2018

The Gathering Storm: The Role of White Nationalism in U.S. Politics

Genie A. Donley
Cleveland State University

THE GATHERING STORM: THE ROLE OF WHITE NATIONALISM IN U.S. POLITICS

GENIE A. DONLEY

Bachelor of Arts in History

Cleveland State University

May 2016

submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS IN HISTORY

at

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2018

We hereby approve this Master's thesis

For

Genie A. Donley

Candidate for the Master of Arts degree in History

for the Department of

History

And

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY'S

College of Graduate Studies by

_____

Thomas J. Humphrey, Ph.D.
History Department

_____

Robert S. Shelton, Ph.D.
History Department

_____

Karen Sotiropoulos, Ph.D.
History Department

Student's Date of Defense: April 18, 2018

DEDICATION

To my son, David, and to my advisor, Dr. Thomas J. Humphrey.

THE GATHERING STORM: THE ROLE OF WHITE NATIONALISM IN U.S. POLITICS

GENIE A. DONLEY

ABSTRACT

White nationalism has played a critical role in shaping United States politics for over 150 years. Since the Reconstruction era, whites have fought to maintain their power and superiority over minorities. They influenced U.S. politics by attempting, and in some cases succeeding, to prevent minorities from voting. Moreover, politicians began to help them. This became most evident in the 2016 U.S. presidential election when Republican Donald J. Trump appealed to racist white voters, gained their support, and won the election. Those voters, who united as the Alt-Right, supported Trump because he appealed to them by playing on their fear of becoming a minority in their country.

This thesis traces white nationalism back to Reconstruction. It analyzes the memberships of separate groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, Neo-Confederates, and Citizens' Councils to show how and why those various groups united as the Alt-Right to support Trump in the 2016 election. This study examines the writings of various white nationalists, including their Twitter accounts, to identify their goals and how they spread their ideology. This work also analyzes race as a political concept and identity by investigating how politicians appealed these groups. Ultimately, this thesis illustrates the presence and significance of white nationalism in United States politics and how it culminated in Donald Trump's 2016 presidential campaign.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

On November 9, 2016, Republican Donald J. Trump defeated Democrat Hillary R. Clinton to win the United States presidential election. Trump's victory shocked countless Americans who wondered how the U.S. could have elected a man who ran a campaign of racism and misogyny. While those more nefarious elements of U.S. culture have long shaped the country's politics, what was new in 2016 was the rise of the Alt-Right, an entity that encompasses ultra-conservative and white nationalist groups and individuals, into the political realm. Prominent white nationalist Richard Spencer coined the term Alt-Right as the name of a fairly-new, racist organization that typifies many other like-minded groups.[1] Like white nationalist groups of the past, members of the Alt-Right despise multiculturalism and advocate a whites-only nation. At the same time, they want to preserve and advance white identity, heritage, and culture. That said, people in different branches of the Alt-Right pursue different goals. Some, for example, believe that the Southern United States should become its own sovereign entity. Others believe that the U.S. should adopt a National Socialist ideology like the one Adolf Hitler established in Germany before World War II. And still others believe that only non-Jewish whites belong in the U.S. and that all non-whites and Jews others should go back

to their homelands. However different these groups may appear on the surface, they were and remain bound by their racism and bigotry.

Alt-Right groups gained prominence throughout Trump's presidential campaign as they rallied around his racially divisive rhetoric and promises. Despite their differences on other issues, the members of these increasingly powerful groups supported Trump because, unlike many candidates in the past thirty-five years, Trump refused to cloak his racist appeals with phrases such as law and order or welfare reform. For them, as well as for Trump, the critical issue was maintaining white supremacy. In that regard, and in others, Trump's victory was a success for white supremacists and white nationalists, who had finally found a candidate who promised to turn their agenda into policy.

Rather than speak to the concerns that separated them, Trump took advantage of their potential political power and built on the groups' common ground, their racism. The group's size alone made it worth the effort for Trump. An August 2017 poll showed that taken together, approximately 10 percent of Americans identify as Alt-Right.[2] In other words, by focusing on the common goal of maintaining white supremacy, Trump at least temporarily brought together groups of people who had been growing apart since the early 1950s, he inspired disaffected people to vote, and he acquired supporters.

This thesis explores that process. In doing so, it traces how racism evolved as a political concept and identity in the sixty years before Trump's election. Based on resources produced by members of these various groups, this thesis examines the common causes pursued by the first two iterations of the Ku Klux Klan. It then examines how and why groups of white separatists, Klan members, and Neo-Confederates moved away from each other in reaction to the Civil Rights movement that started in the decade

after the end of World War II. Despite their shared racial bigotry, these groups pursued different social and political goals in the second half of the twentieth century. While politicians at the local level appealed to specific white supremacist groups in their regions, as evident in Detroit in the 1940s, presidential candidates such as Richard M. Nixon only began to address the concerns of those groups during national elections in the 1960s. Ultimately, this thesis studies how these groups emerged, how they splintered, their different goals, and how Trump appealed to these separate goals to bring the members of these groups under one political umbrella of racism.

By tapping into the racism of white voters, Trump followed a well-worn political path. Racism has driven the political history of the United States since the country's founding. Ten of the first twelve presidents owned slaves, and from 1861 to 1865, the country fought the Civil War precisely over the issue of slavery. The South's defeat in the Civil War spurred white Southerners to create a perspective and history that reflected their view of where the United States had been and where it should go. They predicated their outlook on a racially segregated United States. That perspective found life among the members of the first Ku Klux Klan, formed shortly after the Civil War ended. After the first Klan was declared unconstitutional in April 1871 and when U.S. troops retreated from the South in 1877, white Southerners relied on their political power and ability to use unrestrained violence to control African Americans in their communities. Even though they successfully restored white supremacy by passing Jim Crow laws, when they felt their political power slipping, white Southerners often resorted to violent terrorism, such as lynch mobs, to sustain the Jim Crow laws and to suppress African Americans' civil and human rights.

Although the initial iteration of the Ku Klux Klan was declared unconstitutional, the racist perspectives that brought people to the group lingered. In the twentieth century, at least two other iterations of the Klan emerged. A second Klan surfaced during World War I in part to fuel patriotism but also to counter the Great Migration, the demographic shift when over a half a million African Americans moved from the South to the North and contributed to a growing black civil rights movement. W. E. B. DuBois and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), as well as Jamaican Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association, mobilized tens of thousands of African Americans nationally into different approaches to black advancement. These changes no doubt contributed to the growth of the second Klan, which grew tremendously in the 1920s with the surge of immigrants to the United States and then died out in the 1930s during the Great Depression.

Still, the ideas that shaped the Klan refused to fade, and a third iteration of the Klan appeared in the era after World War II to combat the nascent, but increasingly powerful, struggle for civil rights that shaped the United States on nearly every front from the 1950s through the end of the twentieth century. In the post-World War II period, however, the white supremacist movement fragmented into different components such as the present-day Klan, Neo-Confederacy, the Council of Conservative Citizens, and Christian Identitarians. White nationalists aimed to halt any type of African American advancement, especially after *Brown v. Board* (1954) declared racial segregation in public schools unconstitutional and the Civil Rights movement began to take off in the late 1950s. But their overtly racist appeals began to lose traction in the changing U.S. political and social climate. As a result, these groups increasingly drew on and developed

a brand of racism cloaked in a thin veneer of patriotism and pride in white European heritage and identity. As white nationalist and white supremacist groups increased in number and power, politicians at every level, especially conservative candidates, tapped into these growing movements to build, or rebuild, their voter base and to win over political control. They did so by using coded language to mask their bigotry. Whereas Richard Nixon talked about restoring law and order, Ronald Reagan invoked the stereotype of the black welfare queen without mentioning race, a ploy which helped him and other conservatives to not only conceal their racism but also to legitimate it. Some, however, believed that Reagan was not conservative enough, and they began pushing even farther to the right on issues regarding race. These trends came together in the 2016 United States presidential election when Donald Trump made unconcealed racism a fundamental element of his campaign to attract members of the Alt-Right, who wanted to separate themselves from mainstream conservatism because, like Reagan, it was not conservative enough.

How these groups emerged after the Civil War, who joined them, and what role their members played in the 2016 presidential election are the focus of this thesis. This thesis investigates the growth of these separate branches of white nationalist ideology and analyzes the spectrum of their racism by exploring the writings, speeches, and scholarship produced by members of prominent white nationalist groups. In doing so, this thesis illustrates how racism became the front-and-center issue of politics and power in the United States during the 2016 presidential election.

To understand the origin of that racism, one must start with the pro-slavery ideology in the Antebellum period. The United States was both ruled and built, in large

part, by slaveowners. Lured by slavery's low cost and high yield in the seventeenth century, whites in colonial North America passed laws that ultimately stripped enslaved Africans of their human rights and gave slaveowners the power of life and death over their human property. Those laws persisted through the American Revolution as slavery influenced the Constitution, the fundamental document that has served as the blueprint for the government since 1789. The South, which relied on slavery for production, and then, everything, believed the Constitution protected their right to own imported Africans and their children.[3]

Debates over the morality, legality, and constitutionality of slavery intensified throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. At the time, Americans espoused the ideology of Manifest Destiny, the notion that white citizens of the U.S. had a God-given right to expand and conquer the North American continent. Expansion, however, raised the question of whether states would be admitted as free states or slave states, and those debates increased in number and fervor as the abolition movement grew. Slavery also became a political issue and a major factor in the presidential elections throughout the Antebellum period, and it became the predominant issue in the 1860 election. The Civil War erupted precisely because slavers who ruled the South feared the federal government, under newly-elected President Abraham Lincoln, was hell-bent on eradicating the country of the scourge of slavery.[4]

As the North began to prevail over the South in 1864 and 1865, Lincoln pushed for the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment, which forever abolished slavery in the United States. The end of slavery, however, did not mean an end to the racism that fueled it, and, in fact, the Amendment's caveat that allowed slavery to continue "except as

punishment for crime" directly led to a convict lease system that many argue functioned like "slavery by another name" and came to define Jim Crow America.[5] The abolition of slavery only angered white Southerners who considered it an overreach of the federal government's power and a threat to white supremacy. Their answer to those problems was the Ku Klux Klan.

The first iteration of the Klan began "as a social fraternity devoted to playing pranks" and contained people "drawn from every rank and class of society." The Klan soon "transformed into a terrorist organization," whose goals included maintaining white supremacy and preserving an older, racially hierarchical social order primarily through scare tactics, and, more often, violence. Most of all, the members of the Klan feared that as African Americans acquired political power, they would take power and political positions from whites.[6] After the Ku Klux Klan Act of 1871 put a stop to the first Klan, albeit not the racial violence permitted throughout the Jim Crow era, the second Klan rose in 1915 as "a form of populism that combined hostility to established élites with dedication to white supremacy, support for conservative family values, enthusiasm for 'old-time religion,' and antipathy to welfare recipients, trade unionists, immigrants, liberals, and leftists."[7] Like the first Klan, the second Klan sought to preserve a racialized social order as well as a code of honor that emphasized masculinity. Women, however, formed their own branch in the second Klan, which made "the Klan's influence both more extensive and more deadly."[8] Klan members fiercely opposed any form of sympathy to African Americans and believed that "even the slightest concession would embolden African Americans to make further demands, which would in time undermine the whole apparatus of racial hierarchy."[9] Furthermore, the second Klan emphasized

patriotism and the concept of whiteness, which excluded Jews. The second Klan deteriorated because of its decentralization, but a third iteration rose in response to the Civil Rights movement in the 1950s. Although decentralized, the third Klan remains active today as one branch of the Alt-Right. Like the second Klan, the third Klan emphasizes whiteness, and it dedicates itself to the preservation of whites' rights in the face of increasing racial diversity.

Neo-Confederates compose another branch of the Alt-Right. While driven by the kind of racism espoused by the Klan, Neo-Confederates' outlook grows out of a "complex discourse, a language that at face value appears to laud cultural rights and freedoms, heritage preservation and celebration, local control over institutions, and Christianity."[10] Like the Klan, Neo-Confederates wish to preserve the racist social order supposedly prescribed by God. Unlike the Klan, Neo-Confederates defend an imagined Southern code of honor and hypermasculinity that "forms the basis, for most neo-Confederates, of civilization itself."[11] To do so, Neo-Confederates built a fictional past, known as the Lost Cause narrative, to make their liberty dependent on the oppression of blacks as well as to create and then preserve the kind of society they imagine the South had been before it was ruined by Northern aggression, integration, and the feminization of white men.[12] Neo-Confederates also vehemently oppose immigration to the U.S. because they believe it will result in whites becoming a minority and, as a result, losing their power.

Since the 1990s, Klan members and Neo-Confederates became part of, as Carol M. Swain has argued, "the development of an emerging white nationalist movement in America" that poses a real threat both to the stability of the United States and to any

gains made during the Civil Rights movement.[13] For Swain, white nationalists such as Jared Taylor have facilitated "a sense of white racial pride and European-American group consciousness" by decrying liberal policies, which they think have contributed to the advancement of minorities over whites in the United States.[14] Swain, however, mistakenly erases the violence in the threats presented by modern-day white nationalists. This thesis challenges Swain's contention that modern-day white nationalists avoid violence, arguing instead that despite the lack of physical violence by their leaders, white nationalists, like members of the Klan, invoke language, particularly through hate speech and memes on the internet, as a tool of violence. That language carries the weight, as well as the painful memories, of past acts of horrific violence that have become part of the historical and cultural memory of the United States. In other words, new threats carry the weight and power of past violence that make them powerful and ferocious. Thus, these new white nationalist groups should be equated with organizations such as the historical Klan because they share goals, messages, and tactics. They are different branches of the same tree.

Taken together, these groups wanted to create and preserve their version of, as Benedict Anderson writes, "an imagined political community" which was, and is, distinguishable "by the style in which they are imagined."[15] That is, they sought to establish and then preserve what they considered to be a nation. These groups, however, envisioned different, and sometimes conflicting, kinds of political, cultural, historical, social, and economic sovereign entities. White nationalists defined the basis for citizenship, and even inhabitance, of their nation according to people's ethnic and racial identities. For them, those identities include European and Caucasian. Nationalism, then,

constitutes an ideology of identity with and loyalty to that imagined nation of European whites. In the case of American white nationalists, however, nationalism becomes a combination of ethnic and civic nationalism. James M. McPherson combines the two to describe an ethnic nationalism that entails a "sense of national identity and loyalty shared by a group of people united among themselves and distinguished from others by … language, religion, culture," and, essentially, race. Conversely, civic nationalism involves a belief "in common citizenship in a state embracing a specified territory and common allegiance to the institutions governing that territory."[16]

To study these topics, to show how disparate white nationalist and white supremacist groups coalesced around Donald Trump's presidential candidacy, this thesis explores white nationalism in U.S. politics in three chapters. Chapter Two studies the Ku Klux Klan from Reconstruction forward and how it remains relevant to present-day white nationalism and U.S. politics. It investigates the rise of the first Klan, the actions it took, its fall, and the rise and fall of the second Klan in the early twentieth century. This chapter shows how and why former Confederates, and later people from across the nation, organized to prevent African Americans, and the whites that supported them, from participating in U.S. politics in order to maintain white supremacy. Most importantly, this chapter sets the stage for later discussion of modern-day white nationalism by illustrating how it stems from the Klan and its ideology. It provides an historical foundation for explaining how Trump appealed to white supremacists and why they supported him throughout his campaign. Sources for this chapter include *New York Times* articles from the Reconstruction period, the *Report on the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States* published by Congress in 1872, and writings by former

Klan members including Nathan Bedford Forrest, John C. Reed, and William J. Simmons.

