Panic

DOUG MEYER

University of Virginia, USA

ABSTRACT Research has increasingly drawn attention to the role of online conservative news media in propagating disinformation and reinforcing social inequalities. Scholarship, however, has yet to explore how these media represent intersectionality. Using a grounded theory approach, I examined how 427 online conservative news reports, from nine widely searched websites in the U.S., portrayed intersectionality. The authors of the reports employed a complex set of discourses to condemn intersectionality, constructing it as limited, hierarchical, and divisive, while also conveying panic over its ability to bring individuals on the Left into coalitions. I thus develop the concept intersectional panic to account for how these media responded to intersectionality with a considerable amount of fear or anxiety. Findings reveal that intersectional panic overlaps with, yet also operates differently from, other forms of panic, such as racist, sexist, or anti-LGBTQ fears, because the former involves anxiety over multiply-marginalized individuals advancing in U.S. society. I further reveal that these conservative news media sometimes used intersectional discourses to condemn intersectionality. Building on Patricia Hill Collins's (2019) understanding of intersectionality as a critical tool for social justice, I argue that emphasizing intersectionality's expansive and beneficial capacities would help challenge such panic.

KEYWORDS intersectionality; conservative media; right-wing media; race; gender; feminism

Introduction

As online spaces have proliferated in the United States, intersectionality – a feminist approach that explores the overlapping effects of power relations such as those based on race, class, and gender – has also expanded as a discourse (Crenshaw, 1989; Zimmerman, 2017). Indeed, considerable research has shown that the concept of intersectionality has increasingly been used and

Correspondence Address: Doug Meyer, Department of Women, Gender & Sexuality, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904-4172, USA; email: dom6e@virginia.edu

ISSN: 1911-4788



circulated online (Christian et al., 2020; Collins & Bilge, 2020; Cottom, 2016). Much of this scholarship has pointed to the work of Black women and other women of color in expanding intersectional analyses online and in challenging the persistent exclusion of intersectional issues from more traditional forms of feminism and U.S. society more broadly (Peterson-Salahuddin, 2021; Rasulo, 2020; Steele, 2021). Another substantial body of scholarship has drawn attention to the ongoing co-optation and commodification of intersectionality in online arenas, as it has sometimes been depoliticized and leveraged in ways that maintain a singular focus on one form of inequality rather than a more intersectional emphasis on challenging multiple systems of oppression simultaneously (Banet-Weiser & Glatt, 2023; Hackworth, 2018).

Although previous scholarship has drawn valuable attention to the ways that intersectionality has been used in these arenas, research has yet to explore how the discourse of intersectionality circulates in online conservative news media. To fill this research gap, I designed a qualitative research project in which I examined 427 online conservative news reports from nine of the most widely searched conservative news websites in the United States. All of these reports used the discourse of “intersectionality,” and all were published during the first 18 months of Joe Biden’s presidency (January 20, 2021 to July 20, 2022).

Considerable research indicates that the Right now has a strong news media presence online, as alternative-right (hereafter “alt-right”) websites have been instrumental in expanding right-wing extremism (DiMaggio, 2021; Rae, 2021; Zhang & Davis, 2024). Studies have revealed that online conservative news media present social groups in different ways, with a common privileging of white heterosexual men and a more critical approach toward marginalized groups (Johnson, 2018; Rasulo, 2020). Thus, research has taken up the role of online right-wing news media in reinforcing intersecting systems of oppression; however, how these media use the discourse of intersectionality remains unknown.

Addressing this topic is needed for several reasons. With changing social conditions in which intersectionality is becoming more widely known, outlets and individuals more hostile to intersectionality may position the concept in negative terms. Without knowledge of how intersectionality is being characterized by the Right, such negative constructions remain difficult to challenge. Indeed, in pointing to adversarial uses of the term intersectionality, I extend the growing body of scholarship on U.S. right-wing media by showing that intersectionality remains contested terrain, as anti-feminist outlets may advance some decidedly different understandings of intersectionality than feminist approaches. This study is animated by the central research question of how online conservative news media are presenting intersectionality and, as this research progressed, by an examination of how these media may distort some aspects of intersectionality while co-opting others.

Literature Review

Using a Feminist Approach to Study the U.S. Right

In the literature on conservative media, not only online but also in print and on newscasts, scholarship has pointed to how overlapping systems of oppression shape many right-wing discourses (Nielsen, 2020; Norocel, et al., 2022). For instance, research has revealed that women of color are often vilified in conservative news media (Bresnahan et al., 2021; Rasulo, 2020). Other scholarship has shown that these media frequently present white men as under attack (Campi, 2021; Koulouris, 2018). Norocel and colleagues (2020), for example, have revealed that conservative news media often construct an “us vs. them” dichotomy, such as one between “the seemingly homogeneous and monolithic ‘pure people’ – personified by the ‘man in the street’ – and the ‘corrupt elite’ that defend those unworthy ‘others’ – embodied as feminists; lesbian, gay, and transgender rights activists; and racial minorities and/or migrant communities” (p. 428). This “man in the street” is not only gendered but also racialized as white and associated with heterosexuality. Indeed, Ouellette and Banet-Weiser (2018) have argued that “one of the primary characteristics of the extreme right is nostalgia for a particular kind of identity: the white, heterosexual man” (p. 5).

Although this article contributes most centrally to scholarship examining online conservative news media, my research also builds on feminist work that has explored conservative movements more broadly, through an intersectional lens (Banet-Weiser & Glatt, 2023; Murib, 2020). This work has shown that intersectional approaches can aid in better understanding the rise of right-wing extremism. For instance, many feminists have pointed out that media and scholarly attention on right-wing movements has often examined such movements in a non-intersectional way (Norocel et al., 2022; Singh & Féron, 2021).

In the U.S., media attention has tended to privilege the importance of social class, connecting the expansion of right-wing populist movements to structural changes associated with neoliberalism, in which the Right has capitalized on class-based resentments to heighten racial animus and increase conservative support (Finlayson, 2021; Koulouris, 2018). In contrast, a significant amount of feminist work has pointed out that white supremacy cannot be reduced to a matter of social class and that antipathy toward feminism, as well as racial justice, are central – rather than secondary – to the growth of right-wing movements (Corredor, 2019; Kim, 2022). In this sense, feminist scholarship has argued against the more traditional or mainstream tendency to privilege one axis of inequality as the primary explanatory agent of right-wing mobilization, insisting instead on the importance of examining the overlapping effects of multiple systems of oppression (Murib, 2020; Singh & Féron, 2021).

