

# ScholarWorks@GSU

## Dialectical Relationships in Pre 9/11 and Post 9/11 White Supremacist Discourse

Authors	Williams, Abigail Smith
Citation	Williams, Abigail Smith (2008). "Dialectical Relationships in Pre 9/11 and Post 9/11 White Supremacist Discourse." Thesis, Georgia State University. <a href="https://doi.org/10.57709/1061311">https://doi.org/10.57709/1061311</a>
DOI	<a href="https://doi.org/10.57709/1061311">https://doi.org/10.57709/1061311</a>
Rights	<p>I hereby certify that, if appropriate, I have obtained and attached hereto a written permission statement from the owner(s) of each third party copyrighted matter to be included in my thesis, dissertation, or project report, allowing distribution as specified below. I certify that the version I submitted is the same as that approved by my advisory committee. I hereby grant to Georgia State University or its agents the non-exclusive license to archive and make accessible, under the conditions specified below, my thesis, dissertation, or project report in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known. I retain all other ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis, dissertation or project report. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis, dissertation, or project report.</p>
Download date	2026-05-20 04:13:36
Link to Item	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14694/3569">https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14694/3569</a>

DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN PRE 9/11 AND POST 9/11 WHITE SUPREMACIST  
DISCOURSE

by

ABIGAIL SMITH WILLIAMS

Under the Direction of Dr. James Darsey

ABSTRACT

My thesis argues that a shift has taken place in white supremacist rhetoric post September 11, 2001. I focus on the pre-9/11 rhetoric of Jared Taylor, the post 9/11 rhetoric of Patrick Buchanan, and identify the attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup> as a catalytic event in the history of white supremacist rhetoric. Through careful rhetorical analysis, I identify the 9/11 shift as a shift in placement vis-à-vis the political mainstream.

INDEX WORDS: White supremacy, Racist rhetoric, Hate speech, Catalytic events, Jared Taylor, Patrick Buchanan

DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN PRE 9/11 AND POST 9/11 WHITE SUPREMACIST  
DISCOURSE

by

ABIGAIL SMITH WILLIAMS

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2008

Copyright by  
Abigail Lynn Smith Williams  
2008

DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN PRE 9/11 AND POST 9/11 WHITE SUPREMACIST  
DISCOURSE

by

ABIGAIL SMITH WILLIAMS

Committee Chair: Dr. James Darsey

Committee: Dr. Mary Stuckey  
Dr. George Pullman

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Georgia State University  
December 2008

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my husband for teaching me that love is more potent than any “ism;” to my mother for supporting all that I do and all that I am; but mostly to the person who constantly reminds me of all the beauty there is to find in this world, my daughter Mariah. May she always understand the power of words and surround herself with people who speak from a place of love.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the guidance of Dr. James Darsey. He has been an inspirational teacher and a constant source of support, despite my amazing ability to generate setbacks. I would like to thank him, as well as Dr. Mary Stuckey and Dr. George Pullman for everything they have done for me. I would also like to thank my family and colleagues for their constant support and encouragement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v	
CHAPTER		
1	WHITE SUPREMACY: A PERENNIAL FEATURE OF AMERICAN HISTORY	1
	Scholarly Approaches to the Radical Right and White Supremacy: A Brief Survey	7
	White Supremacy as a Rhetorical Phenomenon	10
	9/11 and a New Rhetoric of White Supremacy	14
	Methodological Approach	15
2	DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN PRE-9/11 WHITE SUPREMACIST DISCOURSE: THE CASE OF JARED TAYLOR	19
	Jared Taylor's American Dilemma	24
	Taylor's Portrait of the Lapsed American	26
	Blacks and Hispanics: Alien Others	30
	The Conspirators: Perpetrators of the Multiracial Myth	31
	Real Americans: Seeing the Truth that Others Do Not See	33
	Taylor's Drama	35
	Conclusion	42
3	DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN POST-9/11 WHITE SUPREMACIST DISCOURSE: THE CASE OF PATRICK BUCHANAN	44
	Buchanan's State of Emergency	47
	Buchanan's Alien Other: Not a Race Issue Anymore	49

	Buchanan's True American: The Patriot	50
	Black Americans	52
	Buchanan's Drama	56
	Conclusion	58
4	FROM 'YOU JUST DON'T GET IT' TO 'UNITED WE HATE'	60
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	66

## **WHITE SUPREMACY: A PERENNIAL FEATURE OF AMERICAN HISTORY**

Prior to the devastating events of September 11, 2001, white supremacist rhetoric was shunned by the mainstream. Notorious white supremacist, Jared Taylor, epitomized this pre-9/11 marginalized rhetoric; characterized by a prophetic rhetor preaching to a group of Americans who had fallen away from the doctrine of real Americanism. He preached about the threat of invading foreigners and the multiculturalism forwarded on their behalf by intellectual elites. Taylor's outsider brand of white supremacist rhetoric was replaced, post-9/11 by a more mainstream rhetoric which embraced the "United We Stand" social atmosphere. This new version of white supremacist rhetoric was epitomized by the now mainstream success of Pat Buchanan, who used many of the same argumentative strategies as Taylor, but played upon the "unity" of the historical moment by positioning himself as a part of one unified America that is facing the same threat. In Buchanan's America, foreign invaders are given a path to join us as real Americans – they must adopt all that is American. On the surface, this may seem somewhat benign (especially when compared to Taylor's claims), but that is exactly what makes Buchanan's more recent brand of white supremacist rhetoric so scary. "White supremacism and racial bigotry are embedded in the economy and culture of U.S. society" (Hardisty 27). Buchanan's rhetoric recognizes and embraces this sad fact. He, like Taylor, bases his notions of Americanism in whiteness. He just invites non-whites to participate in it.

For the purposes of my paper, I will consider 9/11 a catalytic event with respect to white supremacist rhetoric in the United States. This idea of catalytic events as markers of rhetorical eras was forwarded by James Darsey in his essay "From 'Gay is Good' to the Scourge of AIDS: The Evolution of Gay Liberation Rhetoric, 1977 – 1990." In that essay, Darsey argues that "one key to identifying natural divisions in discourse is then situations and exigencies change

dramatically” (Darsey 46). He goes on to define catalytic events as “moments in the life of a movement that provide appropriate conditions for discourse...(1) are historical rather than rhetorical, (2) are nontactical...(3) achieve tremendous significance for the movement, and (4) precede rhetorical responses that constitute demonstrably discrete, internally homogenous eras” (Darsey 46)<sup>1</sup>.

I believe that 9/11 is a catalytic even in the history of white supremacy because it provided the conditions for the collapse of tensions between varieties of Americanness. Immediately following the attacks, citizens of the United States were inundated with billboards and bumper stickers proclaiming our unity and our commitment to a collective memory. Public opinion polls showed patriotism at an all-time high, and flag sales went through the roof. A study conducted by the Pew Charitable Organization on September 19, 2001 concluded that “Americans are standing tall at a time of crisis--they are united in their approval of the nation’s leaders, paying rapt attention to news, and say they are willing to suffer thousands of military casualties in a protracted conflict to retaliate for last week’s terrorist attacks... There is near universal public engagement in the crisis... As other survey organizations have found, President Bush’s approval ratings have risen to historic heights since the terrorist attacks. Eight-in-ten Americans now approve of Bush’s job performance, up from 51% just a few weeks ago... Bush gets even more favorable ratings for how he has dealt with the terrorist attacks-- 85% approve of his performance on that front” (Pew 1-2). It was a moment in history when we were united as a nation against a common enemy who also happened to be an alien outsider. The dialectical arrangement, in my reading, shifts in this moment from one in which “[true] American” has two

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on this, see Darsey, James. "From 'Commies' and 'Queers' to 'Gay is Good'." *Gayspeak: Gay Male and Lesbian Communication*, James Chesebro, Ed. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1981. 224-47 and Stewart, Charles J., Craig, Smith Allen, and Denton, Robert E. Jr. *Persuasion and Social Movements*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Longrove, Illinois: Waveland, 2001. 58.

antitheses, lapsed Americans and the alien other, to one in which there is a simple tension between “American” and the alien other.

9/11 functions as a catalytic even, a marker between two distinct periods of white supremacist rhetoric, because it provided new resources upon which white supremacist could draw and to which they could respond. In the case of 9/11, the major resource was the spirit of unity that engulfed the nation. As Bitzer wrote, “rhetoric is situational” and as the situation changed, the rhetoric of white supremacy had to change in order to be a fitting response to the situation. White supremacist rhetoric both influenced and was influenced by the post-9/11 euphoria.

The changing nature of white supremacy belies the fact that white supremacy is a pervasive social force, particularly in America with our centuries of racial baggage. Defining what constitutes white supremacy at any given point in history is difficult, if not impossible. Harvey, Case, and Gorsline sought to define white supremacy, not as embodied by a particular group like the KKK, but as a broader phenomenon. They wrote, “we understand white supremacy...broadly as system of individual, institutional, and societal racism in which whiteness – that is, the ‘white’ bodies, and cultural and social practices associated with those deemed ‘white’ – are seen as normative and superior” (Harvey, Case, and Gorsline 4). For the purposes of this paper, I will utilize this definition of white supremacy. It is specific enough to establish criteria under which my texts must fall, yet broad enough to account for the historical shifts in what constitutes the “white” aspect of white supremacy.

The difficulty in coming to an understanding of what is white is that “white is a relatively uncharted territory that has remained invisible as it continues to influence the identity of those both within and without its domain. It affects the everyday fabric of our lives, sometimes

violently, and extensive characterization that would allow for the mapping of its contours” (Nakayama and Krizek 291). Desmond King, in his book *Making Americans: Immigration, Race, and the Origins of the Diverse Democracy*, says that it “is a problematic concept: plainly, Africans were not welcome as immigrants, but neither were certain eastern and southern Europeans, who, despite nominal whiteness, were considered unassimilable” (King 127).

In the case of white supremacy, whiteness necessarily assumes the role of a true American. Carolyn Fleuhr-Lobban, in her thought-provoking book *Race and Racism*, alludes to the innate Americanness of being white. She writes that “whiteness in America is normative...Whiteness has been historically described as not being black, or brown, or Asian, and is associated with ‘being American.’ White has also been historically positioned in a place of dominance....it carries a positive identity without negative racial stereotyping – that of being a good neighbor or citizen without having to prove oneself” (Fluehr-Lobban 168). Leonard Dinnerstein also articulated this unique feature of white supremacy. He claims that white supremacists harbor “anxieties about foreigners supplanting ‘real’ Americans” (Dinnerstein 9).

The most prominent aspect of white supremacy (the desire to define what is white as American and what is American as superior) can be seen throughout history. “Similar concerns have been repeated generation after generation...instead of the Scots-Irish being the ‘villains,’ groups of Americans at different times and in various regions have substituted Italians, Chinese, Jews, African Americans, Poles, Puerto Ricans, Irish, Mexicans, and other ethnics” (Dinnersteind and Reimers “Ethnic” 2).

For different reasons and for different justifications, certain minority groups have been labeled as non-white and, thus, anti-American. It takes only a cursory glance at history to see this tendency in its various manifestations. Since early Jamestown, with the ruthless slaughter of

Native Americans in the name of manifest destiny, the defining-out of Americanness reared its ugly head. In 1676, Increase Mather, a clergyman who later served as president of Harvard University attributed the brutal demise of Native Americans to the will of God to preserve “his people” by arguing that “God hath consumed them by the Sword, and by Famine and Sickness...they have come to lamentable ends at last...God hath wasted the Heathen” (Mather 227-8). Since “colonial times, poor and working-class whites have identified with their more powerful brethren on the basis of racial connections...They came to hate the slaves rather than their masters” (Bell “Foreword” XV).

Dinnerstein, Nichols, and Reimers identify the institution of slavery as a particularly insidious manifestation of white supremacy. The rhetoric of William Gilmore Simms, a white southern writer prior to the onset of war exemplifies the white supremacist contention that slavery not only benefited whites, but also served the interest of the inferior African Americans. He claimed that “the free negroes...decline to a worse brutality, with every increase of their privilege...They feel their inferiority to the whites, even when nominally freemen; and sink into the condition of serviles, in fact, if not in name, in compliance with their natural dependence and unquestionable moral deficiencies” (Simms 276). When slavery was finally abolished, this same paternalistic attitude was reflected in the creation and maintenance of Jim Crow laws.

White supremacy experienced resurgence as a reaction to the civil rights movements in the 1960s. Especially prominent during this time, along with a revival of the Ku Klux Klan, was the American Nazi Party founded by George Lincoln Rockwell in December of 1959. Rockwell was hailed by white supremacists for saying things like “We must have an all-White America... an America in which all their offspring will be beautiful, healthy White babies —never raceless mongrels. We must have an America without swarming black filth...an America ...free of alien,

Jewish influence” and “the fight against the Jews will...be renewed...in the United States. Within twenty five years, the Americans will have begun to come to their senses about the Jewish Question” (Schaerffenberg 1).

The 1970s and ‘80s saw rounds of white supremacist backlashes against new waves of immigrants. Dinnerstein, Nichols, and Reimers call this time the “great drama of American immigration” (Dinnerstein, Nichols, and Reimers 278). During this time period, much of the white supremacist rhetoric targeted Vietnamese immigrants. “In the early 1970s, the number of immigrants from Vietnam quintupled...these events in turn contributed to a political climate of intensifying nativism, racism, xenophobia, and ‘compassion fatigue’” (Min 267).

The 1980s belonged to the Skinhead movement. In their 1997 book *White Power, White Pride! The White Separatist Movement in the United States*, Betty Dobratz and Stephanie Shanks-Meile contend that the skinheads of the 1980s expressed themselves in an extremely violent manner towards minority groups (Dobratz and Shanks-Meile 179). This propensity for violence was reflected in their rhetoric. Dobratz and Shank-Meile shared one of their racist songs called *Bootparty* which threatens non-whites with lines like, “It’s you we invite to our Bootparty, Bootparty. You’ll feel the heat of our boots tonight” (Dobratz and Shanks-Meile 180).