Chapter Three focuses on the fragmentation of white nationalism in the post-World War II era from the Civil Rights movement through the early twenty-first century and how politicians began to appeal to them. This chapter illustrates how white nationalism, once centered on the first and second Klans, split into separate groups in order to pursue separate goals to combat the Civil Rights movement. The groups studied include Neo-Confederates, the Council of Conservative Citizens (formerly the Citizens' Council), and Christian Identitarians. This chapter demonstrates how racist whites organized at the grassroots level to combat attempts at civil rights reform and to establish racial superiority over African Americans, sometimes by using the Bible. It then explores how politicians began to appeal to those groups through covert racist language at the local level in 1940s Detroit and at the national level during the campaigns and presidencies of Richard M. Nixon and Ronald Reagan. Sources for this chapter include books by Neo-Confederate brothers James Ronald Kennedy and Walter Donald Kennedy to explore the Lost Cause narrative and how it relates to white nationalism and Neo-Confederacy, writings and website posts by League of the South members, Southern states' secession documents, speeches and writings by members of the Citizens' Councils, and speeches by former presidents Nixon and Reagan.

Chapter Four focuses on present-day white nationalists as well as the formation of the Alt-Right and its significance in the 2016 presidential election. It investigates the Alt-Right's ideas, and it shows how the groups that once fragmented later united as the Alt-Right to support Donald Trump in his bid for the presidency. This chapter illustrates how

this newest brand of white nationalism, in which women built their own branch, culminated in response to the aftermath of the Civil Rights movement, the changing demographics of the United States, and Barack Obama's election and reelection, and it shows how these groups united and why they supported Trump in the 2016 election. Sources include the Twitter accounts of various white nationalists, particularly Richard Spencer and David Duke, as well as posts on white nationalist websites and interviews with them. *American Renaissance*, a white nationalist journal active since 1990 and edited by Jared Taylor, features countless articles from white nationalists discussing race and what Taylor describes as race realism. Finally, other sources include prominent Alt-Right women's Twitter accounts and books by Ann Coulter to explore the female aspects of white nationalism that include traditionalism, anti-feminism, and aversion to nonwhite immigrants.

Throughout this paper I use my subjects' language as much as possible, particularly when referring to them. Many of them prefer the term white nationalist because one of their ultimate goals is to turn their countries into white ethnostates. Again, the subjects of this thesis are not a single group. Jared Taylor has long rejected the label "white nationalist," and Richard Spencer promotes the idea of an ethnostate because he prefers to be known as a white, or European, identitarian. The most prominent group of women in the Alt-Right consider themselves as part of a faction known as TradLife, where they promote traditional living comparable to that of the 1950s when women remained confined to the home and focused on cooking, cleaning, and raising children. While some of them stop short of declaring themselves white nationalists, segregation and a white nation are fundamental components of their goal of living a TradLife.

Sometimes, however, I refer to these people as what they are—white supremacists. All of their speeches, writings, and tweets convey their universal belief that nonwhites simply cannot function in white Western civilization, nor can they contribute anything good to it. This thesis shows why they believe so and why they believed that Donald Trump would fix the nation that they believe nonwhites have destroyed.

CHAPTER II

"'TO KEEP THE N------ IN THEIR PLACE:' THE ORIGINS OF CONTEMPORARY WHITE NATIONALISM"

On a warm summer evening in 1867 in Pulaski, Tennessee, a white man "mounted on a snow-white horse and clad in a mantle as ghostly as that of the White Crook" met a black man at a spring. The white man "approached the negro … and asked for a drink of water in such an unearthly whisper." The black man offered the white man some water from a small bottle, but the white man replied that it was not enough and asked for a bucket. The black man obliged. To the astonishment of the black man, the ghostly man drank the entire bucket of water in seconds. When the black man asked if he really drank all the water, the white man replied that he did indeed. He then declared that he was a Confederate soldier and that this had been his first drink of water since he had died in battle. The black man fled in fright. The white man then "quietly drew out of his chest a gum-elastic bottle of the capacity of several gallons, emptied the water out of it that had been artificially swallowed, returned the vessel to his shirt bosom, and rode off into the night."[1]

These kinds of tricksters with close association with African Americans had a deep history in the pre- and post-Civil War South. The Southern epitome of that trickster

is the mythical Jack, who usually appeared at the edges of societies. Jack occupied the cultural frontier of societies in upheaval. His presence, or use, was an attempt to restore order in a world where order was, at best, elusive and, at worst, under attack by outsiders. At the same time, Jack attacked cultural and societal hierarchies to illustrate what was wrong in their communities. In both ways, in the post-War South, Jack epitomized racialized gender roles by personifying a brand of white masculinity as he attacked elite perceptions of masculinity as well as their sense of order to show that it was the people on the ground who secured white men's rule over others, especially black men. In the post-Civil War South, where Northerners attempted to impose a new racial hierarchy, and thereby threatened prevailing perceptions of masculinity, tricksters emerged as a way to keep black men from voting and to restore white supremacy and white masculinity.[2] In this way, whites in the post-Civil War South resurrected a cultural tradition of tricksters to put to the new use of oppressing African Americans.

These kinds of incidents, perpetrated by the Ku Klux Klan, occurred often in Pulaski and, later, across the southern United States. But Klansmen did more than simply scare African Americans. Klan members terrorized blacks to force them to behave and, when that tactic failed to compel blacks into obedience, Klan members brutalized and murdered blacks to scare them out of politics and into submission.

Considered a terrorist organization by the U.S. government, this first iteration of the Ku Klux Klan consisted of Southern white men upset over the upheaval of their society during and after the Civil War. They hated the loss of honor after the War, the physical and governmental intrusion of Northerners, and, most significantly, the advancement of African Americans through the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and, later, the

Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. Combined, the Amendments freed enslaved African Americans, gave them citizenship, and awarded black men the right to vote. Such radical moves enraged Southern whites. Desperate to preserve white men's pride and power over blacks, the Ku Klux Klan sought to suppress African Americans through scare tactics, disarming them, intimidating them from voting, and murdering them as well as any white who sympathized with or helped them. This chapter explores how the Klan rose, fell, and evolved from the Reconstruction era through the twentieth century. It investigates who joined the Klan, why they joined it, and what they did. Doing so reveals how whites in the South and then throughout the United States fought to maintain their privileged, powerful position in U.S. society in the decades between the end of the Civil War and the beginning of the Civil Rights movement. As they felt that power slipping away, Klan members fought harder and ever more violently to preserve a world they imagined and a world they imagined they were losing.

In the late stages of the Civil War, Republicans in the United States began considering how they might rebuild a country that had been disputing slavery for decades and at war with itself for years. On one end of the spectrum, some wanted an easier reconciliation with Confederates while, on the other end of the spectrum, some wanted to treat Confederates more harshly. Those in favor of reconciliation hoped to allow Confederates to revoke their bills of secession and return to being members of the United States. On the harsher end, Radical Republicans such as Thaddeus Stevens wanted to confiscate Confederates' land and redistribute it to formerly enslaved people, and they wanted to extend the vote to all freedmen. Doing so, they hoped, would level Southern society as well as offer ex-slaves a way to provide for themselves and their families by

making them independent freeholders. Radical Republicans also saw the political benefits of such a move and hoped that freedmen would support Republican candidates throughout the South. Additionally, some members of the Democratic Party wanted no kind of Reconstruction at all.

Most political leaders in the United States, including Abraham Lincoln and then Andrew Johnson, took a more centrist approach, although what that meant to each person differed considerably. While Lincoln was murdered before he could fully implement his vision of Reconstruction, he indicated that he was increasingly in favor of granting ex-enslaved men the vote, but he also wanted to incorporate Confederates back into the U.S. as painlessly as possible. Once he was president, however, Johnson was unwilling to extend the vote to black men or to extend the citizenship rights of former slaves nearly at all. When Republicans in Congress pushed forward their brand of Reconstruction, which included giving black men more political power as well as establishing the Freedmen's Bureau, Johnson vetoed those acts. Congress retaliated by overriding the president's veto and, shortly thereafter, filed impeachment charges for removing from his position the acting Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, and replacing him with Lorenzo Thomas. When Ulysses S. Grant won the presidency in 1968, he pushed for measures endorsed by Congressional Republicans such as the protection of African Americans in the South, and he declared the newly formed Ku Klux Klan to be illegal. He ordered it disbanded.

While African American men acquired some political power and were protected by U.S. troops from white Southerners who used violence to prevent them from voting, Reconstruction essentially ended in 1877. Rutherford B. Hayes became president in 1877 after a disputed election that resulted in a compromise in which the South regained its

power. Although a member of the Republican Party, the party that had tried to uplift African Americans, Hayes began to withdraw troops from the South. After that, the federal government retreated from its former objective of ensuring equal rights for all citizens. The removal of troops left African Americans at white Southerners' mercy. White Southerners regained their influential power in the U.S. government, paving the way for them to enact Jim Crow laws to keep African Americans oppressed.[3]

In that context, the first Ku Klux Klan emerged in Pulaski, Tennessee, in the months after the Civil War ended in April 1865. It drew from a variety of men, but nearly all had either served in the Confederate army or sympathized with aspects of the Confederate cause. And they were all white. The Klan began as a fraternal organization in which men from various professions joined together to preserve the power and position they worried they were losing after the War.[4] That they would lose both to black men who had been recently enslaved, and then freed, only further infuriated Klan members. The group remained primarily known only locally until August 1868 when the *New York Times* described it to the country as a "strong secret organization" of former Confederates "who believ[ed] that the South [could] only be made to prosper by the driving out of all white Radicals, and getting the negroes under some form of control by white men."[5] Even from the organization's earliest days, Klan members understood that they were fighting to preserve a racial hierarchy in the United States.

The notable former Confederate most often credited with starting the Klan, although he repeatedly denied it, was Nathan Bedford Forrest of Tennessee. After serving as a general in the War, Forrest returned home to Memphis to work as a sharecropper, but he found the city in chaos. On May 1, 1866, a riot shook the city after police had arrested

a black man who had fought a white man. When a group of black veterans confronted the police to free the man they arrested, the police refused, and the crowd of former Union soldiers opened fire on the policemen. Several white men shot back. The city descended into turmoil over the next two days as groups of whites hunted down and killed blacks around Memphis. The city's police department did nothing to prevent the killing and, worse, often participated in it. As law and order in Memphis deteriorated into a race war, news of the rioting and killing reached Governor William G. Brownlow and other Radical Reconstructionists. Together, these men had worked to promote black equality in the post-Civil War United States and pushed for legislation to replace local authorities in Memphis. At the same time, Brownlow hoped to cement what he started, the replacement of ex-Confederates in power in Tennessee with white and black politicians and authorities who supported Radical Republicans and their agenda. He did so by supporting, and gathering support for, black suffrage while denying it to ex-Confederates.[6]

For Forrest, the race riot in Memphis and Brownlow's actions epitomized all that he hated and all that he feared. Like other whites throughout the South, Forrest had lived in fear of an armed black uprising, which he saw come to life in painful reality in May 1866 in Memphis. That Brownlow would support black rioters, and push to give black men the vote, enraged Forrest because Brownlow was, for Forrest, betraying white men as well as the United States. According to Forrest, Brownlow was paving the way for black men to gain power, which they would together assuredly use to suppress whites. Not long after the rioting in Memphis, Forrest decried that "mendacious hostility of our legislative enemies" intended to make whites throughout the South "live under the

accumulated weight of disfranchisement and oppression."[7] To prevent that, Forrest organized the Klan.

Whites joined the Klan for several reasons. Generally, they despised Reconstruction policies that gave African Americans freedom, citizenship, and suffrage. Some, such as former Confederate general John Brown Gordon, became distraught that black men had gained so much power.[8] Additionally, riots between whites and blacks had turned some towns into a new war zone.[9] Many white Southerners also joined the Klan to thwart the activities of the Union Leagues, or Loyal Leagues, established to help integrate African Americans into U.S. society. Forrest, for example, testified that he believed the Klan was organized to oppose the Loyal Leagues.[10] Similarly, former Klansman John Tomlinson stated that Klan members were "sworn against the Union League" and sworn to "do all things in opposition to the Union League."[11] In Tennessee, many white men joined the Klan because they hated Governor Brownlow and wanted to reverse policies they thought threatened white rule. Worse, as far as Tennesseans were concerned, was that Brownlow gave blacks the right to vote while denying it to white ex-Confederates. Brownlow also threatened, and later declared, martial law in Tennessee, which further enraged Klansmen. To them, martial law represented more encroachment from the North and from the government.[12]

Besides a way to overcome Brownlow's policies, whites in both Tennessee and across the South saw the Klan as a way to keep African Americans in their place, subordinate to whites. In that way, the Klan offered them a way to maintain white supremacy. Beginning in 1868, African Americans had begun to make economic and political gains. Some of them won seats in Congress, and others found jobs working in

schools and on railroads.[13] Forrest "reportedly said, [the Klan is] 'a damn good thing. We can use that to keep the n------ in their place.'"[14] The Klan fought so hard because, to them, the struggle for white supremacy was a zero-sum game—in their view, any power blacks gained, white men lost. To prevent that decline, Klansmen believed that whites must remain in command over others. It was, for them, the natural order. For them, whites "[belonged] to a race which nature has endowed with an evident superiority over all other races."[15] White Southerners outside the Klan believed the same thing. A lawmaker in Georgia argued the Klan "intended to control the colored race in every respect, politically as well as in every other way, and to keep them in subjection to the whites."[16] For like-minded people throughout the United States, no other goal was so important.

To fully preserve racial hierarchy in the U.S., however, Klan members needed to render black men powerless and oppressed. Southern whites viewed their world to be in turmoil when African Americans began actively resisting them. Nothing illustrated that more clearly than the murder of a Klansman in Mississippi in April 1868 "by a party of negroes whom they were attempting to frighten."[17] Such an attack terrified whites because, in areas throughout the South, blacks outnumbered them, which caused even more fear of black retaliation. In fact, some Southern whites feared black retaliation so much that they slept with their guns.[18] White men took many measures to protect themselves from blacks who might retaliate against them, including joining the Klan to help keep them under control.