As this previous scholarship has shown, using an intersectional approach to study the U.S. Right helps with understanding how multiple forms of

inequality remain implicated in right-wing discourses (Nielsen, 2020; Rasulo, 2020). Similarly, I argue that using an intersectional approach to study online conservative news media can help with better understanding the discourses that propagate in these arenas. Much of previous research on conservative news media, sometimes referred to as “critical disinformation studies,” has been devoted to misinformation – or what Jack (2017) has more broadly characterized as “problematic information” (p. 1) – that is conveyed by these outlets (Marwick & Partin, 2024; Weigel, 2023).

However, in light of the absence of work focusing on how the Right has been portraying intersectionality, this gap leaves several questions unanswered: in what ways are conservative news media presenting intersectionality accurately and inaccurately? And, more broadly, how do conservative news media portray intersectionality in negative ways? Given that previous research has highlighted a considerable amount of disinformation in these media, one might expect that the Right largely misrepresents intersectionality, yet online conservative news media may distort some aspects but not others, which I explore in this article.

Background on Intersectionality

One area in which online conservative news media may represent intersectionality accurately or inaccurately is with regard to additive versus intersectional understandings of oppression. As other research has revealed, intersectionality is often incorrectly understood as an approach that involves additive understandings, even though it began in response to, and as a critique of, these frameworks (Bowleg, 2008; Hancock, 2016). Additive understandings assume that systems of oppression can be “added” together and thus operate distinctly, while intersectional approaches offer a more dynamic and contextual understanding of oppression, whereby forms of inequality overlap to such an extent that they cannot merely be counted or totaled to comprehend how power relations operate.

Crenshaw’s (1989) original formulation of intersectionality drew attention to how anti-discrimination laws often fail to serve the interests of Black women – while more frequently helping singularly-marginalized groups such as white women or Black men – because these protections require individuals to position their discriminatory experiences as either racist or sexist, even when they are both of these things. In this sense, Black women face their own unique set of challenges that cannot be understood by simply adding or combining the oppressive experiences of Black men and white women. Thus, the experiences of multiply-marginalized groups cannot be understood through the lens of additive approaches that privilege or centralize one form of inequality. Scholarship has continued to differentiate between additive and intersectional understandings, despite misinterpretations that conflate the two (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Ken & Helmuth, 2021).

Beyond additive frameworks, in this article I build on Patricia Hill Collins's (2019) understanding of intersectionality as a critical social theory. Although critiques of intersectionality have sometimes suggested that it has run its course and that it is time to move on to more productive approaches, Collins (2019) has argued that intersectional approaches have merely begun exposing and resisting structural inequalities and can expand to many areas of study to improve understandings of how systems of oppression simultaneously structure social life. In *Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory*, Collins (2019) argued that "intersectionality is far broader than what most people, including many of its practitioners, imagine it to be. We have yet to fully understand the potential of the constellation of ideas that fall under the umbrella term *intersectionality* as a tool for social change" (p. 2). This understanding of intersectionality as expansive and as a tool for social change indicates that intersectional approaches have yet still more room to grow, as many areas of academia and social life more broadly have only begun engaging with intersectional ideas and challenging multiple systems of oppression. Ultimately, Collins (2019) indicated that intersectionality has "an important role to play in the world" in "bringing about much-needed social change" (p. 290).

Based on this research, I argue that part of the resistance to intersectionality in online conservative news media involves fear over its coalition-building aspects. As Carastathis (2013) has theorized, intersectionality can aid in coalition building by illuminating not only the differences among social groups but also the differences within them, revealing the inevitable heterogeneity of identity categories. This attention to intra-group differences helps with recognizing the variation that internally constitutes any social group and with discovering potential areas of cooperation across lines of difference (E. Cole, 2008; Crenshaw, 1991).

Mohanty (2003), for example, has referred to her "belief that 'common differences' can form the basis of deep solidarity" (pp. 503-504) and that "differences and commonalities thus exist in relation and tension with each other in all contexts. What is emphasized are relations of mutuality, coresponsibility, and common interests, anchoring the idea of feminist solidarity" (p. 521). Intersectionality can help oppressed groups and individuals see the ways their struggles are overlapping rather than disparate, ultimately working together to challenge multiple systems of oppression simultaneously. From this perspective, the relational aspects of intersectionality help with building toward a politics of radical interconnectedness (Carastathis, 2013; Keating, 2009; Meyer, 2020, 2022).

In this article, intersectionality is used in several ways, some of which relate to the concepts and approaches that intersectional theorists and practitioners have advanced, others of which relate to how online conservative news media may use the concept. With regard to the former, I am using intersectionality as both a methodological approach – one that helps researchers see the ways that systems of oppression are overlapping or interconnected rather than separate

or distinct – and a more conceptual framework that considers the theoretical approaches of intersectionality, which are not settled or definitive. With regard to the latter, I examine how these online conservative news media use intersectionality in distinct ways – by critiquing it, as well as appropriating intersectional discourses.

Through this analysis, I develop the concept *intersectional panic* to account for responses to intersectionality that involve considerable fear or anxiety. I define *intersectional panic* as fear over the advancement of multiply-marginalized groups in U.S. society, which is distinct from racist, sexist, and anti-LGBTQ forms of panic that may focus more centrally on singularly-marginalized groups. Building on Collins’s (2019) theory of intersectionality as a critical and expansive approach for social justice, I argue that feminist resistance to a backlash against intersectionality can challenge these conservative discourses by emphasizing intersectionality’s expansive and beneficial capacities. Indeed, my central argument is that online conservative news media fear the coalition-building potential of intersectionality, and consequently attempt to minimize that potential by reframing intersectionality as narrow and divisive rather than as useful for forming coalitions and building solidarities.

Methods

Data Collection

To study how online conservative news media portray intersectionality, I chose to focus on the 10 most widely searched conservative news websites in the United States during 2021, according to the U.S. cultural website OutKick (Reese, 2021). OutKick classified a website as “conservative” based on the Media Bias Chart from Ad Fontes Media, a public benefit corporation that rates news organizations and websites in terms of reliability and political orientation (Reese, 2021). I eliminated from my analysis one of these websites, *The New York Post*, because a lot of their reports focused on New York City and I wanted to examine online conservative news media with more national coverage.

OutKick’s ranking relied on data from Ahrefs, a search engine optimization (SEO) tool that tracks how many times per month a website is searched in a specific location across a variety of search engines. These data are an estimation, given that websites do not report their amount of internet traffic. Nevertheless, Ahrefs has been described as “the best SEO tool” according to search engine experts (Tonkin, 2020, para. 3), and these search volume data have been characterized as “roughly accurate” in providing a sense of how often a website is searched (Stark, n.d., para. 7). Consequently, this data collection process provided me with a group of nine relatively popular

conservative news websites to examine, even if the truly most visited websites remain unknown and may be different than the nine in my analysis.