The words of the infamous white supremacist David Duke, in his 1997 essay “America at the Crossroads,” echo the sentiments of his predecessors. He claims to “want to preserve the unique character and beauty of my people...Now is the time for all real Americans to journey with me. Together we can secure the existence of our people, and a bright future for our children” (Duke 49). Duke’s words are characteristic of 1990s white supremacist rhetoric. A resurgence of white supremacy in the 1990s was evident in “...a strong anti-immigration

movement, a burgeoning southern heritage subculture glorifying the Confederacy, and a revival of pseudo-scientific claims of Whites' genetic racial superiority" (Berlet and Lyons 283). It is in this social climate that Taylor fashions his notions of whiteness. For Taylor, a white person is anyone who is not Black or Hispanic. He is open to the idea that Asians can assimilate and thus, considers them to be a part of that normative white American. The basis for most of Taylor's understanding of whiteness is historical. He harkens back to the founding fathers and invokes their lineage as that of a pure white society. Of course, that did not include Hispanics and Blacks.

More recently, a national focus on immigration policy, as it is being debated by Congress, has given rise to renewed white supremacist sentiment against Mexican immigrants. On February 9, 2007, *The Christian Science Monitor* reported that "The Ku Klux Klan appears to be on the rise again after years of irrelevance and splintered obscurity. 'Due to the successful exploitation of hot-button issues,' the Klan has seen 'a surprising and troubling resurgence,' states a new report by the Anti-Defamation League..." (Knickerbocker 2). It is this particular wave of anti-immigration sentiment that Buchanan defines his white person. The interesting thing for Buchanan is that he initially describes whiteness in the same way as Taylor, as tied to the racial heritage of the founding fathers and not Hispanic or Black. However, he leaves an opening for Blacks and Hispanics to participate in this normative (white) American life by assimilating into the dominant (white) culture.

### **Scholarly Approaches to the Radical Right and White Supremacy: A Brief Survey**

The story of the defining Americans with whiteness as an essential characteristic is told time and time again by historians and sociologists. It is the story of the perpetual desire to look for a meaning of "American" which is always defined in terms of its antithesis. This antithesis,

the anti-American, takes a different form depending on the social and political climate of the time.

The radical right, in its many and varied incarnations, is one example of this penchant amongst some Americans to exclude what is not white from their notions of equality. In reference to the radical right, Hilliard and Keith say that “typically, the groups identify villains and scapegoats, level attacks against unscrupulous and scheming leaders, and bolster their own patriotism by depicting a vision of a glorious millennial era attached to some bygone period in American history” (Hilliard and Keith xi). The radical right then, as characterized by Hilliard and Keith, has as its central feature the same defining attribute as white supremacy. Also like white supremacy, the radical right, in all of its manifestations, has a perennial presence in American society. Seymour Martin Lipset once called it “endemic” to our political system (Lipset 446).

The first big wave of academic attention to the radical right came in the 1950s as a response to the anxiety over identity created by World War II. The goal of this wave of work appeared to be an attempt to avoid the dangerous pitfalls of the attempt to define Americanism, embodied in McCarthyism, through careful social-psychological analysis.

This is the time period in which Seymour Martin Lipset coined the term “radical right” and used it for the first time in the book *The New American Right* edited by Daniel Bell. Bell’s book embodies the thrust of the academic work on the radical right during the 1950s. It presents essays from several of the leading academics, including Richard Hofstadter, Talcott Parsons, Lipset, and Nathan Glazer.

Daniel Bell supplemented this notion of radicalism by arguing that it included of any sort as a fear of losing power. He said that this fear prompts the powerful to target a group they can

use as a symbol to explain their dispossession. He explained the “psychological stock-in-trade of the radical right” as having a “threefold appeal: the breakdown of moral fiber in the United States; a conspiracy theory of a ‘control apparatus’ in the government which is selling out the country; and a detailed forecast regarding the Communist ‘takeover’ of the United States.” (Bell 8). These same themes of a breakdown in America’s moral fiber, conspiracy, and an alien takeover of the country could be applied also to white supremacist rhetoric specifically.

Richard Hofstadter, in his essay “Pseudo-Conservatism Revisited: A Postscript”, contended that the radical right was a response “to certain underlying and continuing tensions in American society.” He argued that this was the correct approach originally taken by the editors of the book in which his essay appears, but criticized by some for being over subtle and failing to acknowledge the specific conditions that gave rise to 1950s radicalism. He introduced fundamentalism as a particular force in American life that drives radicalism (in addition to isolationism, ethnic prejudice, and economics).

A few years after Lipset, Bell and Hostadter, Edwin S. Newman in The Hate Reader which cites previous work by Andrew Hacker, and the above authors, characterizes the radical right as “the intensification of reactions probably held in free-floating lesser degree by most citizens” (Newman 134). He describes candidates for participation in radical right: person who cannot accept the social mobility of American life, “provincial,” or “fundamentalist.”

A second edition of *The New American Right*, this time titled *The Radical Right*, was published in 1972 in the wake of the civil rights era and in the midst of another period of concentrated academic attention to the radical right. Bell explained this renewed focus in his introduction by claiming that “the re-emergence of the ‘radical right’ in 1961-62 has justified...fears while confirming our [original] analysis” (Bell X).

The most prominent work of this time continued the social-psychological approach to the study of the radical right. Bell highlighted the 1960s radical right as unique in the sense that the target was “friends” rather than “enemies.” He contended that radical groups during this time continued utilizing the strategy of defining what is American. That definition included that idea that the good American must fight back against threats to their Americanness.

Erling Jorstad in his 1970 book *The Politics of Doomsday* claims that the civil rights movement was crucial to the development of the radical right, which was not as visible during McCarthyism. The racist aspect of radicalism breathed new life into the movement.

David Bennett, in *The Party of Fear: from Nativist Movements to the New Right in American History*, traces the historical shifts in white supremacy specifically between focusing on external and domestic targets. He illustrates the potential for different modes of white supremacist rhetoric to exist at different historical moments. He claims that “now and in the future, the party of fear must focus on different disagreements and discontents...movements may be as deeply rooted and deeply divisive as before, but they will not be the same” (Bennett 408).

### **White Supremacy as a Rhetorical Phenomenon**

As previously noted, white supremacist discourse has taken various forms as a result of and in response to the ever-changing social and political dynamics of the United States. In his 2001 essay published in *Rhetoric Review*, Mark McPhail contends that the 1980s marked a period of inquiry into racist discourse “which would have an important influence on communication scholars who focused on the mediated and social construction of race in the next decade” (McPhail 44). He says that this epoch gave way to a rise in the “number of perspectives that problematized traditional approaches to reading the rhetoric of racism” in the 1990s (McPhail 44).

The 1980s saw the emergence reinterpretation of as a dominant rhetorical strategy of white supremacists. “One example of the reinterpretation process involves the Aryan Nations use of the ‘promised land’ imagery. An essential element of the American dream is the notion that Americans are God’s chosen people and America is the promised land. Seizing upon this image, the Aryan Nations develop a distinct religious vision—a vision justifying racial supremacy” (Kay 539). Jack Kay claims that this was not an attempt to integrate themselves within the American mainstream, but rather an attempt to unite the divided factions of the white supremacist movement.

In the late 1990s, Brian R. McGee began focusing on the rhetoric of the radical right, specifically white supremacist organizations like the Ku Klux Klan. McGee’s approach is reminiscent of Wrage’s methodology in Wrage’s seminal essay “Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History.” In that, Wrage contends that “to adopt the rhetorical perspective is actually to approximate more closely a genuinely historical point of view when analyzing and interpreting speeches as documents of ideas in social history” (Wrage 33). McGee, in his 1998 essay “Rehabilitating Emotion: The Troublesome Case of the Ku Klux Klan,” highlights Imperial Wizard Hiram Evans, because Evans was arguably the Ku Klux Klan’s most successful leader of the twentieth century. McGee says that Evans equated whiteness with Americanism, just as the rest of the radical right. Evans argued that intellectualism was bad, and rhetoric needed to focus on emotional appeals. Despite this critique of liberal reason, Evans (and his cohorts) used many appeals to reason in their speeches. McGee suggests “that these Klan texts adumbrate a theory of rationality that ties reason to emotion and racial instinct. No inconsistency exists here when one recognizes that liberal logos lacked the integration with and reliance on pathos required by Evans’s epistemology” (McGee 4).

Thematic reviews of white supremacist rhetoric have been less common than those that focus on rhetoric tactics. Jerry L. Ferguson focused on his analysis on themes in white supremacist rhetoric specifically. Ferguson, in his essay “Lest We Forget: A Thematic Review of the Rhetoric of White Ethnic Superiority,” broke white supremacist rhetoric down into two major themes. The first was rhetoric that espouses the idea that “various groups, white and non-white, are promoting involuntary race mixing” and this is “inherently evil” (Ferguson 141). The second theme Ferguson pointed to was that “race mixing leads to lower individual, hence societal, performance.” He included under this second theme the sub-themes of “stop open housing” and “stop immigration” (Ferguson 144).

These claims of superiority are, historically, combined with calls for assimilation and cooptation of non-whites. Mary Stuckey and Richard Morris’ article “Pocahontas and Beyond: Commodification and Cultural Hegemony,” on the current and continuous commodification and exploitation of Native Americans illustrate that these historically rooted proclivities for racial supremacy do not end as neatly as we like to demarcate in history books. Stuckey and Morris contend that, “Through paternalism, replacement, co-optation, and definition, anglicization incessantly commodifies and consumes all that is Native America” still today (Stuckey and Morris 61).

The academic literature, from Bell and Lipset through McGee and Ferguson, suggest that the rhetoric of white supremacy has remained remarkably consistent over the decades, across organizations, spokespersons, and specific exigencies. In the essay mentioned above, Ferguson argues that, despite the many different manifestations of white supremacy, “there has been little rhetorical variance...over the years” (Ferguson 142). Even in his 1998 article contending that white supremacists have adopted new tactics, Mitch Berbrier admits that there is nothing “so

new” or different about white supremacist rhetoric of the late 1990s when compared to other historical incarnations like “the second Ku Klux Klan (which lasted from about 1915 to 1925)” and “made some efforts that were extremely similar in form” (Berbrier 432).

It is my contention that the shared characteristic of white supremacist rhetoric through the year 2000 is the way it situates itself in opposition not only to the un-American alien other, but also in opposition to “lapsed Americans.” These lapsed Americans are not the alien other. They are Americans who would be considered fully American if they subscribed to the ideology of the white supremacist. They are the members of mainstream society who just don’t get “it.” They fail to see the dangers presented by the alien other and, thus, are part of the problem.

This triangular tension can be seen in white supremacist rhetoric throughout history. In all of the primary material cited in the beginning of this paper, this three-way tension is evident. In Mather’s support for the extermination of Native Americans, he situates himself as a religious leader of sorts who is preaching to those who fail to believe in the inferiority of the Natives. In Simms defense of slavery, he sets himself up against not only the child-like slaves, but also in against the Americans in the North who have lapsed in their ability to defend what is truly American. In Rockwell’s promotion of a war against the Jews, he implies that Americans have not yet realized the true nature of the Jewish threat. And in Duke’s rebuttal to the pro-immigration contingent he makes it clear that those who are not “with him” are not real Americans.

McGee alludes to this triangulated tension in white supremacist rhetoric in “Rehabilitating Emotion: The Troublesome Case of the Ku Klux Klan.” Referring to infamous Klan leader, Hiram Evans, McGee says that “the Klan association of whiteness with

Americanism made charges of white race betrayal consubstantial with anti-Americanism. The liberal, charged Evans, was both ‘alien and alienminded’” (McGee 34).

### **9/11 and A New Rhetoric of White Supremacy**

As consistent as this feature of white supremacist rhetoric has been throughout history, I have reason to believe that the three-way oppositional relationship shifted after the attacks of September 11, 2001. The triangular tension articulated in white supremacist rhetoric has morphed into simple dual dialectical relationship. The category of lapsed American collapsed under the weight of an old national motto that had been called back into the forefront: “United We Stand.”

Carol Swain and Russ Nieli have written one of a very few books written on white supremacy post 9/11, *Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism in America*. The book is a collection of interviews with contemporary white supremacist leaders. In their introduction, Swain and Nieli briefly address the impact of the events of 9/11 on white supremacist rhetoric. They hint at the notion that there is a difference between pre- and post-9/11 white supremacist rhetoric when they say “the events of September 11 have no doubt lent additional weight to white nationalist calls” (Swain and Nieli xi). They conclude the introduction with the sentiment that white supremacists will, at the very least, use the 9/11 to exploit fears in a way they were unable to immediately before, because we were “drawn together by a common foe. In our common vulnerability, the attacks have, for the present, heightened the sense that ‘we’re all in this together” (Swain and Nieli xi).

Bennett also defends the propensity for different modes of white supremacist rhetoric to exist at different historical moments. He claims that “now and in the future, the party of fear

must focus on different disagreements and discontents...movements may be as deeply rooted and deeply divisive as before, but they will not be the same” (Bennett 408).

This change allows for less self-censoring and an assumption by the white supremacist rhetor that what they are saying is acceptable to everyone. White supremacist rhetoric, I will argue, has become somewhat normalized; in the post-9/11 world, it positions itself not as a third point mediating between lapsed Americans and the alien other, a location somewhere on the political margins, but as a central tendency in American political thought, defining the mainstream of Americanism.

We are at an important new juncture. The rhetoric of white supremacy that has remained unchanged for so many years hit a critical turning point on September 11, 2001. Unfortunately, there has not been much scholarly attention paid to the potential change in white supremacist rhetoric after 9/11. The purpose of my thesis is to identify the shift that has taken place as a shift in placement vis-à-vis the political mainstream, because the potential implications are extremely significant. As we encounter our first black president, national debates on immigration, affirmative action, and the recent renewal of the Civil Rights Act, this normalization (even if confined only to the rhetoric itself) is important to understand.