Those efforts began in the household, which white Southerners knew as the foundations of their society. Thus, to protect their society, and to preserve white

supremacy, they needed to protect white women from black men. They worried black men were committed to raping white women as a way to assert their newly acquired power and freedom. More than that, by having sex with white women, black men challenged the white men's masculinity. White Southern men built their masculinity around whiteness, honor, and their ability to protect the people who lived in their households, especially women. The Klan needed to assert its control over black men's sexual behavior because, as Forrest and others believed, official institutions were failing whites in that regard. Forrest, for one, lamented that "ladies were ravished by some of these negroes, who were tried and put in the penitentiary, but were turned out in a few days afterward."[19] When their legal institutions failed them, Klan members such as Forrest took the law into their own hands. More than that, though, Klansmen viewed themselves as heroes to these women, and chasing down blacks accused of rape served as a way to reassert their supremacy over them. Women, they figured, could rest more easily knowing that the Klan was there to protect them from black men.[20] Klansmen also fought against interracial marriage. According to Trelease, Klansmen "often claimed that a major purpose of the order was to prevent miscegenation and the mongrelization of the white race through intermarriage."[21] In this way, being a member of the Klan helped defeated Southern men recover some of the masculinity they lost in the Civil War and whenever black men married and had sex with white women. The Klan was a way for them to restore a semblance of order to their world.

Whether they joined to subjugate blacks, protect white women from black men, or to prevent interracial marriages, the common themes of racism and fear were always present. And those fears drove men to join the Klan. In the five years from 1865 to 1870,

roughly 550,000 Southerners joined the Klan, all of them hoping to use their collective power to oppress blacks, protect white women from predatory black men, and to preserve white supremacy.[22]

To achieve their goals, the Klan used various tactics. The Klan's tactics began as what they deemed harmless pranks built on a tradition of tricksters in the South. While some drank enormous amounts of water and said "something such as: 'That's the first drink I've had since I was killed at the battle of Shiloh, and you get mighty thirsty in Hell,'" others put on a false head made out of a gourd and wrapped themselves in a robe. When they confronted a black person, they removed the false head and "[requested] that he 'hold [his] head a minute.'"[23] Such ghostly tactics terrified African Americans.

As election days neared, and as tricks failed to keep black men from voting or running for office, Klansmen resorted to more effective tactics to ensure that both blacks and whites either voted the Democratic ticket or stayed home on election day. In 1870, for example, Klansmen visited Samuel White, a white man and a member of the Republican Party. Klansmen hoped to make him see his errors by whipping him and ordering him to publicly withdraw from the Republican Party. If he refused, the Klan promised, ominously, to visit him again.[24] Klansmen also manned the polls and, in some places, prevented blacks from voting. In states such as Georgia, the Klan forced people to prove that they had paid a poll tax before allowing them to vote. In others, as in Tennessee, Klan members "seized" a "Confederate veteran who cast a Republican ballot … put [him] on a block, and offered [him] for sale as a 'white nigger.'"[25]

The Klan also tried to drive out blacks, and whites who supported them, from their communities. In 1868, for example, Governor Brownlow, who ultimately supported

black suffrage, "received threatening letters from the Kuklux Klan, containing pictures of coffins and a gallows."[26] The threat was clear: Leave or die. The Klan sent similar notices to students from the North who attended Southern universities. In Alabama, some college students received notices that said if they did not leave "in less than ten days" then they should "look out for hell."[27] The Klan targeted students and teachers at black schools because they thought they were Radicals and carpetbaggers who sought to subject white Southerners to black rule.

When threats failed, the Klan used violence against whites who had shown any sympathy towards African Americans. In September 1868, the Klan set fire to some Quakers' mills in Kentucky. One of the Quakers, in a letter to a friend that was published in a *New York Times* article, speculated that the Klan targeted them because they "hire[d] the negroes and pa[id] them for their work, and nearly all around [the area] want[ed] to work for [them], because [they] treat[ed] them like men and pa[id] them as such."[28]

In many cases, the Klan used deadly force. Klan members saw educated black men as a particular threat. In 1871, when a black man who "could read and write and had talked of starting a Negro school," Klan members considered him "too big a man" so they chased him down, shot him, and killed him.[29] When the Klan targeted a victim, they rarely cared who stood in their way. Even disabled children did not escape the Klan's wrath. In November 1869, the Klan visited the home of Perry Jeffers, a black man in Georgia. Jeffers and some of his children escaped into the woods, but his wife and disabled son remained in the house, "mistaken in thinking that [their] helplessness … would protect them." The Klansmen hanged the woman, who miraculously lived, and they shot the son and threw his body into the pile of the family's furniture they had set on

fire.[30] Additionally, the Klan hardly limited their murderous outrages to blacks. In Tennessee, the Klan was well known to murder Radicals in "in cold blood."[31]

The Klan remained active for years in the post-Civil War South in part because the press refused to take it seriously. The press helped disseminate the view that the Klan's original tactics, pretending to be Confederate ghosts, were simply pranks. While white supremacists found ready support from like-minded editors in the South, Northerners played a role in downplaying the Klan. In April 1868, after Klan members began attacking blacks, the *New York Times*'s writers and staff said they refused to "believe there has been much intimidation of the blacks by the Southern whites."[32] While it may have sometimes occurred, they said, "it has had hardly the slightest effect."[33] One month later, the *New York Times* called the Klan an "imaginary conspiracy."[34] When people later began publicly denouncing the Klan, and when officials collected records of attacks, newspapers across the country started to notice. By then, however, the Klan was operating freely throughout parts of the South and had acquired a stranglehold over state and local politics as a result of its violence and voter intimidation tactics.

Once the Klan held sway over, or was viewed positively by, Southern political institutions, Klan members acted with impunity. In Louisiana, for example, Klan members drove the police force out of Gretna.[35] Once done, the Klan stepped in to fill the vacuum to enforce the law as Klan members saw fit. When the Klan fell short of controlling the police, Klan members subverted the judicial process by rigging the system to allow accused Klansmen to escape the charges. The Klan also stacked juries with Klansmen in order to acquit its members. John C. Reed, a Klansman who became a prosecutor, selected Klansmen for a jury in one of his cases, identifying them by a secret

signal—the form of touching the ear with the thumb and forefinger.[36] When states such as Arkansas and Tennessee figured out how the Klan controlled politics, the police, and the courts, they tried to regain control by imposing martial law, but that rarely worked. The Klan outnumbered the soldiers, they were often better armed, and they often had broad local support.

When the Klan began to subvert legal and political processes successfully and more broadly, the federal government began investigating it. As evidence of the Klan's activities mounted, federal investigators pressured the Klan to retreat. On October 20, 1869, Forrest obliged and gave the order for the Klan to disband. Forrest argued that the Klan was being "perverted from its original honorable and patriotic purpose." As a result, the Klan had lost its initial directive of working for white supremacy and for providing peace in the South. Instead, he argued, the Klan had become "injurious instead of subservient to the public peace and public safety for which it was intended."[37] Most Klansmen, however, continued to assault and kill African Americans until, and even after, Congress passed the Ku Klux Klan Act in 1871.

Congress passed the Ku Klux Klan Act, part of the Enforcement Acts of 1871, on April 20, 1871. In many regards, the Ku Klux Klan Act was an attempt to "enforce the Fourteenth Amendment."[38] The Act echoes that Amendment by stating that any person who seeks to deprive any citizen of his civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution shall be subjected to lawsuits by the individual they seek to oppress as well as to prosecution in several jurisdictions.[39] The Act also forbids any conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. government and compelled people knowing of any such conspiracy to come forward or face potential punishment.[40] Most significantly, the law gives the president power "to

suspend the privileges of the writ of habeas corpus" and to declare martial law in order to protect citizens' rights.[41] Ultimately, because the Act declared the Klan unconstitutional and illegal, it dealt a heavy blow to the Klan. The Klan buckled and dissipated under the combined weight of Forrest's desire and the power the federal government brought to bear on members after Congress passed the Ku Klux Klan Act.

The Klan also began to fade because, by 1870 and certainly by 1877, there was simply no need to violently intimidate blacks or whites to achieve white supremacy or control over political institutions. The Klan had succeeded in reducing blacks' presence on voting rolls, at voting booths, and in political office. White Southerners, who had believed the world was being turned upside-down by Northern Republicans and politically active blacks, felt they had regained a great deal of control over their communities. In his testimony to Congress, John B. Gordon stated, frankly, that the Klan died out "because the people felt safe."[42] People felt even safer after the election of 1877 when President Rutherford B. Hayes pulled federal troops out of the South as part of a compromise that gave him the presidency. Democrats had also started making gains in state elections, so the need for the Klan further diminished. Ex-Confederates won back their right to vote, and white Southerners began enacting Jim Crow laws as peaceful ways to keep African Americans in their place of subordination. Violence, however, still occurred against African Americans at the hands of white Southerners.[43]

While the Klan faded, it refused to die. More accurately, the racism and xenophobia that fueled its rise never waned entirely. In February 1915, the release of the movie *The Birth of a Nation*, based on Thomas Dixon's novel *The Clansman: An Historical Romance of the Ku Klux Klan* rekindled the flickering racism and bigotry.

Many viewers took the film as historically accurate even though it was not. The movie is an ahistorical portrayal of the South as innocent in the Civil War. Worse, it portrays the Klan as heroes who save the South from black domination set in motion by Radical Republicans during Reconstruction. When it premiered, *The Birth of a Nation* sparked riots and protests across the nation, and its glorifying of the Klan contributed to the rise of the second Klan that same year.

The movie centers on the Cameron family in Piedmont, South Carolina. Three Cameron sons fight in the War but only one, Ben, survives, and then only after a pardon by President Abraham Lincoln. At War's end, the Cameron family finds their plantation, like the South, in ruins. Worse, for them, their world has been turned upside-down because African Americans came to rule the South in nearly every conceivable way. The only way to save themselves and the South, the Camerons concluded, was to start the Klan, which became the engine for the South's true salvation.[44]

The Birth of a Nation resonated among white Americans caught in the midst of World War I. Before and during the War, the nation had been undergoing massive reforms such as the institution of a federal income tax and the fight for women's suffrage. Although the War had not yet reached the U.S. in 1915 when the movie premiered, Americans, caught in an atmosphere of change, undoubtedly worried about what was coming. That new immigrants began moving to the U.S. in greater numbers since the turn of the century only compounded white Southerners' worries over the kind of society that was emerging in the twentieth-century United States. While the War fueled people's patriotism, the increased immigration inspired their nationalism and, in some, a deeper racism. In that way, World War I highlighted the growing immigrant population in the

United States. The massive influx of immigrants signified to some whites the slow erosion of the country's white majority.

In 1915, William J. Simmons acted on those fears and emotions when he revived the Klan. Born in Harpersville, Alabama in 1880, Simmons grew up on a farm. By the Spanish-American War, in 1898, Simmons had joined the military.[45] After his service in the military, Simmons floated from job to job. For a few years, he was a minister. For few others, he was a teacher. Whatever his job, however, Simmons grew increasingly dissatisfied with the direction the country was moving. Simmons believed that Americans, and especially immigrants, lacked the patriotism he had developed while fighting in the Spanish-American War. Worse, to Simmons, was the country's immorality, fueled by the increasing number of immigrants and the degeneracy they spread among the native-born population, particularly white Americans. For him, the solution to the dual problem of flagging patriotism and growing degeneracy was the Klan, and, in the early stages of World War I, he became determined to revive it.

While recovering from an automobile accident, Simmons worked out how.[46] No better time existed for the rebirth of the Klan than in 1915 with the War looming, immigration to the U.S. on the rise, and "increasing public enthusiasm toward the old Reconstruction Klan generated by" *The Birth of a Nation*. In a ceremony on Thanksgiving night in 1915, Simmons and a group of white Southern men met at Stone Mountain in Georgia and lit a wooden cross ablaze and, with that, the second iteration of the Klan was born.[47]

The second Klan, known as the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, aspired to save the nation, not just the South, from African Americans, as well as from Catholics and Jews,

and to stave off the growing moral degeneracy that plagued the country. To do so, these Klan members, much like those of the Reconstruction Klan, terrorized African Americans as a kind of vigilante justice for whites who felt their country had lost both its moorings and its moral purpose. For Simmons, the "original Ku Klux Klan sprang from the urgent necessities of the Reconstruction period," necessitated by "'Carpet-Baggers' and 'Scalawags'" who wanted to turn African Americans against the South and, more broadly, against whites. Those people threatened a Southern history and culture as well as white supremacy by establishing "for all time the supremacy of the Negro over our Anglo-Saxon people and civilization." It was *The Birth of a Nation* come to life, and Simmons wanted his new Klan to emulate the actions of the old one depicted in the movie. To that end, Simmons urged new Klan members to reverse the teachings of Northerners who allegedly instructed African Americans to hate whites, and he insisted that the expansion of voting rights paved the way for the invasion of "an alien race, untaught, unskilled and incapable of government" into "our legislatures" and white culture. Simmons believed that reviving the Klan was the only way to reclaim a lost history and civilization.[48]

Although Simmons claimed that the Klan was not racist, quite simply, it was. Simmons himself defined Americans as "white, native-born citizens of this country whose ancestry, birth and training has been such to give them today a full share in the basic principles, the ideals and the practice of our American civilization." To Simmons, true Americans can only be white, and they must have descended from the true Americans who fought during the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. Interestingly, Simmons had to make race part of his definition because plenty of African Americans fought for

independence from Britain between 1775 and 1783. That said, anyone who fell outside his definition of American—anyone who was African American, Asian, Middle Eastern, or Hispanic—was not, and never could be, American.[49]

To keep the United States racially pure, the new Klan wanted to limit or end immigration to the U.S. from countries such as Japan and Mexico. Simmons saw the influx of immigrants from both places as a serious threat to white civilization. According to Simmons, "If [Mexican] immigration continues through the next generation THEY WILL FOREVER ENCROACH UPON AND OCCUPY OUR SOUTHWEST."[50] For Simmons, the point was clear: The United States was on the brink of racial apocalypse and immigrants represented more than a threat to white culture—they personified that apocalypse. Simmons worried that if immigrants, and African Americans, voted themselves into office at any level, they, as unskilled politicians, would ruin the democratic principles upon which the U.S. was built. Nothing horrified Simmons and many other American whites more than the fall of white democracy at the hands of nonwhite immigrants.