After selecting these nine websites, I chose to focus on all of their reports – 427 in total – that included the word “intersectional” or “intersectionality” from January 20, 2021, the day of Biden’s inauguration, through July 20, 2022. This time-period included in my analysis captures representations of intersectionality during the first 18 months of this Democratic administration. Considerable research has focused on right-wing media prior to, and during, the Trump presidency, yet I purposely designed this study to examine how online conservative news media represented intersectionality during a Democratic administration (Murib, 2020; Zhang & Davis, 2024). Periods in which Republicans do not hold the presidency can be times in which conservative ideas and discourses expand, as a significant amount of research has pointed to how right-wing movements grew during Barack Obama’s administration, due in large part to a growing racist backlash against the nation’s first Black president (DiMaggio, 2021; White, 2018).

More recently, as conservative attacks on the teaching of social justice issues have grown during the Biden administration, I became interested in examining how critiques of intersectionality may also operate on the Right (Oladipo, 2023; Zinn Education Project, 2024). I chose to begin the sample on January 20, 2021, to ensure that the news coverage focused primarily on when Biden was president rather than on other events such as the United States Capitol Insurrection on January 6, 2021. I chose to end the sample after 18 months because I reached data saturation at this point, and yet still covered over one year of reporting with these methods.

Sample

The nine websites I examined, with the number of reports included in my analysis, were The Daily Wire (108); The Epoch Times (82); Breitbart (71); Fox News (61); The Daily Caller (39); The Blaze (33); InfoWars (15); Newsmax (10); and The Gateway Pundit (8). These websites varied to a degree in their ideological outlook, with some including explicitly alt-right viewpoints and others identifying themselves as more mainstream-conservative media. At the same time, as other research has pointed out, the line between these distinctions has become blurry, as consumption of more mainstream-conservative media such as Fox News serves as a strong predictor of support for alt-right and white supremacist positions (DiMaggio, 2021; Koulouris, 2018; Zhang & Davis, 2024).

Most of the reports were opinion-based columns from conservative commentators; thus, they could skeptically be viewed as “news.” Consistent with other research, I nevertheless refer to them as news because they explicitly referred to their work as such and positioned themselves as countering other news organizations (Rae, 2021; Vowles & Hultman, 2021). The authors of the

reports were sometimes well-known Republican politicians or TV personalities, but they were more commonly full-time writers or cultural commentators, typically either employed by the website or working freelance for a variety of conservative media.

Data Analysis

I used grounded theory methods to analyze the reports, with open, axial, and selective coding employed with the qualitative data analysis program ATLAS.ti (Miles et al., 2019; Saldaña, 2021). A grounded theory approach is useful because it offers detailed procedural steps for researchers to create codes and conceptual categories, building toward identifying trends and relationships among the texts analyzed (Charmaz, 2014; Glaser & Strauss, 2017). Open coding was employed to identify initial concepts, with line-by-line analysis of the reports (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Saldaña, 2021). Adhering to Corbin and Strauss's (2015) suggestion for axial coding, whereby connections, categories, and relationships are made among the concepts generated from open coding, I then created broad axial codes, such as "intersectionality as hierarchical."

Through the process of selective coding, with analysis of the axial codes and the writing of theoretical memos, core categories emerged, as this examination revealed some more specific trends in the reports (Charmaz, 2014; Miles et al., 2019). Some of these core categories resemble the data presented in this article, including "using intersectional discourse to condemn intersectionality" and "panicking about the expansion of intersectional coalitions." After creating these core categories, I analyzed the reports again, selectively coding any data related to the categories, in addition to refining and validating the relationships that had been established throughout the coding process (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Saldaña, 2021).

As feminist research has shown, scholars' studies cannot be extracted from broader power relations, as researchers' positionalities remain implicated in, rather than entirely separate from, surrounding cultural conditions (Morrow et al., 2015). Although I have tried not to reinforce social hierarchies throughout this research, my analysis of these conservative websites is inevitably immersed in power relations and cannot be decontextualized from systems of oppression. Given that previous scholarship has revealed a considerable amount of disinformation disseminated by conservative news media, I largely expected the reports to misrepresent intersectionality, yet findings revealed a more complicated picture, which I outline in what follows (Johnson, 2018; Weigel, 2023).

Findings

In the following sections, I reveal that a backlash against intersectionality exists on the Right, in online conservative news media. This backlash operates in a variety of ways, including but not limited to constructions of intersectionality as hierarchical, additive, simplistic, and divisive. These constructions typically mischaracterized intersectionality, yet I also argue that the authors of these media sometimes appeared to understand aspects of intersectionality and responded to those aspects with a large amount of fear or anxiety. Additionally, at times, these reports used intersectional discourses themselves, not to further engagement with intersectionality but to position it in negative terms. Finally, I argue that part of intersectional panic on the Right operates through a positioning of intersectionality as divisive, narrow, or limited because these online conservative news reports are concerned about intersectionality's expansive potential – in particular, its ability to bring multiple groups on the Left into coalitions.

Conservative Positioning of Intersectionality as Hierarchical

The reports condemned intersectionality in a wide range of ways. However, throughout the reports, the most common word that intersectionality was paired with was “hierarchy.” The phrase “intersectional hierarchy” appeared more than any other discourse that the websites used in relation to intersectionality. This positioning often involved an understanding that intersectionality simplistically categorizes people, such as in the following report titled, “One Nation, Divisible,” that ascribed an additive understanding of oppression to intersectionality. For example:

Every American, by this measure, either belongs to the society of victims or the society of oppressors. Some people, admittedly, are oppressed two or three or many times over. There are “twofer,” “threefer,” and even “fourfer.” So there’s a hierarchy within the field of victimology. The technical term for this is “intersectionality.” Being oppressed for being black [sic] is impressive, but being oppressed for being black and female is better still, and being oppressed for being black, female, and gay puts you at the top of the victims’ totem pole. (D’Souza, 2021, para. 7)

With the additive notion of “twofer” through “fourfer,” this report positioned intersectionality as simply totaling the number of ways someone is oppressed. This discourse misrepresents intersectionality’s emphasis on the overlapping, not additive, ways that forms of inequality operate, as foundational intersectional texts have critiqued approaches that construct systems of oppression as separate or parallel rather than intersecting (Crenshaw, 1989; Hancock, 2016).