### **Methodological Approach**

For my analysis of pre 9/11 white supremacist rhetoric, I will focus on the rhetoric of Jared Taylor. He is the editor of *American Renaissance*, a journal that deals with issues of race and immigration from a white supremacist perspective. I will specifically focus on his essay from 1998 “Race and Nation,” which was published in an anthology he edited entitled *The Real American Dilemma: Race, Immigration, and the Future of America*.

I chose to focus solely on the rhetoric of Taylor, because he is a figure who represented the extreme of the pre 9/11 radical white supremacy. While being the editor of a wildly popular and blatantly white supremacist journal, he was considered amongst followers to be an “expert” on race relations. Swain and Nieli say that “Taylor, more than any other figure over the past decade and a half, has succeeded through his magazine and his periodic national conferences in creating an intellectual forum in which white rights advocacy, white nationalism, and white ethnic assertiveness could be shifted away from the redneck margins of society to a position of...not mainstream respectability...at least general intellectual seriousness” (Swain and Nieli 87). Not only is Taylor exemplary of white supremacist rhetoric in the eyes of scholars like Swain and Nieli, his rhetoric represents the American v. lapsed American v. alien other tension that runs throughout all of the pre 9/11 rhetoric. He is viewed as a “high brow racist” and considers himself intellectually superior to people who do not agree with his position.

For my investigation of post 9/11 white supremacist rhetoric, I will focus on the rhetoric of a figure whose has demonstrated the ability to straddle the fence between extremism and the mainstream – Patrick Buchanan. Buchanan’s 2006 book *State of Emergency: the Third World Invasion and Conquest of America* was a New York Times Bestseller and landed him guest appearances on networks such as CNN. The book was a huge success despite being riddled with rhetoric that is unashamedly white supremacist. I have chosen to use it as my sample of post 9/11 white supremacist rhetoric because of its popularity, its ability to penetrate the mainstream, and because it highlights Buchanan’s lack of self censoring. The same brashness that made him a political extremist in the 1980s and 1990s situates him almost as a political centrist post 9/11. His rhetoric has only gotten harsher, yet his book was embraced by the public as possessing some level of normalcy. Its success was touted, yet there was very little mainstream

interrogation of the blatant white supremacy it espoused, certainly no recoil identifying the book as a product of the political fringe.

Buchanan's rhetoric from the 2000 presidential campaign clearly appealed to the idea that there are segments of Americans who just do not understand the threat of multiculturalism. Yet, his new book is more of an appeal to all of us. It is a call to follow his lead. It reads as if he knows that some, if not all, of his views were legitimized by the foreign attack on our soil. It is exemplary of the general shift in white supremacist rhetoric post 9/11.

Both Taylor and Buchanan represent the radical fringe of society in the sense that they both argue in favor of the superiority of and necessity to "save" the white race. They both also consider themselves to be intellectuals or "experts" on race relations.

There are also similarities in their rhetoric. They both tend to point towards historical examples of the fall of civilizations and statistical evidence of the propensity for certain minority groups to commit violent crimes. These similarities make their rhetoric highly suitable for comparison and will provide the most accurate accounting of a shift in rhetorical modes.

The shift I am exploring here is a shift in dialectical relationships. Kenneth Burke reminds us that all meanings are dialectical, that "God" means nothing without "the devil," that the act of definition "necessitates negation – saying what the object is not in order to say what it is" (Gusfield "Legacy" 43). From a Burkean perspective, the idea of an "American" cannot be encompassed by a list of positive characteristics; it only fully exists in relation to what is not American or what is "un-American." I will use Burke's dialectical approach in my analysis of the shift in white supremacist rhetoric from its pre-9/11 to its post-9/11 manifestation. In his introduction to Burke's *On Symbols and Society*, Joseph Gusfield contends that Burke's approach to analysis is superior to the usual social scientific analysis because it "directs us

towards the complexities that are lost when great concern for clarity in method leads us to overlook the essential ambiguities in human action and interpretation” (Gusfield 25).

Pre 9/11, white supremacist rhetoric involved two dialectical poles. If my thesis is correct, Taylor’s rhetoric will at times imply the American versus the alien other, and at other times it will imply the American versus the lapsed American. However, in my post 9/11 analysis, it should all line up as American versus the alien other.

**DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN PRE-9/11 WHITE SUPREMACIST DISCOURSE:  
THE CASE OF JARED TAYLOR**

The mid and late 1990s saw a resurgence of white supremacist sentiment among ultraconservatives in the United States in reaction to the appearance of a national “antiracist” sentiment that was spearheaded by President Bill Clinton. In 1997, President Clinton announced the formation of a seven-member advisory board to head his One America initiative on race. The stated purpose was to “facilitate honest, candid discussion and includes a year of events, such as monthly town hall meetings and a White House conference on hate crimes” (News hour). “That remarkable lead from the White House was followed at every level of government, through a plethora of multicultural or antiracist initiatives” (Hadjor 1). Claire Jean Kim argues that Clinton’s initiative (and its offspring) bares historical significance because it “dramatically reformulated the American race problem at the dawn of the new century” (Kim 175). However, Clinton’s plans sparked serious backlash amongst ultraconservatives, namely white supremacists, who were not so willing to be a part of this reformulation. Many conservatives saw the initiative as a ploy to push a pro-affirmative action agenda. At the inception of the initiative, the *Providence Journal-Bulletin* noted the intense nature of the “backlash by angry white men against affirmative action and immigration” (131). Clinton himself noted the intensity of the backlash and was compelled to condemn what he called “an outbreak of white-nationalist violence” in the wake of the initiative (*Washington Times* A4). He claimed the up swell in violence bolstered “the need for his...One America initiative” (*Washington Times* A4).

Chip Berlet and Matthew Lyons have attributed the white supremacist backlash against Clinton’s “unprecedented conversation about race” in part to the publishing of Charles Murray and Richard J. Herrnstein’s book *The Bell Curve*, which reinvigorated arguments for biological

determinism (Berlet and Lyons 281). Ruce Hare condemned the book as “ideological warfare.”

He wrote that:

Murray is better viewed as an elitist and a white nationalist than as a scientist. He may be viewed as a modern-day witch doctor, in academic cloak, which rolls his mystical statistical bones and announces his group smarter than others. He invites the rich and those who define themselves as "white" to a superiority complex. Such people are invited to falsely and stereotypically blame their pain on the poor and "minorities" and on such policies as affirmative action. His is a cheap invitation to scapegoating (Hare 95)

This ability to see the biological basis of racial disparity is something that Berlet and Lyons argue is particularly characteristic of 1990s white supremacist rhetoric. They contend that “the 1990s saw a renewal of the biological determinist claim that genetic racial differences accounted for class inequalities” in white supremacist rhetoric (Berlet and Lyons 281) despite the fact that most Americans were embracing race as a social construct.

Stephanie Houston Grey contends that the racially motivated politics under the guise of scientific methodology espoused by Murray and Herrnstein in *The Bell Curve* rears its ugly head generation after generation. Grey argues that this is because, despite public condemnation of the *The Bell Curve*'s racism, “the underlying methodology that consolidates their agenda still remains in place” (Grey 305). *The Bell Curve* resonated in the 1990's with political conservatives who were fed up with the Clinton-backed initiative. The frustration of conservatives manifested itself in a very unique combination of subcultures that brought together white supremacist movements “to a much greater extent than the...1970s and 1980s” (Berlet and Lyons 282). These subcultures included anti-immigration movements, a revival of the southern

heritage movement, renewed claims of white genetic racial superiority, and the joining of Klan and neo-Nazi far rightists (Berlet and Lyons 282). The violence that ensued as a reaction to the acquittal of the police officers who beat black motorist Rodney King added fuel to the fire of this 1990s white supremacist resurgence (Dinnerstein, Nichols, and Reimers).

This backlash occurred at a uniquely dangerous time. In the late 1990s, the Internet was taking off as a means of communication. White supremacist groups took full advantage of the medium to spread their perspective. This scary development was chronicled in numerous new publications, such as the *Oregonian*:

The Ku Klux Klan used to terrorize people in the dead of night with ropes, torches and burning crosses. Now it sneaks in quietly through home computers to deliver its pictures of horror and high-tech messages of hate. In no time at all, it seems, the global web of computer networks known as the Internet has become the new frontier for neo-Nazis, the Klan and other white nationalist groups. Amid a generation of angry white men and a growing climate of intolerance in the United States and abroad, the Internet, with its 24 million users, has become fertile ground for recruitment. Almost unnoticed by old-line civil rights organizations, these so-called Net Nazis and other white nationalist groups have set up an impressive cyberspace network in the past two years (*Oregonian* E01)

This was the uncharted and delicate political climate that set the stage for Jared Taylor's rise as a spokesperson for the white supremacist movement.

Carol Swain and Russ Nieli, the only authors to attempt an academic biography of Jared Taylor as a foreword to their provocative interview, have claimed that Jared Taylor is "in many ways a most unlikely figure to have carried out" the project of spearheading the reemergence of

white supremacist sentiment in the late 1990s. He was raised in an upper class background, traveled extensively, and was considered an intellectual. Despite what would appear to be a very cosmopolitan experience, Taylor grew up to embrace a white supremacist philosophy that eventually separated him from mainstream America (Swain and Nieli 87). Taylor's background and "portrayal of his racist views as intellectual inquiry enables him to maintain a position as a respectable academic source for racists, many of whom frequently cite his work. He and his admirers often cite his educational background, including a Yale undergraduate degree and mastery of Japanese and French, in order to grant his and their ideas a veneer of credibility" (ADL).

Taylor became one of the central figures in the white supremacy during the latter half of the 1990s, because he was eloquent in a way that few before him had been. He founded *American Renaissance* magazine and become its chief editor. *American Renaissance* quickly became the go-to guide for aspiring white supremacists, and Taylor emerged as a cult-like leader. Taylor parlayed this success into a publishing company, New Century, which published other white supremacists while always featuring Taylor's latest work (Swain and Nieli 87-88).

Taylor's role in the white supremacist movement was solidified during the late 1990s Clinton-backlash. He was a central figure in trying to discredit the One America Initiative. *The New York Times* reported that when Clinton's advisory board met on December 18, 1997 to discuss school vouchers "the discussion also brought out a white separatist, Jared Taylor, editor of *American Renaissance*, based in Louisville, who argues that blacks and other minorities are, because of genetics, less intelligent than whites and that non-whites are bent on destroying America culturally and politically" (NYT). Taylor and his backers held several news conferences to espouse their defiance (SLPD A15). Taylor dedicated an article, which he called

“The Myth of Diversity” to rail against the Clinton-backed plans to create racial harmony. In it, he wrote:

The President of the United States glories in diversity... Of course, the idea that diversity--at least of the kind that Mr. and Mrs. Clinton are promoting--is a great advantage for America is one of the most obviously stupid propositions ever to see the light of day... Of course it is only white societies--and white groups within multi-racial societies--that are ever fooled by guff about diversity.

Everyone else recognizes the Clinton-Harvard-New York Times brand of diversity for exactly what it is: weakness, dissension, and self-destruction (Taylor 1)

This style of rhetoric, in which Taylor describes multiculturalism as a “guff” perpetrated by elites at the expense of everyday Americans is the defining characteristic of Taylor’s rhetoric in the 1990s. Taylor’s rhetoric divided Americans into three distinct categories: 1) ordinary hard-working Americans who have been duped to celebrate specious ideals against their own best interests; 2) intellectual elites who are the perpetrators of the ideology that duped the ordinary working-class Americans; and 3) Taylor and his small band of intrepid followers who see the truth, who are true Americans and true “men” and who are trying to alert the rest of the country to the scheme that’s being used to victimize them.

In this chapter I will first detail the three *dramatis personae* in Taylor’s narrative: the lapsed American, a category in which he placed the vast majority of Americans; the elites, who are responsible for duping the lapsed American and who claim the political and cultural center in the US; and true Americans, a small minority of visionaries’ vis-à-vis the majority of which Taylor sees himself as a leader. After detailing the *dramatis personae*, I will turn attention to the

dynamics of Taylor's narrative, a tri-partite structure that finds the true American in opposition to both the elites and the political center occupied by the lapsed American. The goal of this analysis will be to detail the position of Taylor's late 1990s rhetoric as outside of the mainstream, considered racist, and relegated to the political fringe.

### **Jared Taylor's American Dilemma**

Jared Taylor published *The Real American Dilemma* in 1998 as a response to the era of Clintonian multiculturalism and framed it, half a century later, as a retort to Gunnar Myrdal's 1944 book *An American Dilemma*. Taylor targeted Myrdal so many years later because he believed that Myrdal had "laid the groundwork for integration, affirmative action, and multi-racialism" (Taylor "Seeds" 1) he was witnessing in the 1990s. He said that "Some of today's most destructive ideas were first popularized by a socialist from Sweden" (Taylor "Seeds" 1). He was fed up with liberals of the 1990s imposing guilt upon whites for trying to preserve their racial heritage and believed that "those who would promote white consciousness today" were facing "the same obstacles" erected by Myrdal's book (Taylor "Seeds" 1). Taylor was obsessed with refuting Myrdal in the late 1990s. In the April 1996 issue of *American Renaissance* Taylor wrote two articles on Myrdal, one indicted Myrdal's arguments and the other denounced his character. Myrdal's book focused on how social conditions shaped our thinking about race and disadvantaged minority groups who are equal to whites in all other ways. Taylor believes that "no book, before or since, has ever had such an impact on how Americans think about race" (Taylor 1). *The Real American Dilemma* is Taylor's most successful and widely read book, because of the political climate at the time it was published. It compiles the work of eight of the most outspoken white supremacists of the late 1990s, including Taylor himself.

*The Real American Dilemma* represents the compilation of the major themes in white supremacy at the time. In "Race and Nation," Taylor pulls together the main arguments from the

other seven essays and sets forth his overarching case for white racial superiority. It is, in Taylor's view, a "look back on 50 years during which every major national institution supported policies based on Myrdal's analysis" and the type of integration-based multiculturalism being espoused by President Clinton, and "high time to ask what we have achieved" (Taylor 9).