Whereas the first Klan was predicated on reclaiming an imagined past that opposed attempts by Northerners to control the South, the second Klan presented itself as patriotic and, even more so, nationalistic. The Klan's Imperial Proclamation states that the Klan was "an association of real men … who are in all things 100 per cent pure American" and committed to upholding "an uncompromising standard of pure Americanism untrammeled by alien influences and free from the entanglements of foreign alliances."[51] The second Klan prioritized the U.S. ahead of all other countries, a sentiment that Klan members proclaimed with the slogan "America First." Simmons

portrayed the Klan as an organization formed to protect the democratic and constitutional principles of the U.S. as well as to preserve law and order. The Klan, according to Simmons, was "neither anti-racial nor anti-sectarian. It [was] pro-American. [It] concede[d] to every distinctive organization in race and religion the same rights of restricting and qualifying its membership that [they] claim[ed] for [them]selves." Simmons claimed that he extended the same constitutional rights of whites to those of other races, but, in reality, he restricted those rights to Americans, a group Simmons had already defined as whites only. In doing so, he tried to wrap a thin veil of patriotism around the Klan's racism and jingoism. He also pointed out that immigrants were "nine times as prone to crime as our native-born Americans." Worse, he continued, their numbers and "nationalistic tendencies" caused them to "organize themselves into separate communities and often breed hostility to American institutions."[52] By portraying African Americans and immigrants as dangerous to U.S. democracy, Simmons and people like him made racism the excuse and not the reason for oppressing minorities in the name of patriotism.

The atmosphere after World War I provided cultural, political, and ideological space for the second Klan to recruit new members as jingoism, racism, and xenophobia proliferated in the United States. Quite simply, the new Klan tapped into "the fears of many white contemporaries in the anxious years after the Great War," which included fears of organization by "blacks, Catholics, and Jews, along with the insidious encroachments of Bolshevism." In 1919 alone, for example, the U.S. Department of Justice reacted to the growing Red Scare by conducting the Palmer Raids, "a nationwide dragnet against radicals named for the Attorney General [A. Mitchell Palmer] under

whose direction they proceeded" in January 1920.[53] More broadly, the summer of 1919 was dubbed the "Red Summer" because of the number of racial conflicts that rocked the country. Racial conflict only increased during and after the Great Migration of the 1920s as African Americans competed with whites for jobs in the North. Bitter whites joined the second Klan in order to preserve their way of life, which included job opportunities. But more importantly, people joined the Klan to help protect social order, and, of course, maintain white supremacy both socially and politically. The new Klan welcomed them all.

The second Klan especially appealed to white, middle-class Protestant men. "In general," according to Nancy MacLean, "these were middling men: neither élite employers and brokers nor, as today's popular conceptions of the Klan would have it, 'poor white trash.'"[54] The new Klan consisted of veterans, doctors, dentists, teachers, farmers, bankers, ministers, judges, lawyers, and politicians. Most Klansmen also practiced various forms of Protestant Christianity. In this sense, the makeup of the second Klan mirrored that of the Reconstruction Klan—middle-class, white, Christian people who strove to build and preserve a society in which they exercised power and enjoyed economic opportunities. They strove to fight the social evils that plagued the United States in the 1920s, and the second Klan gave them the conduit through which they could conduct their battles.

The Klan opposed a variety of behavior that indicated, at least to them, the decline not just of society in general but the instability of the household, the building block of American society. While more Americans were drinking, dancing, and gambling, divorce rates skyrocketed as women embraced feminism and the independence that came with it.

Juvenile delinquency had reached an all-time high. The Klan became alarmed at the change in social order because "white men's loss of power over their own children and wives," according to MacLean, "was accompanied by a loss of leverage in public life."[55]

Simmons targeted cities and immigrants for reform because that is where he saw the problems of degeneracy, and the danger to American whites' standard of living, most clearly. The American city, he argued, had "been an irresistible lure to the unhappy and oppressed peoples of the world." Great tides of immigrants had washed ashore on the United States, but they had not dispersed throughout the countryside. Instead, according to Simmons, "the alien peoples" have remained "congested in our great centers." But many could not read or write, and most, allegedly, refused to assimilate, which hurt the Klan's goal of 100 percent Americanism. Furthermore, in Simmons's view, immigrants brought down Americans' standard of living by taking jobs formerly done by whites. Most manufacturers hired immigrants because they worked for low wages and rarely complained about dangerous working conditions. Simmons also argued that the "foreign communities" that increasingly dominated the country's cities became the centers for all "forms of social and political vices," especially consuming alcohol. To that end, the Klan wanted to shut down saloons and its members favored Prohibition.[56] In order to restore American cities, to protect the American standard of living, and to reverse corruption by immigrants, the Klan sought to end immigration to the United States.

As much as Simmons hated immigrants, he hated black people more. He considered African Americans uncivilized and a drain on the nation, and he sometimes quoted President Grover Cleveland, who insisted that it was a mistake to bring Africans to the U.S. in the slave trade. In *The Klan Unmasked*, he used Social Darwinism to

legitimate his view that African Americans were inferior. To Simmons, African Americans did not have the mental capability to live in a civilized society because they simply cannot bear the responsibility of such law.[57] Simmons considered blacks inferior and he hoped to facilitate the rise of a segregated society because he declared them to be a stain on the nation.

Since the Klan viewed African Americans as a stain and drain on the nation, it inflicted horrific terror and violence against them. In Macon, Georgia, for example, the Klan shot Eugene Hamilton after taking him from the county jailhouse in 1919. Hamilton's offense was shooting a white man.[58] Then, in 1921, the Klan kidnapped Alex Johnson, a bellboy at a Dallas, Texas, hotel, and took him to a spot where they "flogged him and then branded with acid the letters 'K.K.K.' on his forehead." Klan members had caught Johnson in a hotel room with a white woman.[59] Indeed, the second Klan was every bit as violent towards African Americans as the first Klan was.

The second Klan, however, did not exist only in the South. It was particularly active in the Midwest and extremely powerful in Mahoning Valley, Ohio. According to William D. Jenkins, Youngstown, Ohio, "had evolved into a society ready to receive the Klan message" before the Klan even reached it.[60] Youngstown grew into a prosperous steel town as the U.S. industrialized in the late decades of the nineteenth century, and the prospect of more jobs brought immigrants, which included Catholics and Jews, seeking opportunities. Initially, few locals noticed but, as the number of immigrants grew in the early decades of the twentieth century, long-time residents of the region grew increasingly antagonistic. As Simmons said, these immigrants differed from the original immigrants to the U.S. because they were used to a lower standard of living and only

came for jobs and money rather than to adopt American values.[61] Youngstown thus became a prime example of what Simmons declared to be the threat of whites' "extinction upon [their] own soil."[62] To Simmons, and the rest of the Klan, pure Americans were a vanishing people, and Youngstown had become a prime example of that trend. Because of this fear, Youngstown quickly became a hotbed for Klan activity.

By the early 1920s, the Klan's hard tactics began paying off with political gains in Youngstown and elsewhere in Ohio. In the 1923 municipal elections, several mayoral Klan-backed candidates won offices in "Youngstown, Portsmouth, Akron and several other smaller cities."[63] The Klan supported Charles Scheible for mayor because of his reputation "as an upright Christian businessman concerned about the morality of the city and the efficiency of the government," and it believed he would help restore the order that degeneracy had ruined in Youngstown.[64] The Klan also endorsed candidates who won the positions of city commissioners and took seats on the board of education in Middletown, Ohio. The incredible success of the Klan in the 1923 Ohio elections prompted the *New York Times* to remark:

> There are probably more members of the Ku Klux Klan in Ohio than in any other State in the Union. … The Klan is in politics in Ohio. … today it holds the balance of power, and the day is not far distant … before the masked forces will be in control in Ohio just as they are in Indiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Oregon and Arkansas. … How well it is succeeding in this direction is indicated by yesterday's elections.[65]

Ohio's elections cemented the Klan's growing power as it tried to purge the U.S. of anyone who was not a pure American, including African Americans, Catholics, and Jews. After those elections, the Klan surged to power across the nation.

As the second Klan grew in political prominence in the 1920s, it increasingly espoused anti-Semitic views. The Klan's hatred of Jews grew as more Jewish immigrants

arrived on American shores, and Klan members increasingly clashed with Jews over racial pride. To Klansmen, and men like them, Jews belonged to a different race. Jews, according to Simmons, "are perhaps the most exclusive people in the civilized world. Their racial pride exceeds the pride of any nation or any land," and they refused to assimilate into the U.S. and to adopt American values. [66] Hiram Wesley Evans, who succeeded Simmons as Imperial Wizard of the Klan, complained that Jews criticized "anything American," and declared that "the most menacing and most difficult problem facing America … is … the permanently unassimilable alien," referring to Jews.[67] For Simmons, and then for Evans, Jews needed to be suppressed or driven out of the United States.

Women agreed. When women won the right to vote in 1920, the Klan claimed that a women's order "could safeguard women's suffrage and expand women's other legal rights while working to preserve white Protestant supremacy." Women had also become dismayed at the perceived degeneracy of the nation, particularly alcohol consumption. Kathleen Blee estimates that "perhaps half a million or more" women "joined the Women of the Ku Klux Klan (WKKK)." Recruitment proved easy with nativist and fierce religious rhetoric. Daisy Douglas Barr became vocal about her hated of alcohol, immigrants, Catholics, and Jews, and, in July 1923, Evans appointed her to "organize several chapters of the WKKK" across the Midwest that many like-minded women joined. [68] Like the Reconstruction Klan, the WKKK, for women, served as a social group where they could form and maintain friendships. Generally, the WKKK refrained from violence, but in some cases, Klanswomen could be just as violent as Klansmen.

Despite its once-growing popularity, membership in the second Klan declined during the Depression and World War II. The Depression ravaged already poor men and left them unable to pay the Klan's membership dues. According to William Rawlings, even in the earliest stages of the Depression, roughly "ninety-nine percent of Klansmen had abandoned the order."[69] But the Klan began its decline even earlier. Approximately three years after the *New York Times* commented on the Klan's growth and political successes, a reporter decided the Klan was weakening. In Ohio, where the Klan had previously swept municipal elections, a survey revealed that the Klan was "disintegrating rapidly" and would soon "be little more than a memory."[70] The city of Cleveland, for example, prohibited a Klan parade in June 1926 on the grounds that it was a threat to public safety.[71] Throughout the next decade, the Klan continued to diminish.

The second Klan met its demise in 1944, but as it gradually weakened, its former targets rose up in opposition. African Americans began to stand up to it. When Klan members attempted to prevent Miami blacks from voting in a May 1939 election, blacks defied them. When "white-robed men in more than fifty automobiles with shielded licenses paraded through the Negro section" to frighten would-be black voters, African Americans "ignored [those] warnings" and instead "cast a record vote" in that election.[72] By the late stages of World War II, the second Klan was all but finished, and it did not take Congressional legislation to end it. By 1943, the Klan's violent actions had received the attention of the press, and the U.S. Congress started to investigate it. Under threat of that investigation, in 1944, Imperial Wizard Jimmy Colescott ordered the Klan to disband "as a national group," and the second Klan was finished.[73]

Again, while the organization disappeared, the bigotry and racialized nationalism that fed it remained a powerful force in the United States. As a result, after the second Klan's national disbandment, white supremacists revived the Klan a third time to oppose the Civil Rights movement that began in the 1950s. This third Klan remains active today. Before the 1950s, many whites had no intention of ever interacting with African Americans, but integration, a core element of the Civil Rights movement, forced greater racial interaction. To push the issue, as well as to highlight the high level of segregation in American society, black activists took a three-pronged approach to erasing segregation. First, they entered or patronized what had been all-white establishments such as restaurants and public transportation. Second, they registered to vote and encouraged other blacks to register to vote, and then to vote, to make political gains at the polls. Third, Civil Rights leaders questioned the legality and constitutionality of segregation in courts. In the early 1950s, activists carried *Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954) to the Supreme Court to protest segregated schools. In a landmark decision, the U.S. Supreme Court declared separate but equal schools unconstitutional.

The Court's decision in *Brown* became a turning point in the Civil Rights movement. It inspired widespread activism among Civil Rights advocates throughout the country. In December 1955, for example, Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat to a white man on a bus. After defying the bus driver, and, at that time, the law, Parks was arrested. African Americans responded, in part, by boycotting public bus service in Montgomery, Alabama, a protest that last roughly one year.[74] During the boycott, blacks walked where they needed to go rather than participate in institutionalized segregation. The boycott shined a spotlight on the kind of institutionalized racism prevalent

throughout the South and compelled the federal government and court to act. In *Browder v. Gayle* (1956), the Supreme Court declared the Montgomery, Alabama, laws that segregated buses unconstitutional.

As important as these cases were as rallying points for Civil Rights activists, they also became rallying points for white supremacists, who quickly realized that the struggle for civil rights and desegregation was being fought on every country road and on every street corner throughout the country. No one, white or black, could ignore it. And the Klan, determined to maintain white supremacy in spite of the gradual social advancement of African Americans, continued to make its presence known in an effort to intimidate black Americans. Soon after *Brown,* Klan members took action. In August 1955, Klan members protested integrated schools by lighting a cross in the yard of Oliver W. Hill in Richmond, Virginia. At the time, Hill was a lawyer for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and he had helped bring *Brown v Board* to the Supreme Court through a case in his own state regarding school segregation.[75]

As the Civil Rights movement gained momentum in the federal government, white supremacists began to take action at the federal level too. Ten years after Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of the bus, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. A year later he signed the Voting Rights Act of 1965 into law. Combined, the laws guaranteed African Americans their civil and political rights as citizens of the United States. But during the debate over the laws, and over the role the federal government should play in forced desegregation, white Southern politicians, already upset over President Harry S. Truman's desegregation of the military, began abandoning the Democratic Party. By pushing for the passage of the acts, Johnson, a

Democrat, opposed the longstanding tradition of Southern Democrats, or Dixiecrats, intent on suppressing civil rights for blacks. While some Dixiecrats supported Johnson, others, rather than stay in a party that promoted desegregation, abandoned the Democratic Party and joined the Republican Party. While Dixiecrats began leaving their traditional party in the 1950s, they began leaving in greater numbers in the 1960s after Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act. Thereafter, the South and, especially, Southern whites have consistently voted Republican in national elections with few exceptions. At the same time, many of those voters began joining the Klan.

The story of the Ku Klux Klan illustrates whites' fear of losing their supremacy and majority in the United States as well as how they mobilized to attempt, and succeed, in influencing national politics to achieve their goals of maintaining their supremacy and majority. The first two Klans subverted state and local politics because their members felt persecuted when Confederates lost the right to vote after the Civil War and when they believed that immigrants were invading the country in the early twentieth century. Integration during and after the Civil Rights movement upset them even more, and they organized again to oppose it. Since the beginning of Reconstruction, the Klan, in all of its forms, has acted on fear and racism through terrorism in physical, verbal, and psychological ways. It has grown from primarily a Southern organization in the late 1860s to branches all over the nation in the twenty-first century. The Klan still works to oppress nonwhites just as it did 150 years ago. The methods they use to do so, however, have changed. Klansmen no longer lynch African Americans or guard the polls to prevent them from voting, at least as an organization. Instead, they mask their racism by claiming that they seek to preserve the white race from black destruction.