The above narrative also positioned intersectionality as reductive and

dichotomous with the suggestion that “every American...either belongs to the society of victims or the society of oppressors.” Conversely, intersectional analyses do not typically reproduce simplistic binaries such as “victims/oppressors,” but instead reveal complexities that are often obscured through a single-axis approach (Cho, 2013; McCall, 2005). This report was atypical in associating intersectionality with the discourses of “victim” and “victimology,” yet the broader construction of intersectionality as hierarchical was commonly done in this way of positioning intersectionality as favoring oppressed groups.

Although the authors of the reports frequently misrepresented intersectionality, I also want to suggest that many of them appeared to understand – rather than misunderstand – some of its primary aspects. The notion that intersectionality is hierarchical, rather than anti-hierarchical – an approach that involves reducing and ultimately eliminating power imbalances – certainly misconstrues intersectionality’s relationship to social inequality. Still, intersectional work frequently advocates for improving the social conditions facing multiply-marginalized groups (Bowleg, 2008; Ken & Helmuth, 2021). When condemning intersectionality, the reports pointed to, and expressed anxiety about, this improvement, as shown by this report’s emphasis on “being black, female, and gay” as something that “puts you at the top of the victims’ totem pole” (D’Souza, 2021, para. 7).

In some of these reports, an acknowledgement of racial hierarchies that harm people of color seemed apparent or at least implied, yet consistent across the reports was a fear that forces such as intersectionality were reversing these hierarchies. This focus reflects longstanding conservative emphasis on “reverse racism,” which has involved positioning anti-white discrimination as a significant social problem (A. Cole, 2007; White, 2018). Indeed, later in this report, the author explained who constitutes the “oppressor” category: “by contrast, everyone who is white is an oppressor. Everyone who is white and male is doubly guilty. And everyone who is white, male, and heterosexual is the worst of the worst” (D’Souza, 2021, para. 8). This report constructed white heterosexual men – and white people more broadly – as being unfairly categorized as oppressive. At the same time, this report criticized a focus on victimization on the Left. Alyson Cole (2007) has referred to such discourses as reflecting “the cult of true victimhood,” whereby a condemnation of “victim talk” occurs with an emphasis on “real” or “true” victims, such as conservatives or white heterosexual men.

Using Intersectional Discourses to Condemn Intersectionality

While positioning intersectionality as reductive or simplistic, the reports conversely pointed to significant differences within social groups. Ironically, at times, this construction included some intersectional analyses:

Using key metrics – sex and race – to reward some and demonize others, the American caste system is the product of intersectionality, a framework that uses race, class, and gender to classify individuals. At the bottom of this socially-constructed, increasingly shaky ladder, you will find white people. To be specific, white men. To be even more specific, cisgender, white men... Progressives, many of whom enjoy talking about lived experiences, are quick to ignore the lived experiences of white people. After all, the lived experiences of a white J. P. Morgan executive director is very different from the lived experiences of a white farmer in Louisiana. Farmers commit suicide at three times the national rate, and 95 percent of American farmers are white... Racism is still acceptable, as long as the hateful comments are directed toward white people – preferably straight, white men. (Ghlionn, 2021, paras. 4-7)

This report again reflected conservative anxieties regarding a loss of status for white heterosexual and cisgender men, and the author positioned intersectionality as an engine of inequality rather than a tool for reducing social hierarchies. Simultaneously, however, this report arguably engaged in an intersectional analysis of white people, pointing to diversity in such a category, where “the lived experiences of a white J. P. Morgan executive director is very different from the lived experiences of a white farmer in Louisiana.”

On the one hand, understanding this emphasis on the variability among white people as an intersectional analysis could be viewed as relying on an individualistic understanding of intersectionality – that is, one in which intersectionality is concerned primarily with group-based differences among individuals. Instead, intersectional theorists have pointed to the problems with individualizing intersectionality, given its broader focus on critiquing unequal power relations (Choo & Ferree, 2010; May, 2015). On the other hand, this statement could also be understood as at least a partial intersectional analysis of white people, given that it points to class and geographic differences within this social group. If this report reflects broader trends, then intersectional discourse and analysis may be increasing in the unlikeliest of arenas – those hoping to undo intersectional aims.

This narrative’s construction of white people as varied based on social class can also be understood as consistent with conservative attempts to attract white individuals with class-based resentments toward their wealthier counterparts (DiMaggio, 2021; White, 2018). Alternatively, given intersectionality’s resistance to overlapping inequalities, economically-marginalized white people would benefit from intersectional forms of activism that reduce poverty and economic precarity. Among the websites, some differences existed in terms of how they presented social class and capitalism. Reports on Fox News tended to position capitalism in a positive way and to construct anyone who criticizes it negatively, while the websites linked with the alt-right tended to position capitalism in more negative terms. The former construction sometimes involved positioning intersectionality as undermining capitalism, while the latter construction more frequently linked intersectionality with capitalism through phrases such as “woke capitalism” (Carney, 2021).

The previous report's emphasis on American farmers is also consistent with broader conservative media. As Gökariksel and colleagues (2019) found in their analysis of right-wing media on lesbian farmers purportedly taking over the Midwest, a "war" on the American farmer has pervaded conservative discourse for quite some time now, in which these media center a white heteromascularity that is positioned as under attack by "outsiders," such as lesbian farmers or Latinx immigrants. White supremacy has also historically operated through an understanding of white people as diverse, while racially marginalized groups have more frequently been homogenized in relation to racialized stereotypes (Hancock, 2016; Young, 1990). Thus, the previous report's emphasis on white farmers can be understood as consistent with aspects of institutional racism in the U.S. that position white individuals as far from monolithic, while not granting the same privilege to people of color.

While the reports were the most likely to point to diversity among white people, other reports used similar discourse regarding people of color. For example, Danielle D'Souza Gill, a host of "Counterculture" on EpochTV, was referenced at length in the following report:

[D'Souza] Gill talks about the "intersectionality" of the left, which she defines as essentially giving people more points based on their race, or minority standing. For example, under this system, a black [sic] woman would be awarded more points than a heterosexual white male... The left says people are essentially identified by three components: skin color, gender, and sexual orientation. However, Gill asks if there aren't things that are more important to us than this, such as our values, actions, or integrity?... Gill speaks about her race, being an Indian woman. She points out that if she was grouped with a fellow Indian woman who was liberal, the two would not have much in common with one another. Instead, Gill would have much more in common with a black or white person who is a Christian and a conservative. To Gill, being an American unites her with others who love America, whether they were born here or not, or whether they share the same skin color or gender. (Allison, 2021, paras. 3-4)

The "more points" discourse again attributes an additive understanding of oppression to intersectionality and the focus on "three components: skin color, gender, and sexual orientation" implies that intersectionality is simplistic.