Taylor begins "Race and Nation" with an invitation to join in a discussion "about what the shifting racial makeup means for the future of our country" (Taylor 43). The use of the term "our country" would lead the reader to believe that this is an essay addressed to all of us who are American, but after reading just a couple of paragraphs, it becomes clear that Taylor is addressing only one audience. He is addressing those Americans who already agree with him and who understand that shifting racial dynamics are detrimental to "our country" as when, for example, he writes "let us...consider something else that is profoundly important – something that everyone knows.... this is an empirical, utterly dependable fact and everyone – I mean everyone – knows it" (Taylor 43). Taylor assumes that his readers "on his side" by lumping his audience into the terms "we" and "everyone." More important, however, is Taylor's insinuation that we share a common knowledge. There is an epistemological kinship being expressed. Taylor is warning his Americans about lapsed Americans who have failed to recognize the impending danger that immigration and integration bring. These lapsed Americans are evident, for example, when Taylor writes "as usual, the Census Bureau's projections didn't stir much interest," indicting an apathetic public, or when he asserts that in some cities "the transformation has already taken place – places like Miami or Detroit or Monterey Park, California," (Taylor 43) that is, that significant populations of Americans have already allowed the body snatchers to invade.

### **Taylor's Portrait of the Lapsed American**

Taylor's lapsed American is not guilty of intentionally forsaking his/her country or race.

Taylor claims that the reason the white majority is so easily duped "has to do with the perversion of something that is good and characteristic of whites, and that is their sense of reciprocity, of morality" (Taylor 51). As this passage demonstrates, for Taylor, the lapsed American has dropped the ball as a result of his/her basically good moral character. White Americans are, by nature, moral and reciprocal, and it is the perversion of those characteristics that pushes them to lapse in their duty to protect their own race. That means that, in Taylor's view, the lapsed American is not hopeless. Taylor allows for the possibility of redemption of the lapsed American. In the introduction to part one of *The Prophetic Tradition*, Darsey contends that prophetic rhetoric contains this type of "desire to bring the practice of the people into accord with a sacred principle" (Darsey 16). This is in contrast to the apocalyptic vision that Darsey later attributes to Eugene Debs who "did not attempt to resolve the crisis of his time through restoration of the covenant" (Darsey 129); where the elect are saved and the non-elect are left to be punished. Taylor expands upon the inherent morality of the lapsed American by arguing "...the reason that whites are paralyzed in the face of national, cultural, and racial dispossession is because they are convinced that it would be immoral to resist...It is the same impulse that makes whites want to save the snail darter and the spotted owl, or to protect the ozone layer, or believe so fervently in democracy – it is this impulse that prevents whites from acting in their own legitimate group interests" (Taylor 52-53). This is what makes the situation tragic in the classical sense of tragedy, the noble hero, in this case the American people, has a tragic flaw, in this case our superior sense of morality. In the tragedy, those with an inferior moral sense are able to capitalize on our superior moral sense and to hold us hostage to it.

Taylor's characterization of lapsed Americans as those who have allowed their inherent morality to be distorted is reminiscent of Robert Welch's defense of conservative Americans against liberalism. Welch argued that conservatives were taken advantage of because of their innate, American individualism (Thornton 1). Similarly, Taylor contends that "when one thinks of the unique characteristics of Western civilization that set it off from other civilizations, many boil it down to a rooted conviction that can be expressed in very simple terms: That the other fellow has a point of view" (Taylor 51). Taylor's use of the term "rooted" indicates that this respect for the other person's point of view is a central and deep characteristic of whites. It is the very essence of what they are, that from which the rest of their being grows and is shaped. Not only is respect for the other rooted in white Americans, it is a conviction, denoting a willingness to sacrifice in defense of this principle. So, white Americans are instinctively inclined to sacrifice on behalf of another. This makes them highly moral, yet vulnerable. Taylor's equation of morality with protecting whiteness ran contrary to the prevailing national tendency to embrace the Clintonian ideal of multiculturalism as morally correct.

As Taylor builds his portrait of the lapsed American, a distinctly feminine image begins to emerge. Women, in American thought, have long been held to have a superior moral sense to men, but they have often become the victims of the superior raw power of men. In his depiction, Taylor invokes a metaphor of physical violence to represent the treatment of the lapsed American at the hands of the elites: "The ultimate insult is to expect whites to celebrate diversity...And the astonishing thing is that so many whites have been browbeaten into at least pretending to be happy about this" (Taylor 48). The lapsed American, in this passage is again cast as a victim, but this time Taylor's accusation is complicated. White Americans are being browbeaten. It is a failure of the duty of citizens to remain diligent. Taylor, as a diligent citizen,

is in the minority and is trying to expose the truth to us. Not only is the lapsed American the victim of the intellectual equivalent of physical abuse, he or she may also have been drugged. Taylor sets the lapsed American in contrast to other homogenous groups when he claims that white people are the only ones duped by diversity arguments. He writes:

people are so dazed by the incomprehensible diversity argument that they don't seem to notice that only whites apparently suffer from the awful paralysis of homogeneity and have to be gingered up with a dose of diversity....if racial diversity is such a good thing for the United States, why not for Mexico? Why not for Howard University? (Taylor 48).

Here Taylor uses a word that creates the impression that Americans are more than passive in the face of diversity proponents. He argues that people are so "dazed" by arguments for diversity that they fail to notice the injustice it inflicts on whites. The use of the term "dazed," which is usually used in reference to how a person acts when they are disoriented from a minor head injury or from taking drugs, gives the feeling that these people are under the spell of some greater force. They have been lulled into a state of confusion without knowledge of how dangerous it is to their self-interest.

Taylor depicts lapsed Americans as being in such an altered state that they become easy targets, passive; even acting as their own censors:

Of course, Communism became a secular religion, just like the doctrine of the unimportance of race has become a secular religion. Both have their dogmas, their hysterical reactions to dissidents, and astonishing ability to ignore the obvious, their suppression of all disagreement, their excommunication of heretics. The most remarkable thing, though, is that whereas it took a government apparatus of

repression to force communism on people, in America, every man is his own commissar and censors his own thoughts (Taylor 50).

The lapsed American has not been forced to do anything against his or her will, but instead has, in their daze, accepted the force of diversity and enforced it upon him/herself; he “censors his own thoughts.” This is the key to Taylor’s characterization of the lapsed American because it goes against American values, especially the idea that we all pull ourselves up by our bootstraps. In the first sentence, Taylor claims that the hypocrisies of the elites are “completely transparent.” Using the word “transparent” makes the hypocritical conspiracy an obvious and sloppy ploy instead of a well-masked, well orchestrated maneuver. Thus, the vision of the lapsed American to see the obvious has been clouded. It is also another allusion to a false religion. Taylor refers to the unimportance of race as a “doctrine,” which means it is something capable of garnering a following in the name of something greater. Taylor’s argument is that the “something greater” is a myth. Whereas most religions have an ultimate payoff: an afterlife, when the lapsed American follows this doctrine they are buying into something with no pay off for them.

More than lacking in an ultimate pay off, Taylor believes that the acceptance of multiracial ideologies by the lapsed American is against their own best interests. Taylor writes that “By increasing the number of non-white residents, the United States has chosen, in effect, to make more and more parts of itself unappealing to whites” (Taylor 44). This tainting of the homeland, making it undesirable, is something that Taylor blames on this hazy passivity of the lapsed American. In this instance the “United States” represents the lapsed American who has ruined the country for the whites, the good Americans. Taylor is making the distinction between the lapsed American and the good American very clear. He could have said that we are making parts of “ourselves” undesirable. He could have framed it as something we are doing to

ourselves. However, he says that the United States is making “itself” undesirable to good Americans. “Itself” depersonalizes it, to take the blame off of any variety of American and place it on some impersonal force. This framing removes guilt from the lapsed American and makes it so that the lapsed American is not responsible for forcing out the whites / good Americans. So, because of the stupor of the lapsed Americans, Taylor’s America is being invaded by alien others; a distinctly racial alien other.

### **Blacks and Hispanics: Alien Others**

Taylor makes it very clear that his alien other is defined by race. He argues that integration via assimilation will never work because “...race largely governs assimilation” (Taylor 44) and that immigration via our southern border “will transform America because race makes a difference. Race matters” (Taylor 43). The notion that “race matters” is a repetitive theme for Taylor. After every major argument against integration, he reiterates his point with lines like: “Once again, the particulars of what happens don’t matter. It is unwelcome, irreversible racial change that matters” (Taylor 45) and “they segregate themselves in social clubs, ethnic dormitories, and all kinds of student activity groups that are defined by race. Race matters...” (Taylor 46).

Although Taylor often uses the general term “non-white” to describe the alien other, he gets specific at several points in the essay. Taylor’s alien others are comprised of two main groups: blacks and Hispanics. His main argument against both blacks and Hispanics is that they make living conditions unacceptable for white people, thus spurring the phenomenon of white flight. He argues that “not even the most ardent integrationists are willing to take the obvious, simplest first step to make integration happen, which is to buy a house in a black neighborhood. Or move into a Mexican neighborhood” (Taylor 44) and that “it will be physically possible for

them to live with the Mexicans of Brownsville, Texas or the blacks of Camden, New Jersey, but whites will go to great lengths to avoid it” (Taylor 44).

Taylor even goes so far as to compare blacks and Hispanics to other groups of people who are less threatening to the sensibilities and life style of good white Americans. He asks and answers his own question: “What happens when Asians arrive in large numbers? Their effect is different from that of blacks or Hispanics. Some North Asians commit fewer crimes than white, make more money, and do better in school” (Taylor 45). On the other hand, Taylor believes that the presence of blacks and Hispanics is deleterious to any community: “No neighborhood or school has improved by going from white to black or Hispanic...” (Taylor 50). This destruction of white communities at the hand of blacks and Hispanics is not something Taylor believes is perpetrated solely by the alien others. Taylor believes in a larger conspiracy to force multiracialism on white Americans communities.

### **The Conspirators: Perpetrators of the Multiracial Myth**

Lapsed Americans are not the only group excluded from membership in Taylor’s white American group. Guilty in a different way, in Taylor’s eyes, are the people who foist the multiracial myth onto the lapsed Americans. Taylor does not immediately give up the culprits. He begins the essay by being very vague about where this conspiracy originated. He claims that “One often hears that today’s non-white immigrants will assimilate just as the European ethnics did at the turn of the century. This view is wrong, because it avoids the fundamental question of race” (Taylor 44). Taylor is inferring that most people just “hear” these things. This makes it sound as if the idea that non-whites can assimilate is not grounded in any fact, thus it must be misrepresented. However, he does not assign guilt to any particular party: “One often hears.” He casts it as an incorrect belief that is just floating about. He calls it a “fundamental” question. The word “fundamental” means that it is part of the original foundation, in this instance, of our

country. In Taylor's view race is unquestionable. It is not something that can be overcome by multiculturalism or an arbitrary social construct, it is part of the foundation of our country; it is fundamental and, of course, it matters.

When Taylor does reveal the culprits, the source of the myth of diversity, it is the upper class, elite opinion leaders. Taylor writes of this group:

...these self-righteous, college-educated, properly socialized folks have come up with a whole set of mental exercises for ordinary Americans who don't have the money to live in the suburbs or send their children to private school. The first exercise is to believe that aliens and strangers are bearers of a special gift called diversity. We are not being displaced; we are being enriched and strengthened (Taylor 47).

This is the first time Taylor points out the agent in this nefarious scheme. He claims that the intellectual elites are the perpetrators of the ideology that has duped ordinary working-class Americans. The elites are like drill sergeants. They have developed exercises and are able to punish those who do not perform adequately. They have a disciplinary power that makes them culpable in a different way than the lapsed American. "Our country has established a gigantic, convoluted system of laws, diversity commissions, racial watchdog groups, EEOC officers, and outreach committees as part of a huge, clanking mechanism to regulate and try to control racial diversity" (Taylor 47). These are the people who are the real conspirators.

Whereas Taylor's lapsed Americans are revealed to be working against their own best interests as they embrace multiculturalism as a principle, elites are depicted as hypocrites, Machiavellian manipulators who prescribe a doctrine for others that they do not adhere to themselves:

The theory is that only ignorant bigots do this (resist multiracialism), but fact is that people with money never have to face the problem. As someone once put it, the purpose of a college education is to give people the right attitudes about minorities and the means to live as far away from them as possible (Taylor 46).

Elite Americans may believe in diversity in the abstract, but they do not want to be the ones to confront it up close and personal. They want to say what sounds the most moral, to chant the right mantra, and then leave poorer Americans, the majority of white Americans, to deal with the consequences. Taylor demonizes the liberal slant of colleges and the people who come away from their education claiming to be enlightened about race, as if there is a conspiracy that originates in college. It is only Taylor and his followers who have not fallen prey to the elites' multiracial scheme.

**Real Americans: Seeing the Truth that Others Do Not See**

In Taylor's rhetoric, the ones who can so easily see through all the hypocrisy are him and his followers. In "Race and Nation," Taylor moves from blaming the elites to emphasizing his own prophetic position. Endowed with a vision of the sacred, the true, Taylor and the real Americans are at odds with the general public of lapsed Americans, too unaware or brainwashed to resist the invasion and myths perpetuated by the elites. At one point, Taylor claims that

American companies are full of blather about how their workforces that 'look like America' are going to whip the world – and they are constantly being whipped in their own markets by companies with workforces that look like Yokohama.

Diversity a strength? It would be hard to think of anything more obviously untrue  
(Taylor 48)

The use of the word "obvious" highlights Taylor's ability to see the simple truths beyond the smokescreen of ideology created by the elites, a testament to his vision.

Taylor, as the real American, is aware of the true nature of humanity, someone who can apprehend the world of true facts – a world in which race matters prominently. He claims:

The theory – almost always unstated – was that if we work at it hard enough race can be made not to matter. This was something that many people thought noble and idealistic, but it was a misreading of human nature. Race matters. It is a brute, biological fact and wishing will not make it go away (Taylor 50).