CHAPTER III

"THE FIGHT AGAINST 'GET WHITEY:' WHITES' FIGHT TO PRESERVE WHITE SOCIETY IN THE POST-WORLD WAR II ERA"

By 1946, two generations of African Americans had fought around the world to preserve and extend people's liberty. When a semblance of peace had finally, if but temporarily, been restored after World War II, African Americans carried that fight for liberty home to the United States. They wanted to enjoy at home the same kinds of freedoms they had fought to protect abroad. Over the next twenty-five years, they carried their fight for equality to the Supreme Court, to the streets of Selma, and to the steps of the Capital. While Civil Rights activists fought long odds, and were often defeated, they won significant victories for desegregation in schools, buses, movie theaters, lunch counters, and in neighborhoods across the country. But as African Americans fighting for civil rights met with some success, they also encountered massive resistance from burgeoning white supremacist groups. The first main white nationalist movement, the Ku Klux Klan fragmented during World War II, but few white supremacists gave up on their fight to keep the races separated. The success of the reinvigorated struggle for Civil Rights after World War II spurred white supremacists to reorganize themselves into a variety of groups with separate goals, but all of them shared the goal of preserving a

segregated society. The two sides spent the remainder of the century struggling to achieve their conflicting goals for the rest of the country.

This chapter explores that contest by focusing on how the white nationalist movement fragmented into various white supremacist groups as they fought an increasingly powerful civil rights movement from 1946 to the end of the century in order to preserve the world they imagined, a world in which whites were superior to, and separate from, blacks. Some whites revived the Klan. Others, such as Neo-Confederates, wanted to revive Southern nationalism, and in turn, white supremacy, based on the Lost Cause ideology. Some joined the Citizens' Councils, whose members united explicitly to fight the Civil Rights movement as it gained momentum in the early 1950s onward. And still others organized grassroots political campaigns in white suburbs to preserve segregated schools everywhere. Furthermore, politicians such as Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan appealed to these groups to get themselves elected into political office. They did so by using coded language and racist stereotypes to convince white voters that they, and not their opponents, would help them achieve their goals.

Despite their differences, these groups shared goals. More than anything else, they strove to recreate a version of the United States in which African Americans were subordinate to, and separate from, whites. The fragmentation of the white nationalist movement, along with the conflicts within it and the ones it faced, reveal the breadth and depth of the racism lingering from the late nineteenth century and how white supremacists increasingly worked within the political structure and process of American society to achieve their goals. While white supremacists had relied on violence and terrorism to implement and preserve their political and social agendas before World War

II, after the War they began using the legal channels of politics and political activism to further their cause. As they entered mainstream American politics, the members of these groups suppressed their overt racism and began using coded language and actions to make their desires known. In the process, they made their goals the issues that defined and divided political parties and candidates at nearly every level of politics and brought them into the policy debates that shaped the kind of society that those people hoped to establish and preserve.

In the aftermath of the Civil War, and to get their communities as close to the pre-War society as possible, white Southerners enacted Jim Crow laws that legitimized racial segregation throughout the South. In *Plessy v Ferguson* (1896), the Supreme Court declared this brand of segregation constitutional. The doctrine laid out by the Court in *Plessy*, that separate but equal facilities were constitutional, continued as the law of the land until the Civil Rights movement attacked that doctrine in the post-World War II period.[1]

To justify that segregation of the United States, white Southerners adopted a cultural perspective that grew out of the Confederacy and that became, eighty years later, Neo-Confederacy. Advocates of this perspective began by reframing the horrifying violence of the recent war in the second half of the nineteenth century. In doing so, white writers built an ideology that reshaped the history of the South, the Civil War, and thus, the United States to give historical and legal legitimacy to their continued violence against, and oppression of, African Americans. They started by distorting the history of colonial North America and the United States to 1861 to mask slavery as the cause of the Civil War. Although the Antebellum South was built on and by slaves, and while the

Civil War grew out of Southerners' refusal to relinquish slavery, whites in the U.S. after 1877 recast the South as a place of honor invested in the sanctity of states' rights. When Confederate writers commonly named the War "The War Between the States," as William Pencak argues, they implied "that the war was about states' rights and sovereignty" rather than slavery. But to make such an assertion, Confederate writers had to rewrite history because their retelling of the War, as Pencak shows, "ignored the fact that state sovereignty was contested almost exclusively with respect to slavery."[2] More than that, Confederate writers were trying to reclaim the moral high ground they lost when they enslaved workers. Thus, they portrayed the Civil War as a war over states' rights to present the South as a heroic force reacting against an aggressive North.

But that argument is ahistorical. As Pencak shows, Southerners who seceded from the United States did not mention states' rights until after the War had started and, to be fair, "the only states' right the South really cared about was the right of slaveholders to take their slaves wherever they wanted."[3] To believe in the mythical heroic South, Southerners needed to ignore their joy over both the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 and the Supreme Court's decision in the Dred Scott case of 1857. To build a nostalgic South based on Christianity, Southerners needed to elide the significant role some Jews played in the Confederacy. And, perhaps most of all, they needed to forget that even while Confederates said they fought to preserve their culture, they did so by waging war against the United States. Thus, to build a past that suited their future, pro-Confederate writers in the nineteenth century had to recreate a past that never existed.

That perspective—pro-Confederate, pro-white, pro-Christian, and anti-federal government—became the ideological basis for Neo-Confederacy in the post-World War

II era. Perhaps more than anything else, Neo-Confederates desire a new version of the Confederate States of America, and they want to revive the version they think existed during the Civil War. Some, for example, argue the Lost Cause narrative that mistakenly holds that the United States tried to suppress Southerners who sought independence during the Civil War. As prominent Neo-Confederates James Ronald Kennedy and Walter Donald Kennedy argue, Northerners suppressed Southerners' "right to self-determination" when they "invaded and conquered" the South, which, in the Kennedys's eyes, had a legitimate right "to establish a new government."[4] The Kennedys, and Neo-Confederates like them, aim to reestablish the Confederate States of America and restore the South to its former glory as a place where whites comfortably maintained superiority over all other races.

For Neo-Confederates such as the Kennedys, self-determination went hand-in-hand with states' rights, the issue Neo-Confederates insist was the true cause of the Civil War. To that end, Neo-Confederates emphasize the sovereignty of the states specified in the Constitution. Because states had kept their sovereignty, they argue, Southerners were legally able to secede from the Union when they felt threatened by Lincoln's victory in 1860. For those reasons, the South seceded from the Union because the federal government, or more specifically, the North, had become aggressive toward the South and used "unconstitutional, unauthorized," and "illegitimate" power against it.[5] More specifically, as the Kennedys argue:

> The states participated in their independent and sovereign role as the elected agent of the people in their respective states. In their acts of ratification, many states specifically reserved the right to recall their delegated sovereign powers should those powers be used by the federal government to encroach upon the rights and liberties of the people. This reservation of rights is another example of the states

> exercising their sovereign authority. … we can see that the states did not renounce their sovereign authority by ratifying the Constitution.[6]

Despite the Kennedys' adamant argument, their view is ahistorical. The states' rights argument fails to acknowledge that the states left the Union because they wanted to preserve their right to own African Americans, as shown in those states' secession documents.[7]

The secession documents themselves show that while Confederate states may have been interested in other issues regarding the hierarchy of power in the United States, Southerners seceded over slavery. South Carolina's secession document accuses "non-slaveholding states" of "increasing hostility" toward slavery that "led to a disregard of their obligations," specifically in reference to Section 2 of Article IV of the U.S. Constitution, which, before the Thirteenth Amendment rendered it defunct, stated that slaves shall not be discharged and that fugitive slaves must be returned to their owners.[8] Per its secession document, South Carolina seceded because it feared that the federal government was trying to curtail white Southerners' right to enslave African Americans. Mississippi's specially convened legislature passed its bill of secession on January 26, 1861, declaring that its "position is thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery."[9] According to Mississippians, Northerners not only "nullified the Fugitive Slave Law in almost every free State in the Union," but they also "advocate[d] negro equality, socially and politically, and promote[d] insurrection and incendiarism in [their] midst."[10] For their part, Alabama's secessionists noted that they were leaving the Union because the "Black Republican Party" that "elected Abraham Lincoln" did "*not recognise property in slaves*" and that the party hoped to eradicate slavery.[11] Texas secessionists argued their state started as "a commonwealth holding" that maintained and protected "the institution

known as negro slavery … which her people intended should exist in all future time."[12]

Moreover, Texas's document also held:

> as undeniable truths that the governments of the various States, and of the confederacy itself, were established exclusively by the white race, for themselves and their posterity; that the African race had no agency in their establishment; that they were rightfully held and regarded as an inferior and dependent race, and in that condition only could their existence in this country be rendered beneficial or tolerable.[13]

Taken together, the statements demonstrate that when Southern states faced the possibility of losing the ability to enslave and otherwise subjugate blacks, they seceded, and they said precisely that in their statements of secession. More than that, those documents contradict Neo-Confederates who insist that Southerners seceded and fought the Civil War to preserve states' rights rather than slavery.

Neo-Confederates also argue that slavery benefitted slaves and the society built to support it. In *Myths of American Slavery*, Walter D. Kennedy claims that the African American population in the U.S. during the Antebellum period grew from 400,000 to four million because slaveowners took care of their slaves so well. In his view, only a healthy slave population would have enjoyed such a high rate of natural reproduction. More than that, Kennedy argues that the institution of slavery helped preserve order in all of U.S. society.[14] Finally, according to Kennedy, enslaved African Americans engaged in a mutually beneficial relationship with their owners in which slaveowners gained loyalty and labor while providing slaves a place to sleep, food to eat, and clothes to wear. Many Neo-Confederates argue that such a mutually beneficial relationship continued after emancipation in 1863. Kennedy, for example, highlights Ezra Adams, a former slave who stayed on his master's plantation, who said, "'Us knowed too well dat us was well took care of," and that "freedom ain't nothin' 'less you is got somethin' to live on and a place

to call home.'"[15] As in other of his arguments, however, Kennedy elides facts that contradict his point. For example, Kennedy quotes former slaves to show that some of them preferred to stay on plantations after Emancipation, but he avoids addressing how state and federal officials prevented emancipated blacks from acquiring land during and after Reconstruction. In other words, free blacks stayed on plantations because they had nowhere else to go and they faced persecution, or even prosecution, if they tried. But even in cases where slaveowners and slaves might have had good relationships, no slave or slaveowner forgot who owned whom. Neither forgot the deleterious, oppressive, and inherently violent relationship that connected them. No pleasantries or niceties could erase the stain.

Inherent in Neo-Confederates' vision of a new South, and of an imagined history of the Confederacy, is a brand of hypermasculinity that, in turn, fuels their desire to return to a white patriarchal nation. Neo-Confederates argue that the nation was lost after the Civil War when, first, African men, and later, women, won the right to vote. White men no longer had full authority, and, while this hurt their pride, they worried more that it threatened to destroy the country. Compounded with the humiliation of losing the Civil War, the expansion of voting rights to include black men, and then all women, dealt a hammer blow to Southern white men's masculinity and, in turn, ruined the South's code of honor that featured, and depended on, the all-powerful white man. After 1877, Southern white men, and then white men everywhere, grew increasingly antagonistic as others, such as blacks and women, gained political power. That antagonism reached fever pitch in the form of violent reactions to both the Civil Rights and Women's Rights movements in the 1960s. Neo-Confederate white men protested more than the

desegregation of their society; they fought to reestablish a "social hierarchy, be this racial or gendered, with white men being dominant."[16]

That brand of Neo-Confederacy is embodied by the League of the South, a Neo-Confederate organization with sixteen chapters across the southern United States. The League promotes the advancement of white Southern heritage and independence based in a strict patriarchy to achieve "a free and independent Southern republic."[17] For Neo-Confederates, "the South is a geographical/historical/cultural reality that has provided a crucial source of identity for three centuries. Long before there was an entity known as 'the United States of America,' there was the South."[18] Michael Hill founded the organization in 1994 and serves as its president. Born in 1951 in Alabama, Hill taught at Stillman College in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, a historically black school, for several years. While at Stillman, Hill became upset with what he saw as "a deliberate attempt to destroy the South and her people" and "the inherent systemic corruption and greed" that he thinks has broken the "American system." That said, Hill promotes his solution, but he does so while insisting he, and the League, will never compromise in his dogged attempt to return the South to its once prestigious status in the world. According to Hill, "the League is more concerned with the survival of our people on their ancestral lands and resurrecting our cultural base than with entering into the conventional political arena."[19]

Members of the League detest multiculturalism and, like the members of the first Klan during Reconstruction, the possibility of rule by nonwhites, and they condemn both as proof of the further "denigration of U.S. traditions."[20] Franklin Sanders, a League of the South board member, wrote that the U.S. government has used culture "as a weapon against [white Southerners] since before Reconstruction aimed to transform the South

into the slavish image of righteous New England."[21] To Neo-Confederates, the federal government is attempting to destroy the South by injecting different cultures into it like it did when it gave citizenship and suffrage to African Americans during Reconstruction. The League of the South also blames industrial capitalism for the decline of the U.S. because industries move jobs once held by white Americans to India and other Third World countries.[22] Together, the U.S. government and companies "[promote] genocide" and are "destroying [white Southerners] as a people, literally killing [them], and resettling the land with Third World immigrants."[23]

What some members see as specifically Southern issues, Hill sees as problems that affect the entire country. Hill put the fear of rule by non-whites into words when he wrote about the 2016 riots in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Violence erupted in the city when a police officer shot and killed an African American man. As was typical, Hill invoked white nationalist fears stoked by *The Birth of a Nation*. Klan members, and Hill, used those fears to justify the Klan's use of violence to save whites from becoming overrun by blacks. "The negro rampage in Milwaukee," Hill wrote, "is but the latest and most high profile example of 'Get Whitey.'"[24] For Hill, the incident was part of "the numerous and mounting attacks on whites … at the hands of dark-skinned, Third World orcs."[25] "The goal," he wrote, "appears to be white displacement and even physical genocide."[26] Despite the fact that the police officer who shot the African American man was, in fact, African American himself, Hill viewed the riots over the killing as a personal attack against whites.