In contrast to the earlier report that focused on diversity among white people, this one contextualized Indian American women in relation to religion, political affiliation, and those who "love America," suggesting that those aspects can be more important than race or gender. Other reports similarly included statements that individuals should be uniting around a U.S.-based identity, or around the "American flag," not speaking about differences regarding race or gender (Mastrangelo, 2021). At the same time, the discourse on variability among people of color differed from that focusing on white people, as only the former emphasized these questions of patriotism or lack thereof, reflecting larger power relations in which white individuals are the most likely to be constructed as "natural" residents of the U.S. (Gökariksel et al., 2019; Murib, 2020). Despite such differences, the reports positioned

intersectionality as reductive when focusing on intra-group variation among both white individuals and people of color.

Constructing Intersectionality as Divisive and Narrow, yet Dangerously Expanding

Overlapping with the hierarchical and reductive emphases, another way that the reports condemned intersectionality was by positioning it as divisive. One report, for instance, included the phrase “divisive intersectional poison” (Hammer, 2021, para. 1), and another explained that “intersectional philosophy depends on dividing people into warring victim groups” (Zeisloft, 2021a, para. 4). While suggesting that it is divisive to focus on group oppression, some of these reports conversely emphasized the importance of the individual:

Intersectionality reduces their sense of selves to mere points on a Venn diagram of group oppression... As powerful institutions from academia to corporations promote divisiveness, fighting back can be daunting, but it must be done to defend individualism – the very cornerstone of a free society... Human beings are far too complex to be infinitely segregated into special interest categories. The true source of identity is not the affinity group – rather, it is the self. (Schlott, 2021, paras. 7-11)

This discourse may be understood as an attempt to appeal to the individualism of some U.S.-based audiences. Intersectional resistance to structural oppression in the U.S. involves challenging these ideas, in part, given that this individualism can lead people to overlook group-based inequalities.

The marginalized groups that these websites referred to in relation to intersectionality differed, yet my research revealed a significant amount of emphasis on LGBTQ people of color – in most cases, Black queer or transgender individuals. Sometimes these groups were included in the very definition of intersectionality, such as in the following report: “‘intersectionality,’ or how one person can belong to multiple minority groups, such as a black [sic] transgender youth” (Schow, 2021, para. 4). The focus on “one person” here was part of an individualizing of intersectionality or a narrowing of its relevance to particular individuals such as Black transgender people.

These constructions of intersectionality as narrow or limited nevertheless largely disappeared when the reports conveyed panic over intersectionality spreading. For example, one of the reports, titled “Leading Pastors Recommend These Books for Christians in 2021,” quoted Carl Trueman, the author of the book, *The Rise and Triumph of the Modern Self*, about the books he would recommend (Zeisloft, 2021b). This report included the following quotation from Trueman about his recommendation of the book *Cynical Theories: How Activist Scholarship Made Everything about Race, Gender, and Identity — and Why This Harms Everybody*:

Trueman endorses *Cynical Theories* to readers seeking to investigate the claims of intersectionality – an ideological framework that is “beginning to exert a powerful effect on public discourse and indeed on all areas of life, from families and schools to places of employment.”... “It is vital that people realize how and why race, gender, and queer theory are converging,” he added. (Zeisloft, 2021b, paras. 6-7)

The notion that intersectionality is starting to exert a powerful effect on “all areas of life” hyperbolically conveys fear regarding its presence and possible expansion. This report also linked intersectionality and queer theory, despite some differences between them. Academic bodies of scholarship as diverse as these two do not always “converge,” to use this report’s phrasing, and have even diverged from one another in some important ways. However, queerness has also always been part of intersectionality, as Black and Latinx queer women were some of the founders of core intersectional ideas (Cho, 2013; Combahee River Collective, 1977; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1981).

While anti-LGBTQ prejudice can mobilize some forms of intersectional panic, the reports conveyed an especially large amount of fear when focusing on intersectionality’s potential to build coalitions among marginalized groups. One report described the dangers of intersectionality “to unite all the various oppressed and marginalized groups into one overarching theory of social justice, and the person who did that was Kimberle [sic] Crenshaw who invented the term intersectionality” (Poor, 2021, para. 23). Here, the coalition-building aspects of intersectionality were part of its very definition, as this report gave intersectionality enormous causal strength, with its ability to “unite all the various oppressed and marginalized groups.” Another report defined intersectionality as “solidarity across causes” (Pollak, 2021, para. 3), and other reports negatively characterized Democratic Representative Hakeem Jeffries referring to the Democratic Party as a “coalition” by derisively relabeling the Party “a coalition of intersectionality” (Husebø, 2022, para. 1).

Fear over expanding intersectional coalitions was also explicit when the reports focused on activist groups. Typically, these representations involved presenting groups on the Left negatively when they used intersectional discourses, such as a Women in Politics group at Loyola Marymount University that described itself as striving for “a strong emphasis on intersectional feminism” (Williams, 2021, para. 5). The more extreme version of these negative representations involved attributing destructive consequences to activist groups. For instance, another report quoted Mark Levin, host of the popular conservative talk radio show, *The Mark Levin Show*, as speaking about Black Lives Matter and Antifa in relation to Marxism and intersectionality:

Levin blamed groups like Black Lives Matter and Antifa, both of whom he categorized as “Marxist organizations” for launching a “full-scale, multi-level intersectional attack on or [sic] system of government.”... “The media won’t say it, they are just peaceful protesters trying to bring in racial justice....this has nothing to do with racial justice,” he said. “This is a full-scale multi-level intersectional

attack on or [sic] system of government, on our founding, on our principles.” (Halon, 2021, paras. 7-8)

Levin gave immense power to this “intersectional attack,” referring to it as both “full-scale” and “multi-level.” He positioned this attack as potentially causing a lot of destruction, in terms of both the government and foundational U.S. principles.

This positioning is consistent with the “destruction” that the Right often attempts to associate with movements such as Black Lives Matter (DiMaggio, 2021; Taylor, 2016). These associations overlook the generative aspects of Black Lives Matter’s anti-carceral work, which typically involves developing new support structures as well as reducing or eliminating existing institutions of control (Taylor, 2016). Despite this consistency with the “destruction” the Right frequently places on such movements, the focus of this report was less on intersectionality dividing people and more on how it can bring people together to enact large-scale changes. Thus, in what follows, I argue that these seemingly disparate constructions – intersectionality as divisive and as unifying or coalition building – coexist on the Right and point to the need for feminist responses to such discourses.

Discussion and Conclusion

Previous research has focused on the role of right-wing media in reinforcing intersecting systems of oppression and on the presence of disinformation in these media, yet little remains known about how negative portrayals of intersectionality operate on the Right (Campi, 2021; Nielsen, 2020; Weigel, 2023). In this article, I have shown that a backlash against intersectionality exists in online conservative news media. I have developed the concept *intersectional panic* to account for responses that involve a considerable amount of fear or anxiety.