*The Bell Curve* preceded Taylor's rise to prominence during a time when scholars had convinced most people that race "does not arise out of biological difference, but is socially constructed" (Hadjor 20). Against social constructionism, Taylor poses biological determinism, an ontology fundamental to Taylor's opposition to the mainstream. Taylor's true American lives in a world of verifiable empirical facts, including the "brute, biological fact" of race at a time when many are seeing race as a construct.

Taylor casts himself, the "real American," as someone who recognizes true or natural law behind the curtain of man-made law and convention. He says that, "Communism, just like multi-racialism, was founded on a catastrophic misreading of human nature. It staggered on for 75 years, just as our doomed experiment has staggered on nearly 50 years..." (Taylor 50). Kathleen Jamieson contends that this argument from natural law is one that "haunted man since the inception of civilization." "Since natural law is argued to be unchangeable, the person who evokes such law, according to Robert Frank, 'appeals to self-evident principles that can be known by all humans.' For instance, Thomas Jefferson justified breaking colonial ties to England in The Declaration of Independence by appealing to the 'Laws of Nature...Implicit in Jefferson's argument is the assumption that there exists a necessary connection between law and morality.

Law, which derives from divine order or natural rights, is moral by virtue of its a priori status as part of the inherent order of things (Swartz 69). Clearly, Taylor sees his position as one dictated by “nature.”

Taylor is firm in his belief that his argument is one grounded in an inherent morality and natural fact. He writes, “At some point, nature will reassert itself, and whites will decide not to let themselves be pushed aside” (Taylor 54). This rhetoric is reminiscent of Hitler’s framing of the superiority of whites which Burke critiqued:

It is in accordance with the laws of nature that the ‘Aryan blood’ is superior to all other bloods. Also, the ‘law of the survival of the fittest’ is God’s law, working through natural law. Hence, if Aryan blood has been vested with the awful responsibility of its inborn superiority, the bearers of this ‘culture-creating’ blood must resign themselves to struggle in behalf of its triumph. (Burke 223)

Nature is at the base of Taylor’s ontology. One of the ways he sets himself apart is by insisting on a view of nature that the majority no longer accepts. It is indicative of where he sees himself in the larger drama he creates.

### **Taylor’s Drama**

The three players in Taylor’s drama-- the lapsed American, the elite perpetrator, and the real American—play out their roles in a triangle that complicates Taylor’s capacity to create a clear tension between antagonist and protagonist. Taylor resolves this dramatic problem by speaking from and positioning himself as an outsider.

The locution “the lapsed American” is intended to call to mind those who have fallen away from a religious orthodoxy. For Taylor “American” is not merely a political or ethnic designation; it is a religion. An American is someone who believes in and practices Americanism in the same way that a Roman Catholic is one who practices Catholicism, or a Methodist is

someone abides by the tenets of Methodism. Taylor's lapsed American is someone who has lost sight of the true principles of the faith and has been led astray by faddish nonsense as Taylor makes clear in this reflection on multi-racialism:

...the current fad of multi-racialism is only a few decades old. Not one great American ever advocated it. Presumably, we are supposed to believe that Jefferson and Lincoln and John Marshall were great men, but when it came to race they somehow got it wrong. Well, who got it right? Ted Kennedy? Bill Clinton? (Taylor 54)

Taylor invokes the forefathers as "saints" of the American civil religion. He refers to the forefathers as "great Americans." That places them a step above the average American. Great is what we look up to. They are also great in the sense that they can do no wrong. Taylor links their greatness to their ability to avoid blunders in judgment. It is a level of judgment he does not ascribe to modern leaders. There is a sense of invincibility and infallibility that is associated with the forefathers in this sentence. He hopes to call us to the defense of that civil religion by invoking the sacred status of the Founders. This is what makes "lapsed Americans" lapsed in the religious sense, a falling away from the bonds of the sacred, in this case the sacred traditions of nation and race. Traditions which Taylor is still a part of.

Taylor's argument for regaining the purity of the "good ol' days" calls for Americans to be willing to sacrifice their lives in the name of the sacred tradition:

Those parts of the country are lost to Euro-American culture and even nationality. America has therefore given up the very thing nations go to war to preserve, the very thing that they send their young men into battle to die for. The integrity of a people, race, or nation is so important that sometimes millions of men are

sacrificed in their name. Why? Because the preservation of the nation of one's forefathers is more important than life itself (Taylor 53).

Taylor is using "integrity" as a synonym for racial purity. Integrity is derived from "integer," which means indivisible. Taylor is invoking Kenneth Burke's cycle of order, pollution, guilt, purification, and redemption. "Burke realizes that all people 'order' their lives, but when they find themselves in a situation that contradicts this order, they feel the situation is 'polluted.' Then, their natural response is to assign 'guilt' for the pollution, so that they can choose an act that 'purifies' the situation. This results in a sense of 'redemption,' which allows them to return to a state of order" (Huglen and Brock 20). In Taylor's case, non-white immigrants are the pollutants to the American sacred tradition, to patriotism. Taylor also uses the term "preservation." He laments what has been lost. The sacrifice he refers to for one's nation is the act of redemption. The order, what has been lost, will return when the lapsed American is able to sacrifice for the good of the nation instead of continuing to be duped. In lamenting what has been lost, Taylor is creating an America that exists in some bygone golden age. His orientation to time is not in the now.

Taylor hints that this sacred tradition is tied to racial lineage by naming it his own. Taylor contends:

...the Americans of the past would look with horror upon what we are doing. I am quite certain that my ancestors did not fight for independence from Britain in order for our generations to turn the country over to Mexicans and Haitians. The Founders did not frame the Constitution to celebrate diversity. Americans did not spill their blood at Gettysburg or in Europe or the Pacific for multiculturalism. And yet, we are giving up our country without a struggle (Taylor 55).

Taylor's reference here to "Americans of the past" is more evidence of his orientation in time. He is situating the ultimate goalpost in the past. Also here, Taylor appeals to a sacred, holy national tradition, a tradition for which blood, white blood, has been shed. He is invoking the same notion of sacrifice that he used previously. Something that is greater than us that we shed blood to preserve. Taylor tosses off the line "I am quite certain that my ancestors ..." with an air of authority; he is a member of that group of Americans whose forbearers spilled blood on historic battlegrounds. It is this group who must now fight against the conspiracy of the elites.

What motive the elites have for perpetuating this conspiracy, aside from their passivity towards it due to their distance from the actual effects of it, is something Taylor never addresses. This is a weakness in Taylor's argument, but he pulls it off because he successfully creates the us/them dichotomy. Burke noticed the effectiveness of this rhetorical strategy in *The Rhetoric of Hitler's Battle*, he wrote that "once Hitler has essentialized his enemy, all 'proof' henceforth is automatic" (Burke 213). Once that enemy is created, the question of "why," the desire for proof becomes irrelevant. Once Taylor successfully creates the "us," the "them" is inherently the enemy. It is only the initial uniting of the "us" and the definition of the "them" that matters to the argument. Burke describes this process by saying that "if a movement must have its Rome, it must also have its devil...Men who can unite on nothing else can unite on the basis of a foe shared by all" (Burke 212).

Taylor continuously avoids this question of motive. He contends that "this orthodoxy about racial integration has therefore developed a completely transparent set of hypocrisies" by "these self-righteous, college-educated, properly socialized folks" (Taylor 46-47). Unlike lapsed Americans, who seem to have been duped into believing the diversity myth, Taylor casts the orthodoxy in power not only as guilty parties, but as hypocrites. The fact that Taylor labels their

dogma hypocrisies reveals the morality of the elites to be inconsistent. It harkens back to them always saying the “morally correct” things, but not putting them into practice in their own lives. It sets him in opposition to the lapsed American because the lapsed American has fallen prey to the elite doctrine of diversity. In Taylor’s estimation, there is not even a coherent statement coming from these elites. Taylor easily dismisses claims as “transparent” as if to acknowledge any level of validity would be beneath him. The Anti-Defamation League agrees with this assessment of Taylor’s rhetoric. They wrote:

Being careful to couch his language in purported scientific research and academic jargon, [Taylor] often roots his findings in what he describes as predetermined factors, including a lower IQ and higher blood testosterone in blacks. During one of his at least ten appearances on *The Political Cesspool*, a now-defunct Tennessee-based radio show that often gave a platform to anti-Semites and white supremacists, Taylor said, “Nature has dealt blacks an unfortunate hand when it comes to crime.” Blacks, he argued in his 1999 pamphlet “*The Color of Crime*,” are more prone to criminal activity than whites, a position from which he justifies the use of racial profiling in community policing. Taylor also views whites as the lone racial group in America unable to proclaim racial solidarity and calls Latinos more dedicated to “race and homeland” than the United States of America. (ADL)

The Anti-Defamation League highlights Taylor’s dependence on empirical “facts,” supported by an implicit positivism that privileges that that can be measured—IQ, blood testosterone, correlations between race and crime—however problematic the measures might be. Taylor does not blame black people for their situation—nature is responsible—but his exoneration comes at the price of hopelessness or futility with respect to any possible reform. This is another

indication that Taylor is living in the past somewhere, living with an outmoded view of science and of epistemology generally.

The Anti-Defamation League featured Jared Taylor in its portraits of extremists in America. They wrote of Taylor:

The New Century Foundation, a self-styled think tank known primarily for American Renaissance, a white nationalist journal and companion Website. The journal, which Taylor edits, promotes pseudoscientific studies that attempt to demonstrate the intellectual and cultural superiority of whites and publishes articles on the supposed decline of American society because of integrationist social policies (ADL).

Taylor attacks a late-20th century ideal, the ideal of color-blindness. This is similar to the way in which he attacks diversity. This is part of what defines him as marginal. Taylor argues explicitly against ideas (such as diversity and color-blindness) that are main stream for late-20th-century Americans. Taylor's view of race is one that is largely discredited by the time he is writing, thus positioning him on the margins.

Taylor considers his arguments to be based in science and nature, but they are seen by the mainstream as "pseudoscientific." In 1999, the *Washington Times* called Jared Taylor's work "offensive." He positions himself on the political margins, in opposition to the alien other and the perpetrators of the multiracial myth; and superior to the lapsed American. He does so by clinging to an ontology that is dismissed by the general public. Taylor espouses the antiquated notions of biological determinism espoused by Murray and Herrnstein.

As the outsider, Taylor is trying to instigate the majority to recognize and act upon its opposition to the perpetrators of the myth – the elites. He is trying to mobilize the white

majority against the intellectual elites by framing the conspiracy as an insult to the majority. He tells the true Americans they are labeled “ignorant bigots” for simply acknowledging the legitimate problems that integration and immigration have caused. He is making a clear split here between lapsed Americans and the conspirators with malign intent. If the American people are the noble heroes then the intellectual elites forwarding the diversity message, are the villains. He not only positions himself in opposition to the elites as he characterizes them, he positions himself against the prevailing sentiment of the time.

In “A Conspiracy of Science,” Darsey theorizes that motive is often precisely the missing or flawed element in conspiracy theories. Darsey writes:

One who claims that things are not as they appear to be  
 assumes the burden of proof; a strong prima facie case is  
 required before appearances need to be seriously interrogated.  
 Conspiracy argument exploits and reverses this normative  
 presumption, making lack of evidence into evidence  
 transmogrifying surfaces from their pedestrian status as the most  
 visible outward manifestation of reality into veils and masks  
 (Darsey 470)

The missing motive in Taylor’s narrative is evidence of this practice of turning lack of evidence into evidence. Taylor places the burden of proving innocence on the intellectual elites as if their failure to agree with him makes them guilty. It is demonizing of elites that makes Taylor’s triangulated dialectic more complicated than the simple dialectic Buchanan will illustrate. It is also what makes Taylor an outsider. At the time of the publication of “Race and Nation,” most of America was trying to expunge the scourge of racism that has plagued us since the inception of

our nation. Taylor considered that majority lapsed Americans. “Outside of a handful of extremists, Americans of the 1990s would not think or say that blacks were an inferior race” (Hadjor 2). Taylor’s rhetoric was panned outside small, extremist circles and Taylor himself was labeled an extremist.

### **Conclusion**

Taylor’s lapsed American exists somewhere in the space between the guilty elites and the aware real Americans. It is an awkward space, because Taylor is blaming lapsed Americans for falling prey to the myths perpetrated by the elites and of being negligent in their duty as citizens, yet he is not holding them to the same level of culpability that he holds the intellectual elites. The lapsed American, to Taylor, is someone who has bought into a scam, is chanting the mantra of a false religion. The lapsed American is guilty by virtue of their ignorance and inherent morality. That makes the lapsed American blameworthy, tainted by the multiracial orthodoxy of the elite. They are people who had the potential to be real Americans, but were derelict in their duty.

The elites on the other hand, are guilty in a more nefarious way. For Taylor, elites are the masterminds behind this whole plan. They are shoving off the horrendous effects of integration and multiracialism on the lapsed Americans and the real Americans. They selfishly insist on perpetrating a false religion because they do not have to suffer the consequences. In Taylor’s eyes, they are the polar opposite of the real American; while the lapsed Americans exist in awkward in awkward tension against both the real Americans and the elites.

The real American, in Taylor’s rhetoric, is the prophet. The real American sees what is happening and is trying to sound the alarm bells. The real American is working in direct opposition to the elites. The real American wants to debunk the myths of the elites in order to stop more Americans from becoming lapsed. It is a heavy burden, to be working to save a population that is not willing to save itself while also working to fight the direct enemy. That is

Taylor's role, the one who sees all and is burdened with the knowledge of the truth. He is a real American because he chooses not to ignore that truth as he believes so many others have.

That belief that he, and his small group of followers, is the sole possessors of the truth is what places Taylor at the margins. He is a true outsider in the sense that his message does not resonate with mainstream America and because he defines himself, through his rhetoric, in opposition to mainstream America. His rhetoric is viewed as racist, because he is delivering a message of biological determinism at a time when that has been universally denounced in favor of viewing race as a social construct. He clearly defines himself outside of that larger group who think anti-racism initiatives like Bill Clinton's are, at least in theory, a good idea. He is the one who is not duped, not willing to worship at the altar of multiracialism for the sake of appeasing the masses. Instead, he considers himself to be interested in the larger, more long-term goal of preserving the white America he deigns the real America.