Another branch of white nationalist groups that emerged in the post-World War II era includes the Citizens' Councils. After the U.S. Supreme Court case *Brown v Board of*

Education (1954), these groups formed to counter efforts to desegregate the South. They formed at the grassroots level to resist not only integration in schools, but integration in society as well. The members of Citizens' Councils included elected officials, judges, doctors, and other professionals, as well as "lesser men," all of whom dedicated "themselves to the preservation of 'states' rights and racial integrity." Primarily, they focused on denying "socio-political equality to the black man."[27]

Few men epitomized what the Citizens' Councils believed and how they tried to preserve a racially segregated society better than Robert B. Patterson. In November 1953, Patterson, who managed a Mississippi plantation, grew worried when he heard of "cases then pending before the Supreme Court that could radically alter traditional Southern behavior."[28] He had attended a meeting at the school in Indianola and heard discussion that the Supreme Court was considering desegregating schools. During that discussion, one man asked if that meant that he would "'have to send [his] grandchildren to school with niggers after [they] built that good nigger high school.'"[29]

Although he had avoided getting involved in politics before, when Patterson began investigating the issue of desegregation he found that, as one man told him, "the whole thing was a Communist plot."[30] Suddenly, Patterson could stand by no longer to this dual, intertwined political and racial threat to his way of life. He wrote dozens of letters begging people in his community and political leaders to "stand together forever firm against" the double "mongrelization" of integration and a descent into communism. Patterson personally vowed to "defeat this communistic disease [integration] that [was] being thrust upon [them]."[31]

The Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* only intensified Patterson's resolve, and he began to reach out even deeper into his community. He did so by organizing his town's Citizens' Council to resist the Court's decision. Patterson said that:

> We just felt … like integration would utterly destroy everything that we valued. We don't consider ourselves hate-mongers and racists and bigots. We were faced with integration in a town where there are twenty-one hundred Negro students and seven hundred white. We didn't feel the Supreme Court had the right to come into the state and forcibly cause the schools which were supported by the taxpayers of Mississippi to be integrated and therefore destroyed.[32]

To combat what he saw as imminent destruction, Patterson, like Confederates before him and Neo-Confederates after him, invoked the states' rights argument as a defense for the Southern life and against desegregation. The Supreme Court's decision in the *Brown* case struck fear into Patterson and other Southern whites whose children now had to attend schools with black students. Moreover, in the case of Indianola, blacks outnumbered whites, and whites, as they had during Reconstruction, feared becoming dominated by blacks. To avoid that fate, Southern whites such as Patterson organized into Citizens' Councils to prevent desegregation of schools.

Patterson modeled his reasoning on a speech given by Thomas Pickens Brady, a Mississippi Circuit Judge, who condemned the *Brown* decision and emanated white supremacy. Brady titled his speech "Black Monday" "to describe the Monday on which the Supreme Court handed down its decision," and the speech became "the most comprehensive exposition of Council thought."[33] Brady began by arguing that race-mixing contributed to the destruction of the white race. "Whenever and wherever [the white man's] blood has been infused with the blood of the Negro," Brady said, "the white man, his intellect and his culture have died." More than that, Brady insisted that blacks had played no role in the foundational moments of the history of the United States and,

worse, were responsible for the worst moments of the country's history. Blacks, according to Brady, "played no part in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, or the winning of the West." But, he continued, they were "the fundamental cause of the Civil War and participated in the 'rapine' of the South during Reconstruction." Brady believed that blacks were aware of their "racial limitations," and that "intermarriage … will elevate them but denigrate the white race."[34] Patterson embraced Brady's perspective entirely. The Citizens' Council that Patterson organized was based on the perspective that blacks were inferior to whites and that any kind of integration, at nearly any level, was destructive to the white race. The Council, comprised of white men, strove to resist desegregation in order to preserve their race and their country.

The message resonated across the countryside, and the Citizens' Council grew rapidly. By the late 1950s, the South contained several chapters and thousands of members before the organization began to decline in the 1960s. Generally, these groups formed at a local and grassroots level to combat desegregation, but they later formed into the Citizens' Councils of America (CCA), a more regional and centralized organization. In 1958, Louis W. Hollis, the CCA's executive director, conducted a survey of the organization's membership in Jackson, Mississippi and determined that "new members [had] joined by the hundreds" and that Jackson contained "between 5,000 and 6,000" members.[35] The CCA had difficulty recruiting in states such as Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee, but Southern states managed to recruit at least a few hundred members in a few dozen chapters by the 1960s.[36]

The CCA continued to oppose desegregation, and, while it disavowed violence, it engaged in economic and voter intimidation against African Americans. CCA members,

for example, organized boycotts of black businesses and worked to deny mortgages and insurance policies to African Americans. Additionally, even though the CCA was never linked to any violent crimes against blacks, their threats carried credibility because whites regularly terrorized, beat up, lynched, and murdered black leaders who advocated for black voting. Reverend George Washington Lee, for example, was shot and killed in May 1955 "after receiving a series of threatening notes and telephone calls" for trying to register African Americans to vote.[37]

Despite its growing numbers and the popularity of segregation among whites in the South, and throughout much of the country, the CCA, much like the first Klan during Reconstruction, ultimately proved incapable of stopping a federal government committed to securing civil rights for African Americans. As a result, membership and popularity of the CCA declined in the 1960s. But the Citizens' Council rose again in 1985 as the Council of Conservative Citizens (CCC), an organization that remains active today via its website, conservative-headlines.com. The website consists of numerous articles that emphasize nonwhite crime with an additional section dedicated to "Muslim Statistics."[38] Similarly, in its attempt to heighten white supremacists' concerns with the growing non-white population in the United States, the CCC also focuses on crimes allegedly committed by immigrants. Their tactics have had some, albeit limited, success. Dylann Roof, who murdered nine African Americans in a Charleston, South Carolina, church in 2015, described in his manifesto that he has "never been the same since" he discovered the CCC's website and saw the countless articles of "brutal black on White murders."[39]

The CCA and Neo-Confederates were hardly the only segregationist, white supremacist groups that emerged in the post-World War II era. The Christian Identity

movement, which remains active today, grew out of the nineteenth-century British-Israelism movement, whose members believed that "the British are lineal descendants of the 'ten lost tribes' of Israel."[40] To members of the Christian Identity movement, the British, of course, meant white Anglo-Saxons. British-Israelism made its way to the U.S. during World War II and evolved into what is now known as Christian Identity, a group dedicated to making the U.S. a white, Christian nation. Christian Identity adherents believe that nonwhites did not descend from Adam. Instead, to them, nonwhites are "Pre-Adamic Mud People" who lack "a spiritual connection with God. They have no soul, no standing in the Kingdom of God."[41] Christian Identity adherents also denounce Jews, whom they believe are associated with Satan.

Christian Identity includes numerous branches around the U.S., including one based in Bainbridge, Ohio, called Divine Truth Ministries. Headed by Pastor Paul R. Mullet, "a fighter in the White Racialist Movement for nearly 30 years," Divine Truth Ministries believes that "seeking out lost sheep of the House of Israel … is a mandate to reach out to those Whites, persons of European ancestry who are the descendants of the Biblical Israelites, who are not yet aware of their identity, and who need spiritual nourishment."[42] Mullet, a self-proclaimed white nationalist, invites whites in his church to critically examine the Bible to see for themselves what he considers the divine truth—that the United States began and remains a white Christian nation in which Jews and nonwhites are not welcome.[43]

Divine Truth Ministries bases its beliefs on its interpretations of Scripture, but Mullet and his followers manipulate the Bible to fit their racist and anti-Semitic agenda. In his online sermons, Mullet usually refrains from capitalizing the word Jews,

presumably because he thinks they are unworthy of that distinction. Jews, according to Mullet, are misunderstood because of the "misinformation being spewed from the pulpits of today's jewdeo loving fork-tongued churches." Mullet believes that Jews control the government as well as the "state chartered 'politically correct' churches." Therefore, according to Mullet, Jews prevent Christians from seeing the truth and, because of that, are evil and undeserving of God's mercy and love. In a sermon entitled "The 'Jews:' An introduction," Mullet aimed to prove that "the jews no longer enjoy a 'CHOSEN PEOPLE' status, … and that the jews are in all actuality, ANTI-CHRIST AND VERY MUCH ANTI-CHRISTIAN, in their thoughts, ideas, and agendas," and he invoked Bible verses as evidence. In the sermon, Mullet acknowledged that Jews had, in fact, once received chosen status but, in several places in the Bible, God himself revoked their chosen status. For example, Mullet referenced Romans 11:28, which according to him, says "As concerning the gospel, they (the jews) are enemies for your sake." Besides Bible quotes, Mullet justifies his anti-Semitism with the obvious observation that "the jews would not and did not accept Jesus the Messiah as their personal Lord and Savior." Because they did not accept Jesus, Jews cannot retain their status as the chosen people, and they are anti-Christian. Mullet also provides numerous other Bible verses in an effort to prove that Jews hate Jesus and Christians, including the fact that "not only did the jews oppose the Messiah, they WILLINGLY conspired against Him to have Him put to death!"[44]

Like Neo-Confederates and others, Mullet relies on some selective omissions. His reference to Romans 11:28, for example, leaves out the rest of the verse that says that God still loves the Jews because He chose their fathers. Regarding the accusation that the

Jews killed Jesus, Mullet's argument is flawed because the Romans prosecuted and then executed Jesus. Additionally, crucifixion was a Roman method of punishment rather than a Jewish one.

Such absurdities are hardly unique. Mullet regularly misinterprets or misquotes Biblical verses to support his racism. In his essay, "Seventh Commandment Forbids Race Mixing," for example, Mullet insists that the Seventh and Tenth Commandments prohibit interracial sex by expanding, or even misinterpreting, the words "adultery" and "bastard."[45] For Mullet, "adultery," and its variants "adulterant" and "adulteration" suggest that the Commandments warn Christians to avoid interracial sex because such relationships dilute, or adulterate, their race and result in mixed-race, or "bastard," children, who would be "impure, imperfect or [an] inferior product."[46] The result of Mullet's analysis of the Seventh and Tenth Commandments and the words "adultery" and "bastard" is that

> IF YOU DISOBEY THE SEVENTH COMMANDMENT, COMMIT ADULTERY (mongrelize with a non-White) AND CONCEPTION TAKES PLACE, THE CHILD IS A MONGREL (bastard). HE IS IMPURE, IMPERFECT AND INFERIOR PHYSICALLY, MENTALLY AND IS AN ABOMINATION IN THE EYES OF GOD. BECAUSE THE OFFSPRING IS A NON-WHITE, A MONGREL.[47]

Neo-Confederates, Citizens' Council members, and Christian Identity adherents represent just a few of the many groups that fragmented out of the white nationalist movement, that originated with Ku Klux Klan, in the post-World War II era. These groups serve as examples of what people believed, especially after the *Brown* decision and the progress made during the Civil Rights movement, as well as how they organized at the grassroots level to protect what they perceived to be whites' rights. Politicians at all levels listened to them, and they framed their campaigns in ways that appealed to those

disgruntled whites. In that way, white supremacists' beliefs became integrated with political campaigns.

Nowhere was this truer than in Detroit, Michigan, from the 1940s through the mid-1960s as African Americans began to migrate to the city, causing urban whites to mobilize to protect not only their neighborhoods, but their racial identity. Whites in Detroit fully expected "a vigilant government to protect" them from the threats they thought were inherent in an increasingly integrated city. They wanted help because they believed blacks in their neighborhoods would decrease the value of their houses and property. Moreover, whites in Detroit believed that blacks would destroy the orderly society they had built and that blacks' presence "posed a fundamental challenge to white racial identity" because it carried a greater risk of miscegenation.[48]

Like other white supremacists in the United States in the post-World War II period, whites in Detroit invoked language steeped in patriotism and used in foundational documents such as the Constitution to justify their racist complaints. One man, for example, pointed out that white war veterans had just fought to protect Europe from an African invasion. Those veterans, the man argued, should not have to come home and fight the same battle in their hometown. Others argued that the alleged, and greatly feared, black invasion infringed on their rights to freedom of association.[49] Detroit's political leaders got the message. When Detroit mayor Edward Jeffries, who won the 1941 election as a liberal, ran for reelection after World War II, he "refashioned his racial politics" and led a "campaign laden with racial innuendo," promising to "uphold white community interests" by protecting white neighborhoods from black invasion.[50] Jeffries,

with the support of whites who believed blacks threatened their racial identity, won reelection.

Tactics like the ones Jeffries used began to make their way to the national level in the 1960s, beginning with Barry M. Goldwater. Goldwater, a member of the Republican Party, served as a U.S. Senator of Arizona from the 1950s halfway into the 1960s and then from the late 1960s until the late 1980s. During his second term as senator, Goldwater decided to run for president. Conservative historian Lee Edwards argues that Goldwater's "presidential candidacy in 1964 marked the true beginning of a fundamental shift in American politics from liberalism to conservatism." Goldwater became notorious for voting against the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. He voted against it because he believed that "if the government 'can forbid such discrimination, it is a real possibility that sometime in the future the same government can *require* people to discriminate in hiring on the basis of color or race or religion.'"[51] In other words, Goldwater believed that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was another example of federal overreach and would result in discrimination against whites. He based his reasoning on "a clear conservative principle: Washington shouldn't intrude in the private sector."[52] If anything, discrimination issues should be for the states to decide. Goldwater ran, and lost, on this campaign advocating overtly for states' rights and covertly for whites' rights.

Alabama Governor George Wallace advocated overtly for both states' and whites' rights in his campaign for the presidency in 1968. Wallace is most famous for his advocation of segregation, calling in his 1963 governor inaugural speech, "segregation now … segregation tomorrow … segregation forever," and for attempting to block African American students from entering the University of Alabama after a federal judge

had ruled segregation illegal that same year.[53] In the 1968 presidential election, Wallace obtained a spot on the presidential ballot as a member of the American Independent Party, running against Republican Richard Nixon and Democrat Hubert Humphrey. Wallace made no secret of his racism, although he sometimes tried to frame it as a concern about overreaching federal power. For example, he vehemently opposed "busing to achieve racial balances in schools." At the same time, however, as Stephan Lesher argues, "Wallace's insistence that race had nothing to do with his positions was, of course, a sham."[54] In the 1968 presidential election, Wallace received forty-six electoral votes, all from Southern states. In 1968, however, along with his presidential bids in 1964 and 1972, Wallace received votes from all over the nation, illustrating white resentment of liberal policies of the time.[55] Thus, Wallace allowed Nixon, and then Ronald Reagan, to be viewed as moderate compared to his extremism, particularly regarding segregation.

By the 1960s, then, the messages of racism and bigotry were successful enough at the state and local levels that politicians adopted similar strategies at the national level. In 1968, Nixon ran for president, for the second time, on the promise of law and order after a decade of liberal change that saw legislatures and courts expand the social and political rights of minorities and criminals, while more conservative whites saw those changes as steps towards chaos. At the national level, politicians hoped to take advantage of those disputes to garner votes. Where mayoral candidates in Detroit in the late 1940s, such as Jeffries, appealed to voters by assuring them they would keep blacks out of certain neighborhoods, politicians after Wallace who sought broader appeal in the late 1960s used more coded language designed to make clear the candidates' racial appeal without being so explicit. Nixon, for example, most often used the phrase "law and order" to

mask his appeals to white racist voters during the 1968 presidential election. The phrase found traction among white voters throughout the country who hoped a new president would restore order to American society.[56]

Nixon's strategy during the 1968 presidential campaign capitalized on middle-class Americans' desires for both preservation of law and order and an escape from charges of racism by using coded language in the form of color-blindness and an emphasis on class. Nixon's platform of law and order, according to Matthew D. Lassiter,

> tapped into Middle American resentment toward antiwar demonstrators and black militants but consciously employed a color-blind discourse that deflected charges of racial demagoguery and insulated the Republican from direct comparisons to [George] Wallace.[57]

By appealing to white middle-class Americans with this language, Nixon used class to conceal the issue of race in the South, which led many middle-class white Southerners to leave the Democratic Party to vote Republican in the 1968 election.