On the one hand, I have revealed that this resistance to intersectionality overlaps with other conservative anxieties, such as racist panic over the gains made by Black Americans or gender and anti-queer panic over the expansion of LGBTQ rights. On the other hand, when the reports discussed intersectionality, the panic was distinct from these other anxieties as well, with fear over multiply-marginalized groups gaining power and multiply-privileged groups losing status. Conservative media for quite some time have worried about the declining status of white men, yet my work here draws attention to some possibly newer or expanding dynamics with online conservative news media referring to multiply-marginalized groups of LGBTQ people, particularly Black queer or transgender individuals. In this sense, intersectional panic is not the same as other anxieties rooted in maintaining systems of oppression, such as racist or gender panic, because the former involves negative constructions of multiply-marginalized groups.

The reports seemed to appeal most overtly to cisgender and heterosexual white men, whom they positioned as victimized by intersectionality. However, ascribing additive understandings of oppression to intersectionality also seemed designed to appeal to more oppressed groups. These online conservative news media added oppressions and applied that understanding to intersectionality perhaps as a way of appealing to individuals who feel as if they will not benefit from an approach that focuses on individuals who experience multiple, or even many, forms of oppression.

Thus, part of the utility for the Right of applying an additive understanding of oppression to intersectionality is that these media can appeal to singularly-marginalized groups through references to multiply-marginalized individuals. In this sense, the implications of these findings point to the necessity of better understanding conservative misinterpretations of intersectionality, as such distortions may help expand intersectional panic. As a concept, *intersectional panic* draws attention to the unique fears over multiply-marginalized groups, which cannot always be fully explained by a singular focus on racism, sexism, or heteronormativity, but instead requires greater consideration of how these forms of inequality overlap.

At the same time, these online conservative news media cannot be understood entirely through the lens of disinformation. My work here builds on feminist scholarship that has shown how conservative movements may use and transform feminist discourses for their own aims; what Julia Schuster (2021) has referred to as “the increasing co-optation of feminist demands in right-wing narratives” (p. 24). Here, I found evidence that these conservative news media are co-opting intersectional discourses, not only more broadly feminist ones. The reports certainly distorted many aspects of intersectionality, yet my findings also revealed that these media are using intersectional discourses to condemn intersectionality. One of the ways anti-feminist media may react to the expansion of intersectional discourse is by using it themselves, in a way that reinforces oppressive social conditions.

For this reason, building on the work of Patricia Hill Collins (2019), I have argued for a perpetual insistence on understanding intersectionality as a critical tool for social justice. It becomes more difficult to co-opt intersectional discourses for conservative aims, or for reinforcing structural inequalities, when intersectionality is understood as an approach that aids in transforming social relations in a more fundamentally equal way. The reports’ “intersectional hierarchy” phrasing can also then be understood as a misnomer.

In this article, I have also built on theorizing intersectionality in relation to coalition building, given that the reports included a lot of fear regarding this aspect (Carastathis, 2013; Keating, 2009). The reports assigned some opposite notions onto intersectionality – namely, that it problematically divides people, and yet also has the power to bring people together on the Left. Although these notions may appear as opposites – dividing people or bringing them together – I interpret both of these discourses as arising out of fear over intersectionality’s potential expansiveness.

The panic expressed over intersectionality's ability to foster coalitions on the Left clearly reflects this fear over feminist and intersectional expansion. Nevertheless, I also view attempts to present intersectionality as divisive in this way because such portrayals imply that intersectionality's expansion will inevitably lead to division. These seemingly contradictory constructions – as divisive and unifying – may help resistance to intersectionality grow, as conservative discourses can label intersectionality as either disruptive or expansive, depending on the issue at hand.

According to these conservative websites, it is simplistic and divisive to focus on group oppression because individuals vary tremendously within a social group, yet an intersectional rejoinder need not deny this variation – and, indeed, intersectional approaches help draw attention to intra-group differences – but instead emphasize the many divisive harms that result from conservative attempts to divert attention away from systems of oppression. The notion that white, heterosexual men – sometimes identified in the reports as cisgender as well – are at the bottom of U.S. social hierarchies helps to undermine intersectional understandings of oppression; that is, it reverses the social privileging of whiteness, heterosexuality, and maleness simultaneously. Intersectional work is particularly well-suited to challenge these discourses, given that, for all of these websites' contentions, it is actually the Right's insistence that white heterosexual men are disadvantaged by U.S. social relations that is simplistic, divisive, and supportive of social hierarchies – the very ideas these reports attached to intersectionality.

Given that intersectional panic operates in part through a positioning of intersectionality as divisive, then revealing the productive and generative capacities of intersectionality may be as necessary as ever. This emphasis can be understood as a return to core intersectional aims that draw attention to how considerably more individuals in the U.S. would benefit from an intersectional approach than the existing state of affairs, or certainly a conservative framework. In this sense, the “divisiveness” these reports emphasized can be reversed on to not only systems of oppression that divide and hierarchize individuals but also outlets such as these conservative news websites that attempt to frighten their audiences into being concerned about the destructive effects of intersectionality.

Despite revealing the complex ways that these websites positioned intersectionality, this study undoubtedly suffers from a few limitations regarding its broader implications. My results can only speak to U.S.-based online conservative news media, as these findings would have differed if I had examined another form of media, such as radio, newspapers, or television. The research methods employed, in which I examined nine of the most widely searched websites, allowed me to study fairly popular and well-known conservative websites, but this approach also meant that lesser-known websites, with different positions, were not included in my analysis; the findings presented throughout this article should be understood in relation to this context. Forms of intersectional panic may operate in conservative media

in other countries, as well as in some areas of the U.S. Left, yet future research is necessary to examine the extent to which these findings exist beyond the websites I have examined here.

Although intersectional panic has possibly increased as of late, intersectional coalitions and activist groups have also expanded during this time. The Movement for Black Lives, for example, has challenged a wide range of issues rooted in white supremacy, capitalism, and heteropatriarchy (Taylor, 2016). Intersectional forms of activism have flourished in many other arenas as well, including immigration, reproductive justice, LGBTQ rights, and resistance to global capitalism, among many others (DiMaggio, 2021).