The tension in Taylor's drama is triangular with the true Americans relegated to the political and cultural margins. All of this will be in contrast to Buchanan's drama, which is dyadic and one in which white supremacists play a central role, working from the political center.

## **DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN POST-9/11 WHITE SUPREMACIST**

### **DISCOURSE: THE CASE OF PATRICK BUCHANAN**

On September 11, 2001 the United States experienced the most devastating terrorist attacks in its history. The Airline Industry Information service issued the following description of the events within hours:

Four commercial airlines have crashed in a series of massive terrorist attacks against the United States of America. Thousands of people are feared to have been killed and many thousands more injured in the various incidents which have paralyzed the country. The country has been rocked by a series of attacks which began at 0845 EDT when a hi-jacked aircraft crashed into one of the two towers at the World Trade Center in New York. Eighteen minutes later a second aircraft crashed into the World Trade Center's second tower, hurling debris onto those who were being evacuated from the area at the time. At 0943 EDT an aircraft crashed into the Pentagon, the country's central military complex, in Washington, DC causing serious damage...at around 1010 EDT a United Airlines aircraft crashed in Somerset County in Pennsylvania, about 80 miles southeast of the major city of Pittsburgh (AIF 1).

Clearly, this was a unique moment in history. It would change not only the course of U.S. foreign policy, but the hearts and minds of U.S. citizens. On the one hand, it united a country that was, just moments earlier, deeply entrenched in partisan political battles, a country that had, just a year earlier, been divided an astoundingly contentious presidential election. In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, an overwhelming sense of patriotism swept across the nation. As one citizen writing in the *St. Petersburg Times* wrote on September 12, 2001, "United we stand and after the

months of political chaos in the United States, it is now clearly evident that we need to push that aside and focus as one nation on seeking out justice” (“Letter writers respond to terrorist attacks on America” 29A). Across the country, citizens felt a sense of unity in the grief-stricken wake of 9/11. “Even as we grieve, even as we rage, Americans are uniting in a stirring combination of patriotism and humanitarianism, from college students flocking to donate blood to kids offering the take from their lemonade stand sales to firefighters' funds” (Kloer 1M). The *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel* described the phenomenon as a rekindled love affair: “Americans have rediscovered their love affair with Old Glory. The flag has been plastered over everything -- T-shirts and jackets, cars and sport utility vehicles, office buildings and shops. Some neighborhoods look as though it's Flag Day 24 hours a day” (“The True Test of Patriotism is Harder than Just Waving a Flag” 3B).

With this sense of unity came some other overwhelming sentiments: nationalism and fear of outsiders. These feelings played out in bills such as the Patriot Act; violence, especially against those perceived to be of Middle Eastern origin; and a renewed call to close U.S. borders. The violence, although denounced in the mainstream media, was widespread. For example, on September 19, 2001, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* reported the following:

A gas station manager in St. Louis said he was beaten and hit on the head with a tire iron in a melee with a man and woman who cursed his Middle East heritage and told him to leave the country. "It's crazy, I tell you, I love this country," the 31-year-old immigrant from Jordan said Tuesday, back on the job at an Amoco station in south St. Louis. It is one of eight gas and convenience stores his family owns, three in St. Louis and five in California (Bryan 1).

The push to close the borders began moments after the attacks. The Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) led the charge:

The heinous terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, D.C. yesterday that cost the nation many lives demonstrate anew the need to defend our country better by stopping the easy entry into our country by terrorists" said Dan Stein, executive director of FAIR. "The nation's defense against terrorism has been seriously eroded by the efforts of open-borders advocates, and the innocent victims of today's terrorist attacks have paid the price." It will take time to identify the perpetrators of these mindless, bloodthirsty actions. Only then will we learn how they entered the United States. Initial evidence, however, indicates that foreign terrorists perpetrated this horrible crime against our nation. Past experience has shown that foreign terrorists take advantage of our lax border enforcement, gaping holes in our legal immigration laws and our political asylum process (US Newswire1).

The Federation was not alone in its call for tighter borders. Members of congress quickly introduced their own versions of border control bills to assuage the growing public sentiment against immigration:

Already lawmakers are introducing a rash of bills in Congress to tighten immigration procedures and provide for better tracking of those who come here. Possibilities include requiring special data cards that could be swiped by computers. Immigrants would have to produce them in different situations ("Special Report: U.S. considers tightening borders in wake of attacks" A1)

Other proposals are brewing to significantly lower the number of people allowed to immigrate to America:

The proposals come as numerous polls show Americans supporting tighter immigration restrictions, including some targeted specifically at Muslims. In a poll released Wednesday, Wirthlin Worldwide reported that 80 percent of Americans would favor more restrictions on the number of Muslims allowed to come to the United States. Another 58 percent favored tighter controls on Muslims already in the country (“Special Report: U.S. considers tightening borders in wake of attacks” A1)

### **Buchanan’s State of Emergency**

Pat Buchanan’s book, *State of Emergency: the Third World Conquest of America*, was published five years after that fateful day in 2001. The patriotic sentiment spurred by the events of 9/11 still lingered. Buchanan’s book was written and published at a time when the entire nation was looking beyond race to embrace a singular national identity, the idea of a border fence was being seriously pondered, and the public was receptive to supremacist sentiments under the guise of nationalism.

An MSNBC poll released in the summer of 2005 revealed that September 11, 2001 had been a pivot point in U.S. patriotism:

We tracked patriotism, spirituality and religion, and giving to charities and volunteerism right after 9/11,” Silvers said. “All three popped up. Within about nine months, volunteering was down and so was religion, but what has stayed with us is patriotism, and it's obviously fueled by a couple of things. The shift point was 9/11. (MSNBC)

That study found that four years later that sense of patriotism did not fade; leading the researchers to conclude that it may be a long-lasting or even permanent remnant of 9/11. Even more importantly, the 9/11-induced patriotism crossed racial boundaries in a way never seen before. The survey found that “eight in 10 Americans of all ages and income groups, from all regions of the country, say patriotism is in” (MSNBC).

It was also during this time period that anti-immigration sentiment was rising. In 2006, Congress was debating the Secure Border Fence Act of 2006. The act authorized hundreds of miles of “fencing along our Southern border... barriers, checkpoints, and lighting to help prevent people from entering our country illegally” and “...aerial vehicles to reinforce our infrastructure at the border” (Whitehouse.gov). The bill had some issues in Congress, but none of the disagreement was over whether or not we should stop illegal immigration. The discord was only over how to most effectively curb the waves of immigration. The bill was signed by President Bush. It was against this backdrop that Buchanan was able to adopt a white nationalist, yet centrist, position.

The book capitalized on and played to the nationalist sentiment lingering in the midst of America’s desire to right the wrong of 9/11. Buchanan’s book spent several weeks atop the *New York Times* bestseller list. The Southern Poverty Law Center’s Alexander Zaitchik marveled the book’s mainstream success in 2006: “Pat Buchanan's latest book is a white nationalist screed. But that hasn't stopped it from climbing the best-seller charts” (Zaitchik 1). It was something Jared Taylor could never have imagined in pre-9/11 world. Buchanan was able to create and capitalize on a shift in white nationalist rhetoric that happened after the fateful events of 9/11. After 9/11, Buchanan was able to position himself, as a white nationalist under the guise of a

more general nationalism, in the mainstream instead of in the margins of society where Taylor's rhetoric resided.

How did Buchanan accomplish this? Buchanan actively rejected the complicated triadic narrative established in pre-9/11 white nationalist rhetoric. Where Taylor's narrative placed the "[true] American" in opposition to both the lapsed American and the alien other, intellectual elites, with the elites occupying a clear role as antagonist and the lapsed American occupying a more problematic role, almost a damsel in distress whom the protagonist is attempting to rescue from the clutches of the antagonist, Buchanan opts to create a simple dialectic in which all genuine Americans are collapsed into one big American family standing against infection by the alien other. Among the consequences of Buchanan's differences from Taylor are that Buchanan presumes to represent the majority opinion and does not position himself as marginal or as an outsider.

Buchanan used some distinct rhetorical strategies in order to accomplish this repositioning. In his attempt to define the real American, Buchanan first shifted the defining characteristic from racial or ethnic markers to markers based on beliefs. Second, he actively incorporated blacks into his definition of "American," and his third strategy was to engage in some revisionist history to create the feeling that we have always been united. Of course, in Buchanan's rhetoric there is still an alien invader. But, given his redefining of the American, this alien invader is not overtly characterized by race.

### **Buchanan's Alien Other: Not a Race Issue Anymore**

Buchanan's us/them dialectic defines immigrants outside of our own systems. He is very careful to set them up as outside of us legally, culturally, economically, and intellectually. For example, he starts describing immigrants as people who come simply to leech off Americans very early in the book. He says that "Because the vast majority of immigrants, legal and illegal,

now come from rural areas, towns, and cities of the most impoverished nations of the hemisphere, where sanitation is often poor and health care nonexistent, they impose other costs upon the American people” (Buchanan 29). Here is a clear example of the us/them dialectic, based on an attitude. “They” come not to become American, but to leech. Buchanan’s aliens are identified not by the color of their skin or their country or origin, but by their attitude toward America: it is not that the invaders come from foreign lands; it is that they “bring no allegiance to America,” that they “remain loyal to the lands of their birth;” it is not that, by birth, “they are not part of our family,” but that they “do not wish to be.” He leaves open the possibility for anyone to join the ranks of true Americans, but it is the choice of the individual.

Buchanan executes a similar rhetorical strategy later in the book by comparing today’s immigrants to immigrants of a century ago. He says that “Unlike the immigrants of a century ago, who bade farewell to their native lands forever when they boarded the ships, for Mexicans their mother country is only hours away. Millions have no desire to become Americans or to learn English. Why should they? Mexico is their home” (Buchanan 135). This defines today’s immigrants as those who actively chose to not be a part of our family. They will always be tied to their home, which makes them dangerous to ours. Obviously there’s some revisionist history here. “The hyphenated American” was a huge problem early in the 20th C, and many of the complaints leveled at immigrants today are the same complaints made 100 years ago. It is with this skewed sense of history and insistence upon a non-racialized alien other that Buchanan is able to define his true American as the American Patriot.

### **Buchanan’s True American: The Patriot**

Buchanan, like Taylor, argues that patriotism is one of the key defining elements of a real American. Buchanan writes that “Patriotism is the soul of a nation. It is what keeps a nation alive. When patriotism dies, when a nation loses the love and loyalty of its people, the nation

dies and begins to decompose” (Buchanan 139). Buchanan differs from Taylor, however, in that Buchanan does not overtly tie patriotism to whiteness. In introducing his treatise, Buchanan suggests a test for Americanism that is not racial or ethnic. He writes, “Millions bring no allegiance to America and remain loyal to the lands of their birth. And they occupy more and more rooms in our home; they are not part of our family. Nor do they wish to be. They are strangers, millions and millions of strangers in our midst” (Buchanan 13). For Buchanan, one’s patriotism is measured by their commitment to the U.S rather than their ethnic heritage. Taylor uses words like “racial” and “white,” but Buchanan uses “allegiance” and “loyal” to describe the essence of the true American.

“Patriotism is not nation-worship, such as we saw in Europe in the 1930s,” Buchanan writes elsewhere. “It is not that spirit of nationalism that must denigrate or dominate other nations. It is a passionate attachment to one’s own traditions, culture, and customs” (Buchanan 139). This passage is an excellent example of Buchanan’s detachment of race from patriotism. Buchanan lists traditions, culture, and customs, but mentions nothing about race or ethnicity. He is talking about American culture, and American customs. By doing this, he is positioning himself within the mainstream in a way that his predecessors, specifically Taylor, could not. Buchanan appeals to the patriotism that was permeating the nation, that sense of togetherness, that was present immediately post-9/11.

Buchanan’s rhetoric is, on the surface, very open about the fact that ethnicity is not a factor in his calculation of what it means to be American. For example, he writes that “to be a nation, a people must believe they are a nation, and that they share a common ancestry, history, and destiny. Whatever ethnic group to which we may belong, we Americans must see ourselves as of a unique and common nationality – in order to remain a nation” (Buchanan 142). Note

Buchanan's allowance—"Whatever ethnic group to which we may belong"—and the phrasing of this in the first-person plural; Buchanan himself is part of an ethnic group; he draws attention to our multi-ethnic heritage, piercing through the conceit that some of us are no longer ethnic, but are "true Americans." Again, Buchanan puts the emphasis on belief or attitude.

### **Black Americans**

One of Buchanan's favored rhetorical strategies for reconciling his white nationalist tendencies with his open invitation for anyone to subscribe to an American identity is incorporating blacks into the definition of a real American. This is his most overt attempt to position himself in the center. One of Buchanan's oft-used tactics to accomplish this is to point to instances where a black person has agreed with him. For example, he happily recounts his encounter with a black man who agreed with his proposal to build a fence along the southern border of the United States:

Following a debate at NBC in Washington, as I walked to my car, a black worker drove up beside me and rolled down his window. 'Mr. Buchanan,' he said, and edge in his voice. 'Did I hear you say we need a fence on our border?' 'That's right,' I replied, 'across all two thousand miles.' 'We don't need a fence,' he shot back, 'we need a wall!' (Buchanan 69)

This passage accomplishes two things. First, it paints Buchanan as someone who actually speaks to black people. This may seem trivial, but it is something that makes him quite distinct from Taylor and the rhetoric of pre-9/11 white nationalism. Buchanan finds black people worthy of his time and willingly engages them in conversation. Second, this paragraph leads the reader to believe that black people listen to and support Buchanan's message.