Nixon continued this populist strategy throughout his presidency, and the middle-class sentiment of a color-blind ideology expanded from the South to the rest of the nation. In 1969, *Time* magazine "observed that the White House 'was pursuing not so much a 'Southern strategy' as a Middle American strategy.'" Additionally, Nixon "pledged that the federal government 'will not seek to impose economic integration' or destabilize suburban neighborhoods 'with a flood of low-income families.'" Nixon's promise in effect guaranteed the continuation of residential segregation but in the name of class rather than race. Moreover, this brought forth welfare as a prominent issue in the 1972 presidential election. "Casting the election as a showdown between 'the work ethic and the welfare ethic,'" Nixon appealed to white middle-class voters nationwide.[58] Using an allegedly color-blind ideology to conceal racism, white middle-class Americans could

protect their class status, and their segregated neighborhoods, from African American invasion by voting for Nixon.

While Nixon appealed covertly to racist whites in the late 1960s and 1970s, Ronald Reagan did so more overtly through the use of racial stereotypes in the 1980 presidential election, which Reagan won over Jimmy Carter in a landslide. Reagan won because, as Leonard Zeskind argues, "Reagan had long been a figure on the far-right wing of the Republican Party," whose conservative views appealed to a growing number of voters.[59] Reagan appealed to the "far-right wing" of Republican voters by promising to reform welfare and by advocating states' rights. More than that, Reagan resurrected a brand of overtly racist conservativism not seen in politics since George Wallace. It was a brand of political rhetoric with which Reagan was familiar. While a Democrat in the 1950s, Reagan sat at the far-right end of the party, and he named names during the investigation into alleged charges of Communism among notable entertainers led, and fueled, by Joseph McCarthy and the House Un-American Committee. By the end of that decade, and certainly by 1962, Reagan had abandoned his Democratic Party roots to join the Republican Party. He made the change while an employee of General Electric when he became aware of what he perceived as the need for less government and lower taxes.[60]

Reagan cultivated his conservatism while he served as a lead campaigner for Goldwater's run for the presidency in 1964. That year, Reagan gave a speech entitled "A Time for Choosing," in which he declared his support for Goldwater, but the speech "put [him] on the national political map" because of its "more ideologically charged philosophy."[61] Over the ensuing decade, and then while governor of California, Reagan honed his views, and his delivery. He made his views known nationally when he ran for

the presidency in 1976, a run that ended in defeat in the primaries. In that campaign, he rallied conservative support by making welfare reform a top priority and by criticizing the level of rampant welfare fraud in the country. To do so, Reagan often referred to a Linda Taylor, an African American woman living on Chicago's south side who

> has 80 names, 30 addresses, 12 social security cards and is collecting veterans' benefits on four nonexisting deceased husbands. … And she is collecting Social Security on her cards. She's got Medicaid, getting food stamps and she is collecting welfare under each of her names. Her tax-free cash income alone is over $150,000.[62]

Even though Republican voters enjoyed and supported these kinds of attacks, Reagan's claims regarding welfare fraud and abuse, as well as his claims about Taylor, were exaggerated. In an article investigating Reagan's claims, the *New York Times* reported that "after a series of indictments," the state of Illinois charged Taylor with using only four aliases rather than eighty and that her income was only $3,000 rather than the $150,000 as Reagan had claimed.[63] Reagan repeated similar, and similarly unfounded, claims of welfare fraud while president. For example, in a radio address in 1986, he detailed how such women obtain welfare and manage to remain on it indefinitely. Welfare, according to Reagan:

> Can pay for [women] to quit work. Many families are eligible for substantially higher benefits when the father is not present. … Under existing welfare rules, a teenage girl who becomes pregnant can make herself eligible for welfare benefits that will set her up in an apartment of her own, provide medical care, and feed and clothe her. She only has to fulfill one condition—not marry or identify the father.[64]

Reagan particularly targeted black women for welfare fraud, an obvious attempt to reassert patriarchy while criticizing its alleged decline in the black community, but more importantly here, Reagan legitimated conservatives' racism. Although whites constituted the majority of welfare recipients, Reagan's constant references to welfare fraud

perpetrated by black women convinced many of his supporters that African Americans received the disproportionate share of welfare and that they did so fraudulently. These references found a ready audience because they reaffirmed what conservatives had long believed—that African Americans inherently possessed the qualities of laziness and inferiority. Reagan had fed racist whites' misconceptions of African Americans, and in doing so won their votes. In fact, Reagan pleased conservatives, and Americans in general, so much that he won his 1984 reelection in another landslide. Many conservatives viewed, and continue to view, Reagan as an American hero.

Although conservatives praised Reagan as the man to revive their ideology in the U.S., many white nationalists, particularly a separate branch of Neo-Confederates commonly known as paleoconservatives, believed that Reagan was not conservative enough. When Reagan advocated for states' rights, he won the support of Neo-Confederates, who associated states' rights with the South's argument for the cause of the Civil War. Although the Reagan era represents a return to racialized conservatism, paleoconservatives believe that "the Reagan administration did not deliver suitably conservative social policies, failing to reinstate school prayer or overturn abortion rights that the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court decision assured." Reagan's failure to return the United States to its traditional values, as defined by Neo-Confederates, angered paleoconservatives and pushed them even farther to the right and away from the mainstream conservatism they had come to detest. Paleoconservatives, "embittered by the failure of the Republican Party to adopt their agenda, began to develop their own venues for publishing and promoting their ideology."[65] Such venues included numerous journals

and newspapers as well as numerous new organizations that advocated a sharper turn to the right.

The latter half of the twentieth century saw white nationalists, originally centered in the Ku Klux Klan, splinter into several different groups. Some, still stuck in the nineteenth century, continued to seek justification for the South's role in causing the Civil War. Neo-Confederates organized to defend the South's right to secede, and they continue to advocate Southern secession from the United States today. Additionally, Neo-Confederates sought to return the U.S. to an agrarian nation, as imagined by Thomas Jefferson, because, according to them, industrialism keeps the South oppressed. Other white nationalists began grassroots campaigns to combat the Supreme Court's order to desegregate schools. Citizens' Councils rose and spread throughout the South specifically to protect white children from having to go to school with black children. The Christian Identity movement rose to prominence as a way to establish biblical justification for segregation and anti-Semitism. Politicians, such as Jeffries, Nixon and Reagan, tapped into these conservative groups' desires to win election into political office, and they oftentimes used coded language to mask the racism in their campaigns. These politicians, particularly Reagan, however, proved not conservative enough for paleoconservatives. Thus, a new and sharper turn to the right occurred in the United States with even more white nationalist groups.

But however splintered white supremacists and white nationalists were at the end of the twentieth century, they would find increasingly common ground in the twenty-first century. They bonded over their distaste for Muslims, undocumented immigrants from Mexico and South America, the loss of manufacturing jobs, the decline in income as

unions faded in power, increasing integration, and the loss of status, power, and economic opportunity among whites. No one embodied all that white supremacists and white nationalists disliked more than Barack Obama. And no one seemed to serve as their rallying point, a celebrity and political candidate they could support, more than Donald Trump. Trump spent the first fifteen years of the new century speaking out against the very issues that triggered the ire of white nationalists. He also slowly realized that he could turn his popularity into political support if he voiced such concerns on a national scale. In doing so, Trump, in 2016, unified those groups that had splintered in the previous decades. Trump rode the wave of support from white nationalists to the presidency in the 2016 presidential election.

CHAPTER IV

"'AMERICA, AT THE END OF THE DAY, BELONGS TO WHITE MEN:' THE UNIFICATION OF WHITE NATIONALISTS UNDER THE ALT-RIGHT"

On January 20, 2017, Richard Spencer gave an interview near Donald Trump's inauguration ceremony in Washington, D.C. As he spoke, Spencer paused to address the people around him who had come to protest his presence in the city. While protesters shouted that he was a racist and a Neo-Nazi, Spencer insisted he was neither. His language, however, rang a false note because most in the crowd had seen a recent video of him leading an audience at a recent rally in chants of "Hail Trump!" and "Hail Victory!," a direct reference to what Nazis chanted during World War II.[1] When asked on the street if he liked black people, Spencer responded with a condescending "yeah, sure." But the interview is infamous for what happened next. While Spencer described the frog pin he was wearing, a depiction of the Pepe the Frog meme, a masked assailant punched him in the face.[2] Although the punch was illegal and violent, thousands of people across the United States rejoiced when they heard the news of the assault. At the same, thousands of people across the country agreed with Spencer and saw the violence against him as one of the prominent reasons they agreed with him. In a way, the assault on Spencer represented, to those that agreed with him, an assault on white America.

Richard Spencer represents the Alt-Right, the newest incarnation of ultra-conservative, ultra-nationalists who have grown increasingly prominent in politics in the past two years. The term is short for Alternative Right, representing a break from mainstream conservatism that is not conservative enough. The Alt-Right encompasses various far-right groups that share the characteristics of racism, anti-Semitism, misogyny, and a deep disdain for multiculturalism and globalism. Spencer, the prominent voice of the Alt-Right, grew up in an affluent Dallas, Texas, neighborhood. He attended a first-rate private high school, then the University of Virginia, the University of Chicago, and Duke University. While pursuing the kind of education reserved for men of his class, Spencer encountered Friedrich Nietzsche and Jared Taylor, two men who shaped his as-yet percolating philosophies. In these two authors, Spencer found the language to express his disdain for the direction the United States seemed to be going during his young adulthood. He found Nietzsche, for example, to be a "radical traditionalist," and reading *On the Genealogy of Morality* "blew [his] mind."[3] He has used those ideas and that language in his work as president and director of the National Policy Institute and co-editor of AltRight.com, two white nationalist organizations, and in the books he has written. The Alt-Right has grown to become a prominent contemporary manifestation of white nationalism seemingly in response to the changing demographics in the U.S. as well as the election, and reelection, of a nonwhite president.

At the center of Alt-Right ideology looms a fear of the eradication of white hierarchy, heritage, and culture, a process known as white genocide, due to the rapidly changing demographics of the United States, and, as a result, the nation's perceived decline. The surge of immigration since the 1960s has resulted in whites becoming less of

a majority in the United States, as well as, in the Alt-Right's eyes, in a loss of whites' rights. "The Alt-Right," according to David Duke, "is a group of young White people who realise their future has been stolen, their culture subverted & their rights trampled on."[4] For this group of people, nothing signified that decline, that theft, better than Barack Obama's two terms as president. As Obama's second term waned, the people to whom Duke referred began to mobilize around their concern for the loss of white heritage and identity, resulting in an explosion of white nationalism during the 2016 U.S. presidential election. As Republican candidates fell by the wayside, the victims of the primary process, white nationalists found their candidate in the form of Donald Trump. Trump's campaign recognized that these racially-charged voters might well swing the election its way and so appealed to the Alt-Right on nearly every issue: immigration restriction, misogyny, racism, Christianity, hatred of liberalism, dislike of welfare fraud, and a disdain for what the derisively call "political correctness". Above all, Trump's campaign slogan, "Make America Great Again," as well as another slogan, "America First," formerly used by the second Klan, fully encompassed and appealed to white nationalists' desire for a nation of white reign. The people of the Alt-Right rallied together to support Trump because they saw him as the savior for supposedly endangered whites. Spencer noted that Trump "talked about America as a nation, as a people, and there is an inherent white nationalism to that."[5] In Trump, the Alt-Right saw a candidate who shared their sense of nationalism, patriotism, and unabashed racism. In Trump, they saw a candidate they could support and a candidate who would support them. This chapter explores what led far-right extremist groups to believe in an attack on white

heritage, and it examines the unification of these people under the Alt-Right to propel Trump to the U.S. presidency.

In 2008, U.S. voters elected Barack Obama, a man of African descent, president. Once in office, Obama implemented policies the Alt-Right and other white nationalists considered to be anti-white. Those policies combined with Obama's race to fuel the Alt-Right's fear of a declining white majority as well as the ramifications of that fear. When Obama attempted to reduce income inequality, particularly through implementing the Affordable Care Act and increasing the earned-income tax credit, white nationalists sneered at his socialist efforts to lift African Americans, and other Americans, out of poverty. When Obama planned to admit thousands of Syrian refugees into the U.S., white nationalists balked at the thought of more nonwhites pouring into the country and lowering the percentage of whites in the country's demographics. When Obama made statements in support of the Black Lives Matter movement, white nationalists became furious and believed that he prioritized black lives over white lives. White supremacists responded to Obama's policies much like Southern whites responded to Reconstruction policies that sought to integrate African Americans into U.S. society—they became enraged that anyone threatened whites' majority status and power. "America, at the end of the day," said Spencer at Texas A&M University in December 2016, "belongs to white men."[6] According to white nationalists in the U.S., any other kind of perspective was, and remains, un-American and anti-white.

It was, in fact, after Barack Obama's first presidential election victory in 2008 that the term Alternative Right came into use. In an interview conducted via YouTube, Spencer referenced a 2008 article by Paul Gottfried that discussed the rise of a group

challenging the mainstream right that inspired him to act.[7] In his article, which is a speech he gave roughly a week before its publication on December 1, 2008, Gottfried lamented paleoconservatives' failure to take conservatism further to the right, and he described his new group as "an independent intellectual Right, … full of young thinkers and activists … who consider themselves to be on the right, but not of the current conservative movement."[8] When Spencer read Gottfried's thoughts, he began to think that Gottfried's group was what conservatism needed, only he put an identitarian spin on it. When asked what, exactly, the Alt-Right is, Spencer responded that "it is an identitarian movement" and "an identity politics for white people and North America and really around the world."[9] In emphasizing identity politics, Spencer illustrated what the white nationalism movement in the U.S. has represented all along. Spencer also referenced a 2009 article by Kevin DeAnna titled "The Alternative Right" that bemoans conservatives' failure to combat the U.S.'s decline in identity and traditionalism since the Civil Rights movement. DeAnna, referring to Obama's election victory, declared "the election of 'the most liberal man in the Senates'" as "a crowning moment" in the nation's downturn.[10]

In that sense, the rise of the Alt-Right has served as the culmination of an attempt to counter changes in the U.S. stemming from the Civil Rights movement. The changing demographics in the U.S. combined with Obama's election and reelection pushed already conservative-oriented people further to the right. More significantly, it opened up a way for them to argue against multiculturalism and diversity without appearing racist by phrasing their arguments in terms of identity.