Emphasizing the widespread benefits of this work is part of what remains necessary in challenging intersectional panic. Further, the relational aspects of intersectionality help reveal how individuals can form solidarities and coalitions in working together across differences. Through this emphasis on mutuality, intersectional approaches can resist conservative media discourses that prioritize individualism, exposing individuals instead to their shared responsibility in simultaneously challenging multiple systems of oppression. *Intersectional panic* as a concept helps to recognize and problematize hostility to intersectionality, which may be growing, and which has become prevalent in online conservative news media, as my findings throughout this article have revealed.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Alberto McKelligan Hernández, as well as the anonymous reviewers, for their extremely helpful feedback on earlier versions of this article.

References

- Allison, E. (2021, October 14). EpochTV review: The racism of CRT and identity politics. *The Epoch Times*. <https://www.theepochtimes.com/opinion/epochtv-review-the-racism-of-crt-and-identity-politics-4042959>
- Banet-Weiser, S., & Glatt, Z. (2023). “Stop treating BLM like Coachella”: The branding of intersectionality. In J. Nash & S. Pinto (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to intersectionalities* (pp. 499-511). Routledge.
- Bowleg, L. (2008). When black + lesbian + woman ≠ black lesbian woman: The methodological challenges of qualitative and quantitative intersectionality research. *Sex Roles*, 59(5), 312-325. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9400-z>
- Bresnahan, M., Roscizewski, A., Whitaker, S., & Cossmann, H. (2021). Online public responses to the “send her back” chant at the 2019 Greenville rally. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 50(4), 338-351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.1877177>
- Campi, A. (2021). Cultivating authoritarian submission: Race and gender in conservative media. *Theory & Event* 24(2), 456-482. <https://doi.org/10.1353/tae.2021.0022>

- Carastathis, A. (2013). Identity categories as potential coalitions. *Signs*, 38(4), 941-965. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669573>
- Carney, J. (2021, August 13). *Woke capitalism: Steve Forbes rebukes American Express over critical race theory training*. Breitbart. <https://www.breitbart.com/social-justice/2021/08/13/amex-critical-race-theory-training/>
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Cho, S. (2013). Post-intersectionality: The curious reception of intersectionality in legal scholarship. *Du Bois Review*, 10(2), 385-404. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000362>
- Choo, H. Y., & Ferree, M. M. (2010). Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory*, 28(2), 129-149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2010.01370.x>
- Christian, A. J., Day, F., Diaz, M., & Peterson-Salahuddin, C. (2020). Platforming intersectionality: Networked solidarity and the limits of corporate social media. *Social Media + Society*, 6(3), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120933301>
- Cole, A. (2007). *The cult of true victimhood: From the war on welfare to the war on terror*. Stanford University Press.
- Cole, E. (2008). Coalitions as a model for intersectionality: From practice to theory. *Sex Roles*, 59(5), 443-453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9419-1>
- Collins, P. H. (2019). *Intersectionality as critical social theory*. Duke University Press.
- Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2020). *Intersectionality*. Polity.
- Combahee River Collective. (1977). *Combahee River Collective statement*. BlackPast. <https://www.blackpast.org/african-american-history/combahee-river-collective-statement-1977/>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Corredor, E. S. (2019). Unpacking “gender ideology” and the global right’s antigender countermovement. *Signs*, 44(3), 613-638. <https://doi.org/10.1086/701171>
- Cottom, T. M. (2016). Black cyberfeminism: Ways forward for intersectionality and digital sociology. In J. Daniels, K. Gregory, & T. M. Cottom (Eds.), *Digital sociologies* (pp. 211-232). Policy.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-168.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- DiMaggio, A. R. (2021). *Rising fascism in America: It can happen here*. Routledge.
- D’Souza, D. (2021, October 18). One nation, divisible. *The Epoch Times*. https://www.theepochtimes.com/one-nation-divisible_4053844.html
- Finlayson, A. (2021). Neoliberalism, the alt-right and the intellectual dark web. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 38(6), 167-190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764211036731>
- Ghlonn, J. M. (2021, September 14). Like China and India, the US also has a caste system. *The Epoch Times*. https://www.theepochtimes.com/like-china-and-india-the-us-also-has-a-caste-system_3992512.html
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (2017). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Routledge.
- Gökariksel, B., Neubert, C., & Smith, S. (2019). Demographic fever dreams: Fragile masculinity and population politics in the rise of the global right. *Signs*, 44(3), 561-587. <https://doi.org/10.1086/701154>
- Hackworth, L. (2018). Limitations of “just gender”: The need for an intersectional reframing of online harassment discourse and research. In J. R. Vickery & T. Everbach (Eds.), *Mediating misogyny: Gender, technology, and harassment* (pp. 51-70). Palgrave Macmillan.

- Halon, Y. (2021, June 20). *Levin: Don't be fooled, the Squad is nothing more than a "cabal of Marxists who hate this country."* Fox News. <https://www.foxnews.com/media/levin-squad-cabal-marxists-who-hate-this-country>
- Hammer, J. (2021, October 18). The campus "diversity" menace comes to Yale. *The Epoch Times*. https://www.theepochtimes.com/the-campus-diversity-menace-comes-to-yale_4054948.html?utm_source=ai&utm_medium=search
- Hancock, A.-M. (2016). *Intersectionality: An intellectual history*. Oxford University Press.
- Husebø, W. (2022, April 27). *Rep. Hakeem Jeffries claims the Democrat Party is "not a cult."* Breitbart. <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2022/04/27/rep-hakeem-jeffries-claims-the-democrat-party-is-not-a-cult/>
- Jack, C. (2017). *Lexicon of lies: Terms for problematic information*. Data & Society Research Institute. https://datasociety.net/pubs/oh/DataAndSociety_LexiconofLies.pdf
- Johnson, J. (2018). The self-radicalization of white men: "Fake news" and the affective networking of paranoia. *Communication, Culture and Critique*, 11(1), 100-115. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcx014>
- Keating, A. (2009). From intersections to interconnections: Lessons for transformation from this bridge called my back. In M. Tracy & K. Guidroz (Eds.), *The intersectional approach: Transforming the academy through race, class, and gender* (pp. 81-99). University of North Carolina Press.
- Ken, I., & Helmut, A. (2021). Not additive, not defined: Mutual constitution in feminist intersectional studies. *Feminist Theory*, 22(4), 575-604. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700120987393>
- Kim, J. (2022). Wikiality within the manosphere: Namuwiki, gender equalism, and antifeminist disinformation in the post-truth era. *Signs*, 48(1), 97-123. <https://doi.org/10.1086/720430>
- Koulouris, T. (2018). Online misogyny and the alternative right: Debating the undebatable. *Feminist Media Studies*, 18(4), 750-761. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2018.1447428>
- Marwick, A. E., & Partin, W. C. (2024). Constructing alternative facts: Populist expertise and the QAnon conspiracy. *New Media & Society*, 26(5), 2535-2555. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221090201>
- Mastrangelo, A. (2021, September 9). *Watch: Ayaan Hirsi Ali points out commonality between radical Islam and woke leftists*. Breitbart. <https://www.breitbart.com/tech/2021/09/09/watch-ayaan-hirsi-ali-points-out-commonality-between-radical-islam-and-woke-leftists/>
- May, V. (2015). *Pursuing intersectionality, unsettling dominant imaginaries*. Routledge.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs*, 30(3), 1771-1800. <https://doi.org/10.1086/426800>
- Meyer, D. (2020). An intersectional analysis of LGBTQ online media coverage of the pulse nightclub shooting victims. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 67(10), 1343-1366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2019.1591784>
- Meyer, D. (2022). *Violent differences: The importance of race in sexual assault against queer men*. University of California Press.
- Miles, M., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2019). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2003). "Under western eyes" revisited: Feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles. *Signs*, 28(2), 499-535. <https://doi.org/10.1086/342914>
- Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (Eds.). (1981). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color*. Persephone Press.
- Morrow, O., Hawkins, R., & Kern, L. (2015). Feminist research in online spaces. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 22(4), 526-543. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2013.879108>
- Murib, Z. (2020). Backlash, intersectionality, and Trumpism. *Signs*, 45(2), 295-302. <https://doi.org/10.1086/704953>
- Nielsen, C. (2020). Send her back: News narratives, intersectionality, and the rise of politically powerful women of color. *International Symposium on Online Journalism*, 10(1), 85-107.
- Norocel, O. C., Saresma, T., Lähdesmäki, T., & Ruotsalainen, M. (2020). Discursive constructions of white Nordic masculinities in right-wing populist media. *Men and Masculinities*, 23(3-4), 425-446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X18780459>