Buchanan even quotes famous black leaders who gave no indication in their life time that they were interested in Buchanan's larger agenda. In a blatant attempt to appeal to the non-racist

masses, Buchanan actually quotes Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. who said that “There is nothing more dangerous than to build a society, with a large segment of people who feel that they have no stake in it; who feel that they have nothing to lose. People who have a stake in their society, protect that society, but when they don’t have it, they unconsciously want to destroy it”

(Buchanan 42). Of course, King was referencing the need to for the government to embrace and empower minority groups. King wanted the government to give people a reason to have stake in their country. Buchanan’s message is: do not allow people in who do not have a stake. With a little bit of revision, Buchanan spins Dr. King’s message to align with his own.

Buchanan gives blacks a stake in the immigration debate. He does this by creating a dialectical opposition between African-Americans and immigrants. He writes, “Is it any wonder African-Americans, millions of whom are forced to compete with immigrants for jobs, are the most forceful in demanding that the government get control of the border and halt the invasion?” (Buchanan 35). Buchanan here takes up the cause of the African American, who is, at least, a species of American, whereas the immigrant is the outsider. By taking up the cause of a minority group, Buchanan has positioned himself once again with a liberal cause while at the same time beating the nationalist drum for his conservative followers.

Buchanan continues in this vein by quoting Booker T. Washington’s speech to the Atlanta Cotton States and International Exposition. He shares Washington’s plea to new industrialists hiring for their factories and writes, “Do not wait, said Washington, for ‘those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits.’ Take my people first” (Buchanan 231). Again, Buchanan’s strategy is to represent blacks in alliance with whites against the alien other, ‘those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits,’ thus incorporating African Americans into the fold of true Americans. Washington’s speech had a very strong segregationist strain in it, but

Buchanan uses this particular selection to make it seem as though Washington were pleading with industrialists to use black people first because they were a part of America, true Americans. Buchanan goes on to say “America did not listen” (Buchanan 231), as if the situation was true Americans (including blacks) against the immigrants instead of blacks against whites and immigrants, which would be more historically accurate.

Buchanan’s view of the American is broad and inclusive. Buchanan writes that, “In almost every opinion survey, majorities of Americans say they want to stop illegal immigration, even if it means troops on the Rio Grande and a barrier fence from Brownsville to San Diego” (Buchanan 247). Here and elsewhere, Buchanan makes sure to position the majority of Americans as real Americans. Buchanan forwards the idea of the majority as if that is all that matters. Buchanan uses opinion surveys as a way to rhetorically include Americans across ideological boundaries as well. He points specifically to groups that have not always been considered truly American (such as women and African Americans) by virtue of being defined outside our legal systems and to groups widely identified as liberals (such as Democrats) to prove that no real American has lapsed. Buchanan says that “Zogby found the greatest hostility to illegal aliens among African-Americans, Democrats, women, and workers earning less than \$75,000. These are the Americans directly impacted socially and economically by 12 million illegal aliens willing to work for wages below what an American family needs to survive” (Buchanan 69). So, instead of defining these people outside of the true American identity, as Taylor did, Buchanan actually defines them as almost the epitome of real Americans because they stand most strongly against the anti-American. He is using the logic of “The enemy of my enemy is my friend” to create a common bond among various racial, ethnic, and ideological groups, to find everyone under the umbrella “American” by virtue of their common opposition to

the alien other. He is also trying to make this not an issue of white, male, Republicans. He is trying to thrust white nationalism onto traditional Democratic and liberal constituencies. He is undercutting the liberal arguments against his protectionist ideas by appealing to African Americans, a group that is often the target of liberal causes. This is a kind of reluctant testimony, which allows him position himself as part of the majority.

Buchanan's next rhetorical move in his effort to include blacks in the definition of a real American is to acknowledge that blacks have been mistreated by whites in the past. Of course, he fails to enter into a discussion of any maltreatment today or even acknowledge that racism could still exist. Instead he just says that "Slavery was a great moral evil and we condemn it. The unequal treatment of our fellow Americans of African descent for a century after Appomattox was a grave injustice and historic wrong" (Buchanan 159). This passage, again, illustrates Buchanan's magic. He is able to situate himself in the mainstream by acknowledging the historical injustices perpetrated against blacks, while completely ignoring any current manifestation of racism. The implicit message in his choice not to acknowledge modern racism is that it does not exist. Racism was something that happened in the past. This appears a bold move by a white nationalist (and one that removes him from the margins of society). Buchanan apologizes for racism in the past, solidifying his relationship to African-Americans, and he ignores racism in the present, simply pretending that we're all one, big, happy family. Buchanan is espousing the mainstream belief that slavery was morally wrong. In doing so, he is again positioning himself in the middle. However, he stops short of indicting current racism which helps him paint the picture that we are all one big happy family.

Buchanan's final rhetorical strategy for including blacks in the category of true Americans, instead of lapsed Americans or alien others, is to engage in some more revisionist

history. He paints a picture of racial harmony prior to this recent invasion of non-white immigrants. In describing the past, he says, “Though of two races, we were of one nationality. We were all Americans. We worshipped the same God, studied the same literature and history, honored the same heroes, celebrated the same holidays, went to the same movies, read the same newspapers and magazines. We had endured the same Great Depression and war. Though the South remained segregated, culturally, we were one people” (Buchanan 36). Here, Buchanan has again set the litmus test for being a real American as one of nationality, not race. So, any racial discord becomes a family fight. And, despite family quarrels, family will always come to one another’s defense against an outsider. This is a clear example of how Buchanan is inaccurate in trying to gloss over contemporary racism. Though, it might work for some given that the move is to include those who had, in the past, been excluded.

The rhetorical purpose served by this rewriting of history is that Buchanan appeals to a fiction that present day Americans can now hold of their own ancestors as people who wanted to come here, learn the language, and be “American.” If Buchanan were honest about his history, he would have to recognize that many of our grandparents were the same people that Buchanan is excoriating today, and that could be divisive (more along the lines of Taylor’s rhetoric). Barnes and Nobles’ editorial review of Buchanan’s book substantiates this view of history spun by Buchanan. They write that “Conservative political commentator Patrick J. Buchanan insists that America’s melting pot has been shattered beyond repair, that the assimilation and Americanization of immigrants that we once took for granted no longer occurs” (“Editorial Reviews: State of Emergency” 1).

### **Buchanan’s Drama**

Buchanan’s dialectic also differs greatly from Taylor’s in that Buchanan does not focus on the majority of the American public as lapsed or even mildly lacking in awareness of the

threat non-white immigrants pose. Buchanan is instead careful to point out that the influx of non-white immigrants is happening against the will of the majority of Americans. Buchanan consistently claims to represent the majority of Americans, not a sacred remnant, a small community of the faithful existing on the fringes of society. For example, as a part of his ominous opening, Buchanan writes: “Against the will of a vast majority of Americans, America is being transformed” (Buchanan 5). This line sets up dialectic between most Americans (who are also true Americans) and an onslaught of immigrants who are not only invading our country, but transforming it. The word “transformed” on its own does not necessarily carry negative overtones, but when done against the will of someone, or in this case a group, transformation feels more like a violation. It is an unwelcome, nay resisted, change.

This appeal to such a central figure of the Civil Rights movement is not only an attempt to position himself as a centrist, but it also allows him to historicize his claim in a way that makes it feel more legitimate. This is a rhetorical marker of centrism. By the time Buchanan is writing, MLK, Jr has moved into the center of American thought. He is now beatified in the American pantheon, in a way that he was not always, and is almost universally admired, at least officially. Even President Bush, when visiting King’s memorial library, remarked that “Martin Luther King is a towering figure in the history of our country. And it is fitting that we honor his service and his courage and his vision” (Whitehouse.gov). Buchanan is using a very centrist rhetorical marker when he invokes King.

Buchanan contends specifically that we, as Americans, should set aside our notions of ethnicity in order to form a strong protection force against the continuing invasion. This passage, again, reveals a key feature that distinguishes Taylor from Buchanan. Taylor adheres to an outmoded, almost nineteenth-century idea of race as innate and immutable, while Buchanan is

suggesting that Americanness is evolutionary and ideological. That ideology is tied to a historical notion of whiteness, but without the label of “race.”

The climate proved to be particularly receptive to Buchanan’s rhetoric and solidified his position as a centrist. The reviews of the book were overwhelmingly positive. Of course, there were a few reviews that called Buchanan out as a racist or fear-monger. However, a perusal of the reviews on the most popular book-seller sites reveals that most Americans considered Buchanan’s rhetoric to be reasonable and justified. One reviewer on Amazon wrote “Well written and reasoned. Of course there will be a few open border types who will slam the book based on their socialist political views (probably without really reading it!). Those of us who desire to live in a safe, sovereign nation understand the difference between sensible immigration policies and racism.” After publishing the book, Buchanan was offered a job as a political analyst on MSNBC, a network that is home to mostly liberal political commentators. He joins the panel of almost every show on almost every day of the week. Despite espousing many of the same ideas as Jared Taylor, Buchanan’s successful realignment has earned him a spot as a mainstream media pundit.

### **Conclusion**

The rhetoric of Buchanan substantiates the claim that after 9/11, white supremacists began to see themselves as part of the ideological center. This move away from the margins can be seen in one key aspect of Buchanan’s rhetoric: the replacement of a racial definition of American with one based on history, heritage, and values.

Buchanan invokes the same sense of patriotism that made Taylor’s rhetoric so appealing to white nationalists, yet removes race from the equation in order to position him in a different place ideologically. Taylor presents us with the alien other, lapsed Americans, insidious elites, and true Americans. Buchanan has a much simpler drama according to you: Americans v. the alien

other. Buchanan masterfully appeals to the mainstream of American society, while leaving open the door for his white nativist base to draw the same conclusions they drew from Taylor's rhetoric. This move towards "unity" in Buchanan's rhetoric plays upon the sense of togetherness that has pervaded the nation as whole since the attacks of 9/11. It is under the cloak of this "unity" that Buchanan is able to re-position white nativist rhetoric as something that is, ironically, not so racist.

## **FROM ‘YOU JUST DON’T GET IT’ TO ‘UNITED WE HATE’**

What a difference a decade makes. Many of the arguments Jared Taylor makes in the late 1990s are reiterated by Patrick Buchanan post-9/11. Content-wise, both Taylor and Buchanan forward the notion that the American majority should protect itself against “invasion” by foreigners. However, Taylor was (and still is) labeled a racist and there is something that makes Buchanan’s message palatable to the general public in a post-9/11 world: positioning. Buchanan’s choice to position himself within the mainstream (while echoing many of Taylor’s arguments) allows Buchanan to move from outright white supremacy to a more specific and acceptable brand of white supremacy: white nationalism. Loretta J. Ross, Executive Director of the National Center for Human Rights Education, explains white nationalism as a form of white supremacy:

It propagates the ideas of white supremacy while denying its racist and xenophobic roots. White supremacists believe in biological determinism: that the white race is genetically, culturally, and economically superior to all other races of people. White nationalism has a vested interest in denying the privileged position of whiteness because this would belie their claim to victimhood status, relieving whites of responsibility for racism and xenophobia. Yet white nationalists remain obsessed with identity borders, conflating race with nation. The central question for them is maintaining white dominance, and non-white immigrants threaten their power (Ross 1).

The differences between straight-up white supremacy and white nationalism illuminated by Ross are evident in both Taylor and Buchanan's rhetoric. Post-9/11 the white nationalist spin of Buchanan's rhetoric allowed him to position himself as part of "us" instead of at the margins looking in and critiquing "us."

Jared Taylor was a strong advocate for the antiquated notions of biological determinism that were largely discredited by the time of his writing, making him an outsider. One of the key distinctions between Buchanan's rhetoric and that of his predecessor, Taylor is Buchanan's argument that identification trumps genetics when determining who is a real American. Taylor relied heavily on notions of biology to determine Americanism. Taylor argued that "race matters," that it is a brute "biological fact" that cannot be trumped by other characteristics. Buchanan clearly takes a step away from that. He stays away from words like "race" and "ethnicity" which would have put him in Taylor's camp and positioned him outside of the mainstream. Buchanan believes that the true American can transcend material, genetic difference and embrace multitudes (in this case, the multiculturalism that Taylor rails against). Taylor, on the other hand, opted for the purging of difference.

This has important implications for where each man may position himself vis-à-vis the public at large. Taylor's view is a bit like Calvinism or Presbyterianism; there's a heavy element of predestination in it. Buchanan's religion, in contrast, seems to be based on conversion and belief. In Buchanan's view, if you are not a part of that shared history, there is still an opportunity for you to make the right choice (by abandoning the traditions and heritage of your homeland and adopting the ideology of an American). It is a defining characteristic of Buchanan's rhetoric that allows him to exist in the middle and places Taylor on the margins. Buchanan focuses on the here-and-now, who we are now. He still argued that non-white

immigrants were threatening the vitality of the nation, but he couched it in nationalist terms instead of racial terms. This choice allowed Buchanan to make arguments similar to Taylor's with a mainstream, legitimate voice.

While defining immigrants as the alien other, as the anti-American, Buchanan goes to great rhetorical lengths to make sure that his definition of American includes ethnic groups who were left out of Taylor's ideal American. The strongest point of agreement between Taylor and Buchanan is the existence of an alien invader who is destroying American society. Of course, because they define American differently, the alien also morphs into something quite different in post 9/11 rhetoric. For both, the immigrant is a foreign invader. For Taylor part of what made the alien foreign was their lack of whiteness. However, for Buchanan, it is simply their lack of an American national identity. For example, California is considered a diverse state. This is something that Taylor would have identified as a weakness, as a sign that Californians are lapsed Americans. Buchanan, on the other hand, identifies Californians as real Americans who just happen to be losing the battle. He asks, "Did Californians vote for this future?" and then answers his own question with, "Never. They saw it coming and resisted as best they could" (Buchanan 50). By positioning California in this way, Buchanan is able to perform some more of his rhetorical sleight-of-hand. He casts California as a "lost" state in which immigrants are obliterating all that is truly American. Yet, he does not alienate Californians by accusing them of being anything less than American. Buchanan positions himself on the side of the Californians. He casts them as noble resisters, as opposed to Taylor's lapsed citizens. This sets Buchanan apart from Taylor, because Taylor categorized areas that were losing the white majority as being comprised of lapsed Americans.