- Norocel, O. C., Saresma, T., Lähdesmäki, T., & Ruotsalainen, M. (2022). Performing “us” and “other”: Intersectional analyses of right-wing populist media. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 25(3), 897-915. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549420980002>
- Oladipo, G. (2023, March 4). “Just the tip of the iceberg”: Kimberlé Crenshaw warns against rightwing battle over critical race theory. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2023/mar/04/critical-race-theory-kimberle-crenshaw-segregation-us-democracy>
- Ouellette, L., & Banet-Weiser, S. (2018). Media and the extreme right: Editor’s introduction. *Communication, Culture and Critique*, 11(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcx021>
- Peterson-Salahuddin, C. (2021). Opening the gates: Defining a model of intersectional journalism. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 38(5), 391-407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2021.1968014>
- Pollak, J. (2021, May 21). *NPR: For left, Palestinian cause similar to Black Lives Matter movement*. Breitbart. <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2021/05/21/npr-for-left-palestinian-cause-similar-to-black-lives-matter-movement/>
- Poor, J. (2021, April 5). *FNC’s Hilton: “We need to overturn wokeism with our own revolution.”* Breitbart. <https://www.breitbart.com/clips/2021/04/05/fncs-hilton-we-need-to-overturn-wokeism-with-our-own-revolution/>
- Rae, M. (2021). Hyperpartisan news: Rethinking the media for populist politics. *New Media & Society*, 23(5), 1117-1132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820910416>
- Rasulo, M. (2020). The vilification of the “Squad”: The discursive (de)construction of women in US far-right media. *Anglistica AION: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 24(1), 55-77.
- Reese, E. (2021, December 29). *The top ten conservative news websites of 2021 as ranked by searches*. OutKick. <https://www.outkick.com/top-ten-conservative-news-websites/>
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Schlott, R. (2021, April 26). Identity politics is destroying the social fabric. *The Epoch Times*. https://www.theepochtimes.com/identity-politics-is-destroying-the-social-fabric_3790258.html
- Schow, A. (2021, May 12). *Biden administration expected to bring back Obama-era school discipline rules, which led to racial quotas*. The Daily Wire. <https://www.dailywire.com/news/biden-administration-expected-to-bring-back-obama-era-school-discipline-rules-which-led-to-racial-quotas>
- Schuster, J. (2021). A lesson from “Cologne” on intersectionality: Strengthening feminist arguments against right-wing co-option. *Feminist Theory*, 22(1), 23-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700120921077>
- Singh, S., & Féron, E. (2021). Towards an intersectional approach to populism: Comparative perspectives from Finland and India. *Contemporary Politics*, 27(5), 528-549. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2021.1917164>
- Stark, H. (n.d.). *How accurate is keyword search volume in Ahrefs?* Ahrefs. <https://help.ahrefs.com/en/articles/72571-how-accurate-is-keyword-search-volume-in-ahrefs>
- Steele, C. K. (2021). *Digital black feminism*. New York University Press.
- Taylor, K.-Y. (2016). *From #blacklivesmatter to black liberation*. Haymarket.
- Tonkin, M. (2020, September 14). *Is Ahrefs accurate? (how accurate is SEMrush also?)*. Lewton. <https://lewtononline.com/is-ahrefs-accurate-how-accurate-is-semrush-also/>
- Vowles, K., & Hultman, M. (2021). Dead white men vs. Greta Thunberg: Nationalism, misogyny, and climate change denial in Swedish far-right digital media. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 36(110), 414-431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08164649.2022.2062669>
- Weigel, M. (2023). Hating theory: “Cultural Marxism,” “CRT,” and the power of media affects. *International Journal of Communication*, 17, 6504-6524.
- White, K. C. (2018). *The branding of right-wing activism: The news media and the Tea Party*. Oxford University Press.
- Williams, T. (2021, November 5). *Jesuit university to host planned parenthood fundraiser*. Breitbart. <https://www.breitbart.com/faith/2021/11/05/jesuit-university-planned-parenthood-fundraiser/>
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton University Press.

- Zeisloft, B. (2021a, March 15). *Four examples of “wokeness” infecting the United States military*. The Daily Wire. <https://www.dailywire.com/news/4-examples-of-wokeness-infecting-the-united-states-military>
- Zeisloft, B. (2021b, March 11). *Leading pastors recommend these books for Christians in 2021*. The Daily Wire. <https://www.dailywire.com/news/leading-pastors-recommend-these-books-for-christians-in-2021>
- Zhang, X., & Davis, M. (2024). E-extremism: A conceptual framework for studying the online far right. *New Media & Society*, 26(5), 2954-2970. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221098360>
- Zimmerman, T. (2017). #Intersectionality: The fourth wave feminist twitter community. *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice*, 38(1), 54-70.
- Zinn Education Project. (2024, September 1). *Right-wing campaign to block teaching for social justice*. <https://www.zinnedproject.org/news/gop-campaign-to-block-teaching-for-social-justice/>