Whereas Taylor was very careful to identify those Americans who did not understand, whether in the majority or minority, Buchanan positions the majority of Americans as if they constitute all Americans. In Taylor's rhetoric the majority does not get it. The clear counterpoint to the majority is a minority. In Buchanan's rhetoric it is the majority that gets it and the minority that does not.

Taylor's scapegoat was the lapsed American. It was the lapsed American who had failed to protect America from the non-white invaders. In Taylor's rhetoric, the lapsed Americans comprised the majority of Americans. Taylor was part of a select group of real Americans that was witnessing the effects of this failure from the outside. Taylor set himself in opposition to the majority by defining himself in opposition to those who could not see through the sham of diversity. Buchanan, instead, defined himself as a part of the majority. In Buchanan's rhetoric, the majority was in the know. He did think that there was a failure, but that we were all aware of it and participating in the process of fixing it.

Both Buchanan and Taylor used rhetoric that harkens back to the good ol' days when America's forefathers made the right decisions for the country. They both invoked the founding fathers in a sacred way, as people to be worshipped and followed as part of the path to becoming a real American. They were notable white Americans whose traditions must be followed. Both men idealized whiteness. The difference, however, is that Buchanan argued that it is a path open to any willing takers and Taylor argued that it is a path only truly available to whites.

Buchanan's characterization does dovetail with Taylor's in another distinct way. Buchanan's analysis is done in economic terms. This economic analysis, by nature, presents itself as irrefragable, dispassionate, and scientific. Taylor, also appealed to science to create distinctions between his version of "them." For Taylor, however, the third-person (they, them,

those people) is the non-white and the first-person (we, us, our) is white people. For Buchanan the third-person is solely the immigrant and the first-person is white people.

James Kirchik of *The New Republic* recently asked “How is it that Pat Buchanan enjoys so much mainstream credibility as of late (he is a near-constant appearance on MSNBC)? (Kirchik 1). This question becomes all the more perplexing once one realizes that the meat of Buchanan’s arguments are very similar to the arguments made by white supremacists like Jared Taylor about a decade ago. The answer, however, is simple: Buchanan considers himself one of us. Taylor cast himself as the outsider and it is always easier to brush off an outsider than it is to cast aspersion on one of your own.

The potential implications of the mainstream acceptance of post-9/11 white nationalist rhetoric like Buchanan’s are enumerable. At a time when race relations are being tested by the nation’s first black president, national acceptance of Buchanan’s rhetoric could incite discord at a time with great potential for unity. This was evident in during the tail end of the 2008 presidential election, when Senator John McCain and his running mate, Governor Sarah Palin, made a habit out of identifying real Americans. Like Buchanan, they defined those real Americans implicitly (as those Americans who emulated the founders and were from majority-white parts of the country) and explicitly stated that anyone could be a real American...if they were willing to adopt the ideologies of real Americans. The racial component McCain and Palin’s appeals to real Americans, like Buchanan’s, should have been obvious. They spoke to almost always all-white crowds and riled up the crowds with talk of anti-Americanism hurled at the black candidate. However, as disturbing as that image should have been, it was rarely, if ever, questioned. When Georgia Congressman and civil rights hero, John Lewis recognized the racial bent of the McCain/Palin rallies and accused McCain of fostering “a mood not unlike the

one created by George Wallace, the former segregationist governor and presidential candidate” (Huffington Post), he was maligned by the mainstream media. The example of Lewis’ is demonstrative of the mainstream acceptance of Buchanan-style rhetoric post-9/11.

In June of 2008, Matthew Bigg wrote that “Obama's race will complicate his White House bid, Americans say in both interviews and a poll showing that nearly a third of them acknowledge feeling racial prejudice...showing that race relations in the United States were improving but problems persist” (Bigg 1). This is what makes Buchanan’s rhetoric even more dangerous than Taylor’s. Taylor was more easily dismissed by the mainstream as a fringe extremist. But Buchanan’s arguments are about national identity and, even if racial connotations lie directly beneath the surface, it is a safe shield for those with a racist agenda to hide behind.

Taylor and Buchanan both promote white supremacist ideologies, but Buchanan’s nationalist twist has allowed him to slither his way into the mainstream without the baggage of his pre-9/11 counterparts. That he has flown under the radar in a sense is both indicative of the nationalist sentiment that gripped the nation post-9/11 and a cause for concern about the future of race relations in the United States.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Documents

Buchanan, Patrick J. State of Emergency: The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2006.

Duke, David. "America at the Crossroads." Documents of American Prejudice. Ed. S.T. Joshi. New York: Basic Books, 1999. 45-50.

Mather, Increase. "The History of King Philip's War." Documents of American Prejudice. Ed. S.T. Joshi. New York: Basic Books, 1999. 226-228.

Simms, William Gilmore. "Slavery in America." Documents of American Prejudice. Ed. S.T. Joshi. New York: Basic Books, 1999. 273-279.

Taylor, Jared. "Race and Nation." The Real American Dilemma: Race, Immigration, and the Future of America. Ed. Jared Taylor. Oakton, Virginia: New Century, 1998.

### Secondary Sources

Archdeacon, Thomas J. Becoming American: An Ethnic History. New York and London: The Free Press, 1983.

Atton, Chris. "Far Right Media on the Internet: Culture, Discourse, and Power." New Media and Society 8.4 (2006): 573-587.

Augoustinos, Martha and Danielle Every. "The Language of 'Race' and Prejudice." Journal of Language and Social Psychology 26.2 (2007): 123-141.

Barlow, Andrew L. Between Fear and Hope: Globalization and Race in the United States. Lanham, Boulder, New York, and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003.

- Behdad, Ali. A Forgetful Nation: On Immigration and Cultural Identity in the United States. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Bell, Daniel. "The Dispossessed." The Radical Right. Ed. Daniel Bell. New York: Anchor Books, 1964. 1-46.
- Bennett, David H. The Party of Fear: From Nativist Movements to the New Right In American History. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Berbier, Marie-Claude. Racial, Ethnic, and Homophobic Violence: Killing in the Name Of Otherness. England and New York: Routledge-Cavendish, 2007.
- Berlet, Chip and Matthew N. Lyons. Right-Wing Populism in America: Too Close For Comfort. New York and London: The Guilford Press, 2000.
- Billig, Michael. "Humour and Hatred: The Racist Jokes of the Ku Klux Klan." Discourse and Society 12.3 (2001): 267-300.
- Billings, Charles E. Racism and Prejudice. New Jersey: Hayden Book Company, 1976.
- Blauner, Robert. Racial Oppression in America. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Blauner, Bob. Still the Big News: Racial Oppression in America. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.
- Burke, Kenneth. Counter-Statement. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Los Altos, California: Hermes Publications, 1953.
- Burlein, Ann. Lift High the Cross: Where White Supremacy and the Christian Right Converge. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Burr, Clinton Stoddard. America's Race Heritage. New York: Arno Press, 1977.
- Bushart, Howard L., John R. Craig, and Myra Barnes. Soldiers of God: White

- Supremacists and Their Holy War for America. New York: Kensington Books, 1998.
- Campbell, Alex. "The search for authenticity: An exploration of an online skinhead Newsgroup." New Media and Society 8.2 (2006): 269-294.
- Carlson, Lewis H. and George A. Colburn. In Their Place: White America Defines Her Minorities, 1850-1950. New York, Sydney, London, Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, 1972.
- Cheng, Vincent J. Inauthentic: The Anxiety over Culture and Identity. New Brunswick, New Jersey, and London: Rutgers University Press, 2004.
- Cobb, James C. The Brown Decision, Jim Crow, and Southern Identity. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2005.
- Daniels, Roger and Harry H. Kitano. American Racism: Exploration of the Nature of Prejudice. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Darsey, James. "From 'Gay is Good' to the Scourge of AIDS: The Evolution of Gay Liberation Rhetoric, 1977 – 1990." Communication Studies. 42/1 (1991): 43-66.
- David, Thomas J. Race Relations in America: A Reference Guide with Primary Documents. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2006.
- Dinnerstein, Leonard, Roger L. Nichols, and David M. Reimers. Natives and Strangers: A Multicultural History of Americans. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Dobratz, Betty A. and Stephanie Shanks-Meile. 'White Power, White Pride!' The White Separatist Movement in the United States. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1997.

- Duffy, Margaret E. "Web of Hate: A Fantasy Theme Analysis of the Rhetorical Vision of Hate Groups On Line." Journal of Communication Inquiry 27.3 (2003): 291.
- Epstein, Benjamin R. and Arnold Forster. The Radical Right: Report on the John Birch Society and Its Allies. New York: Vintige Books, 1967.
- Erenhaus, Peter. "Race Lynching and Christian Evangelicalism: Performances of Faith." Text and Performance Quarterly 24.3/4 (2004): 276-301.
- Fenster, Mark. Conspiracy Theories: Secrecy and Power in American Culture. London and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Ferguson, Jerry L. "Lest We Forget: A Thematic Review of the Rhetoric of White Ethnic Superiority." Communication 10.1 (1981): 139-147.
- Flynn, Kevin and Gary Gerhardt. The Silent Brotherhood: Inside America's Racist Underground. New York: The Free Press, 1989.
- Forster, Arnold and Benjamin R. Epstein. Danger on the Right. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Forster, Arnold and Benjamin R. Epstein. The Trouble Makers: An Anti-Defamation League Report. Westport, Connecticut: Negro Universities Press, 1970.
- Frazier, John W., Florence M. Margai, and Eugene Tettey-Fio. Race and Place: Equity Issues in Urban America. Colorado: Westview Press, 2003.
- Garfield, Bob. "Buchanan TV Spot a Sure Head Turner, and , oh yeah, Racist." The Advertising Age 71.43 (2000): 1-2.
- Grey, Stephanie Hudson. Reading Racism: A Reflection on the Politics of the Production of Knowledge." Critical Studies in Media Communication 18.4 (2001): 466-471.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. Introduction. On Symbols and Society. By Kenneth Burke.

- Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989. 1-52.
- Hadjor, Kofi Buenor. The Changing Face of Race: The Role of Racial Politics in Shaping Modern America. Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press, 2007.
- Hardisty, Jean. Mobilizing Resentment: Conservative Resurgence from the John Birch Society to the Promise Keepers. Boston: Beacon Press, 1999.
- Hofstadter, Richard. "Pseudo-Conservatism Revisted: A Postscript." The Radical Right. Ed. Daniel Bell. New York:Anchor Books, 1964. 75-96.'
- Holmes, David G. "Affirmative Reaction: Kennedy, Nixon, King, and the Evolution Of Colorblind Rhetoric." Rhetoric Review 26.1 (2007): 25-41.
- Isaac, Allan Punzalan. American Tropics: Articulating Filipino America. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.
- Jaspin, Elliot. Buried in the Bitter Waters. New York: Basic Books, 2007.
- Jillson, Cal. Pursuing the American Dream: Opportunity and Exclusion Over Four Centuries. Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 2004.
- Jorstad, Erling. The Politics of Doomsday: Fundamentalists of the Far Right. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Knickerbocker, Brad. "Anti-Immigrant Sentiments Fuel Ku Klux Klan Resurgence." Christian Science Monitor 9 Feb. 2007: USA Section 2.
- Knobel, Dale T. 'America for the Americans': The Nativist Movement in the United States. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1996.
- Leets, Laura. "Disentangling Perceptions of Subtle Racist Speech." Journal of Language And Social Psychology 22.2 (2003): 145-169.

- Levin, Jack, and Gordana Rabrenovic. Why We Hate. New York: Prometheus Books, 2004.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, and Birchers." The Radical Right. Ed. Daniel Bell. New York: Anchor Books, 1964. 373-446.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin and Earl Raab. The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1970-1977. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Chicago and London: The University Of Chicago Press, 1970.
- McPhail, Mark Lawrence. "Revisiting the Rhetoric of Racism." Rhetoric Review 20.1/2 (2001): 43-47.
- Min, Pyong Gap. Encyclopedia of Racism in the United States. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2005.
- Newman, Edwin S. The Hate Reader. New York: Ocean Publications, 1964.
- Overstreet, Harry and Bonaro Overstreet. The Strange Tactics of Extremism. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1964.
- Randall, Steve. "Academic Racists Make Mainstream Inroads." Extra! 18.2 (2005): 12 – 15.
- Redekop, John Harold. The American Far Right: A Case Study of Billy James Hargis and Christian Crusade. Michigan, William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1968.
- Riegel, Robert Dee. Birth of a Radical. New York, Washington, and Hollywood: Vantage Press, 1964.
- Rusher, William A. The Rise of the Right. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1984.

- Salatia, Steven George. Anti-Arabe Racism in the USA: Where it Comes From and What it Means for Politics Today. London and Ann Arbor: Pluto, 2006.
- Schaerffenberg, A.V. Who Was George Lincoln Rockwell?  
<http://www.americannaziparty.com/rockwell/index.php>.
- Simons, Herbert W. and Trevor Melia. The Legacy of Kenneth Burke. Wisconsin and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.
- Stern, Kenneth S. A Force Upon the Plan: The American Militia Movement and the Politics of Hate. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Stewart, Charles J., Craig Allen Smith, and Robert E. Denton Jr. Persuasion and Social Movements. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland, 2001.
- Stuckey, Mary E. and Richard Morris. "Pocahontas and Beyond: Commodification and Cultural Hegemony." World Communication 28.2 (1999): 45-68.
- Swain, Carol M. and Russ Nieli. Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism in America. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Thompson, Charis. "Race Science." Theory, Culture, and Society 23.2/3 (2006): 546 – 549.
- Willie, Charles V. Black/Brown/White Relations: Race Relations in the 1970s. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1977.
- Wrage, Ernest J. "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History." Readings In Rhetorical Criticism. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Ed. Carl R. Burghardt. State College, Pennsylvania: Strata Publishing, 2000. 29-34.
- Yousman, Bill. "Blackphilia and Blackophobia: White Youth, the Consumption of Rap Music and White Supremacy." Communication Theory 13.4 (2003): 366-391.