Another way to argue against multiculturalism while trying to avoid being labeled a racist includes the argument of race realism, promoted most prominently by Jared Taylor, whom Spencer cited as a prominent influence. Taylor was born on September 15, 1951 in Japan. He graduated from Yale University in 1973 with a bachelor's degree in philosophy, and he obtained a degree in international economics from l'Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris in 1978. Since 1991, Taylor has edited the *American Renaissance*, a popular white nationalist journal, and he has written several books about race relations and racial consciousness. He is outspoken about race and prides himself on the fact that he is not politically correct. White nationalists believe that the Civil Rights movement suppressed racism by making it taboo to invoke racist language or imagery in any way. Certainly, many inhabitants of the U.S. still harbored racist thoughts, but they feared being ostracized socially, politically, or economically if they voiced their perspectives in public. According to Taylor, the Civil Rights movement had worked to impose politically correct speech and essentially suppress whites' voice, and he intended to get it back.[11]

Even as he uses racialized language to voice his concern for the decline of a white America, Taylor rejects the label of white nationalist. He prefers to refer to himself not as a white nationalist, but as a race realist—that is, Taylor sees himself as someone who rejects "the agreeable fantasies about race that have become orthodoxy since the 1960s."[12] By framing his identity this way, and by laying it out for others to claim as well, Taylor counters the contemporary argument that race does not matter in terms of intelligence and says that people who believe so only believe it because they are afraid of being labeled a racist. It is a strategy used throughout the community of white supremacists and white nationalists. By making charges of racism a strategy, Taylor and

other white nationalists condemn their accusers for trying to silence people's speech. Thus, opponents of race realists are more than cowards

> Because they fear that any departure from carefully scripted opinions about race—to suggest, for example, that the very fact of multi-racialism gives rise to serious problems no matter what whites do—will be met with charges of racism. And they are right. Charges of racism are not a form of debate; they are meant to silence debate. Accusations of racism are often transparent attempts to choke off honest discussion.[13]

If, according to Taylor, people talked honestly about race, they would acknowledge what he already knows. Race matters because the differences between races are the most critical issue. Those differences determine the communities people build and maintain. According to Taylor in the *American Renaissance*, "race is an important aspect of individual and group identity," and "different races build different societies that reflect their natures."[14] That said, race realists think that people of different races build inherently unequal societies because people of different races do not "have the same average intelligence."[15] For Taylor and race realists, race dictates everything people do. Moreover, to the Alt-Right, race determines one's ability to live in a civilized and Western world. For them, nonwhites, because of their race, cannot do so.

Taylor also advocates racial realism and consciousness because he believes liberals and Civil Rights activists, in an effort to foster political correctness, have created a culture in which whites are forbidden to be racially conscious, at least toward themselves. The Civil Rights movement, according to Taylor, "was a historically unprecedented attempt to dismantle racial consciousness for all Americans in the hope of building a society in which race did not matter."[16] As a result, whites are, allegedly, forbidden from acknowledging, embracing, or celebrating their whiteness lest they be seen as racist. "More and more whites," says Taylor, "now recognize that it was only

they who have shed their racial consciousness, while every other racial group unabashedly advances its collective interests at the expense of whites."[17] African Americans and Latinos have their own television channels, awards ceremonies, groups and clubs at colleges, and they live and work in their communities, which often, according to Taylor, ostracize whites. Taylor's not-so-subtle reference to affirmative action grows out of his belief that whites have been forced to abandon their racial and cultural identity while other groups continue to promote theirs.

At the crux of the matter, for Taylor, is his belief that other races are benefitting by suppressing whiteness, which runs counter to how Taylor views the desires of the country's founding fathers. In "What the Founders *Really* Thought About Race," Taylor insisted that Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and other leaders of the Revolution envisioned a nation of only whites. Jefferson, whose views Taylor said "were typical of his generation," for example, "hoped slavery would be abolished someday, but 'when freed he [the Negro] is to be removed beyond the reach of mixture.'" Taylor also wrote that Madison believed African Americans should be "'permanently removed beyond the region occupied by or allotted to a White population.'" Moreover, Taylor points out, erroneously, that until the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868, citizenship laws in the U.S. applied only to whites, and that most U.S. states had anti-miscegenation laws. To make his case that these views of the U.S. remained prevalent in the twentieth century, Taylor referred to the language from later presidents such as Woodrow Wilson, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower. "The history of the franchise," according to Taylor, "reflects a clear conception of the United States as a nation by and for Whites."[18] For the Alt-Right, the gains made by minorities in the

twentieth and twenty-first centuries have upset what the founding fathers envisioned for the United States. Taylor is correct when he said Jefferson, Madison, and other men conceived the U.S. as a nation by and for whites, but it was not simply to be a nation of only whites; it was, rather, to be a nation where whites asserted and maintained power over African Americans.

How whites exercised that power changed over time, particularly after the abolition of slavery, but integration, the goal of the post-World War II Civil Rights movement, threatened that control. From Taylor's perspective, that goal was the primary problem. Integration, for Taylor, undermined the very fabric of the white-dominated society he argued the country's forefathers hoped to establish, and it was, and is, to blame for all of the nation's problems. Integration resulted in more diversity, and while many people argue that diversity is America's strength, Taylor insisted it is not. Instead, he argued that diversity is the cause of the nation's ills and has resulted in increased gang violence, particularly in schools. He insisted that diversity has also led to more crime, and more violent crime, in cities where people of different races increasingly interact and live next to each other.[19] But that greater diversity had broader political ramifications. As the U.S. became more racially diverse, whites, as Taylor argued, lost power in a world they once dominated. For Taylor, whites in the United States were increasingly facing discrimination and becoming aliens in their own land.

The idea of white discrimination initially emerged during the post-World War II period as immigration increased and as politicians introduced affirmative action policies designed to redress historical injustice. More than anything else, according to David Duke, those non-European immigrants attacked and undermined the U.S.'s "European

traditions, institutions, and values."[20] Born in 1950 in Oklahoma to a middle-class family, Duke began his journey in white nationalism at just fourteen years old when "he attended a local meeting of the Citizen Councils of America (CCA), an anti-integration group known informally as the White Citizens' Councils."[21] As a student at Louisiana State University in 1970, Duke founded the White Youth Alliance, a protest group for whites. Duke had planned to join the advanced ROTC program at his school, but he was rejected, according to him, because of his political views.[22] That rejection fueled his fury and determination, and reinforced what he believed to be white discrimination, even more. After graduating from college in 1974, Duke founded the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in Louisiana and became a prominent Klan leader. He also served a term in the Louisiana House of Representatives as a Republican, after switching from the Democratic Party, and he ran, unsuccessfully, for governor of Louisiana and U.S. president. Duke founded and led the National Organization for European-American Rights (NOFEAR), now labeled as the European-American Unity and Rights Organization (EURO). As a white nationalist, Duke seeks to defend European-Americans from what he believes to be "multileveled discrimination against them that occurs through various affirmative-action-type policies that favor minorities" and to "preserve the heritage and values of European-Americans … which are threatened by multiculturalism and the massive influx of non-European immigrants into the United States."[23]

Like Taylor, Duke argued that attacks on white culture and heritage, the prominent symptoms of white genocide and discrimination against whites, deeply threaten American society because those who promote them target young audiences. Those attacks start at a young age. Duke referenced student textbooks, for example,

which he argues play up the role of nonwhites in U.S. history while downplaying the efforts and successes of white Christians. Duke notes:

> When a textbook, say, uses the word "African Americans" or "black Americans," it's always in a positive way. … Black Americans did "such and such." … or Martin Luther King was "a great black American," or this type of rendition. Whenever the term "white race" or "white people" is used in our modern textbooks, it's always in a negative fashion. White people exploited blacks in slavery, white people stole the land from Indians, whatever, and it's always a negative connotation. So there is always a double standard … Any perceptive person can begin to see this very antiwhite racist attitude present.[24]

To Duke, the implicit message is dangerous: Acknowledging whites' wrongdoing leads to discrimination and racism against them. To drive home that point, Duke echoes the Yankee myth referenced by the Kennedy brothers and prominently featured in the Lost Cause narrative. Duke, Neo-Confederates in the South, and like-minded white supremacists around the nation believe that proponents of integration design, write, and use school textbooks to discriminate against whites and make them feel guilty simply for being white. They also think that discrimination against whites has grown over the last half of the twentieth century, a trend that has the potential to become a way to legitimate white genocide. In an interview with Duke, for example, Russel K. Nieli asked about the racial consciousness Duke had mentioned in a recent article and on his website. Duke responded, "Europeans, people of European descent, wherever they live on the globe, are beginning to realize that our people are truly the real minority of the earth." The attack against that group of people is, he continued, in a "real sense … a genocide."[25]

Duke and other white supremacists invoke the term "genocide" for effect. They do so to equate their imagined attack on Europeans across the globe to the real plight of Jews during the Holocaust, an event perpetrated by the people with whom Duke has aligned himself since he was a teenager. At the same time, Duke and like-minded white

supremacists try to make the point that whites will refuse to accept their declining position in American society. That brand of racial consciousness has grown in the United States, and throughout Western Europe, because of the influx of nonwhites into what white nationalists consider white nations. But, Duke and others are quick to point out, with that growing consciousness comes a reaction. In other words, Duke and the rest of the Alt-Right refuse to submit to white Europeans' allegedly growing minority status. In response, and to perhaps fend off what the Alt-Right sees as a decline, they sensationalize the fear and discomfort of the dwindling ratio of whites to nonwhites by comparing it to the systematic mass murder of over six million people.

At the same time, Duke used a phrase loaded with historical meaning to attack what he and others considered to be a loss of free speech. Part of that loss stemmed from the belief that the Civil Rights movement has imposed the use of politically correct speech on Americans, which Duke argued limited the free speech of people who refused to accept it. To that end, Duke regularly describes himself as a "Human Rights Advocate of Free Speech," particularly of dissenting opinions, and he depicts himself as a martyr by saying that he is "willing to suffer defamation in order to tell the truth."[26] As much as Duke sees his struggle as a fight against social forces, he sees it as a fight against political entities as well. He fears that the federal government would, at some point, take "action to try and suppress the Internet, to suppress free speech there, because they know the power of these ideas and these ideas represent a threat to their power."[27]

Although the government has not acted to suppress free speech on the internet, some social media sites have. Twitter, for example, suspended Jared Taylor's account for his racist messages, and the company did the same thing to the *American Renaissance*

account, when Twitter implemented new guidelines regarding hateful content on December 18, 2017. A search on Twitter of the terms "Jared Taylor" and "suspended" shows the outrage of the Alt-Right regarding his suspension. Some of his supporters argue that Twitter targeted Taylor because his far-right ideology, like Duke said, represents a threat to liberals' alleged plans to force multiculturalism and political correctness on the United States. From Duke's perspective, he and other like-minded people need to be silenced one way or another. Thus, for Duke and the rest of the Alt-Right, that brand of white genocide is a real and serious threat.

From the point of view of white supremacists, that threat is growing. On the same day it suspended the account of Taylor, Twitter suspended the account of the Traditionalist Worker Party (TWP), an organization of Neo-Nazis headed by Matt Heimbach, who helped found it in 2013 after being kicked out of the League of the South for being photographed with a swastika; he was later let back in. Much like the German Nazis in World War II, the TWP advocates National Socialism and a white ethnostate. The TWP's website states that its "guiding principle … is fighting for the rights and self determination of Whites in America," and that "The Fourteen Words, 'We must secure the existence of our people and a future for White children' best exemplifies" the movement's mission. The Fourteen Words come from the 88 Precepts, a manifesto of white supremacy based on natural law written by David Lane, a former member of the Ku Klux Klan, the Aryan Nations, and The Order.[28] The number "88" is significant because of its connection to Neo-Nazis who, to this day, continue to maintain that Adolf Hitler did nothing wrong in his extermination of Jews during the Holocaust. The letter "H" is the eighth letter of the alphabet. The code "88" allows white nationalists to

pronounce “Heil Hitler!” without instant reprisal by others. More than that, however, the 88 Precepts resemble Hitler’s views on natural selection and the laws of nature. The fourteenth Precept, for example, states that “In accord with Nature's Laws, nothing is more right than the preservation of ones own race.” Other Precepts denounce multiculturalism and glorify Aryans by stating that the Aryans are responsible for everything that has benefitted people of other races. The twentieth Precept, for example, argues that whites have suffered the “invasions and brutality from African and Asia for thousands of years,” an alleged fact which renders invalid the “attempted guilt-trip placed on the White race by” those “executioners” of civilizations who have, previously, “benefited immeasurably from the creative genius of the Aryan People.” The conclusion of the 88 Precepts includes the “14 Words,”[29] This gives the number “14” significance to Neo-Nazis, such as those who belong to the TWP, who typically combine it with the number “88,” either with “1488” or “14/88,” to convey their message in code. The organization’s goal is “to create a sustainable Homeland for [white] culture, identity, families, and blood.”[30]

To the TWP, white American values include fierce nationalism and traditionalism, and the organization wants to protect those values from globalists who have allegedly attempted to eradicate them in the name of diversity and multiculturalism. The group uses the slogan, “Faith, Family, Folk.” Faith stands for “the traditional faiths of the European people,” primarily traditional Christianity. Family, according to the TWP, “is the foundation of the national community,” and the group “supports working families” so that “every child [may] have a chance at a better and brighter future.” Folk means people who inhabit a true nation. That is, only people who share “blood, history,

and traditions" may comprise a true nation, as imagined by the TWP and other white nationalists. In that way, the TWP fights "for the interests of White Americans, a people who for decades have been abandoned by the System and actively attacked by globalists and traitorous politicians."[31] The TWP despises capitalism and believes that globalist U.S. politicians have sacrificed working-class, white families for cheaper and outsourced labor. In doing so, the U.S. government has ruined the traditional nuclear family, plunging white American society into degeneracy and despair.

But Twitter suspended accounts related to the TWP because the organization, like most Alt-Right organizations, spouted violent anti-Semitism and also blamed society's degeneracy on Jews. For the Alt-Right, Jews are the source of degeneracy throughout the world, and promoting it is part of their Zionist conspiracy. According to David Duke, "there are thousands of active Zionist groups in the US pushing open borders, degeneracy, multiculturalism and undermining our country."[32] According to Duke, Jews do so to pursue their own interests. They seek:

> A Babylon-like, multiracial America suits Jewish interests. In a divided land, the most unified group exercises the greatest power. Divide and conquer has always been the supremacist prescription for power. … Multiracialism muddies the waters. Jews will always thrive in such a Babylon. Every blow that has broken the solidarity and furthered the dispossession of the founding and once-ruling American majority is an opening for the new contenders to the throne. … this process goes on not only in America but in every nation where Jews constitute a powerful minority. They consistently seek to weaken the predominant group, no matter what it might be, as to afford an opportunity for increasing their own power.[33]

For Duke, Jews want to make these gains, establish this world, and garner control of society at the expense of whites. Such a pursuit is, for Duke, detrimental to white nations because, for Duke and other Alt-Right white supremacists and white nationalists, and as Jews themselves have allegedly claimed, Jews are not white.[34] Similarly, Richard

Spencer claimed, in a tweet, that a video he said was produced by Jews "[seems] to be asking Jews to become White people" and states that "Jews are Jews."[35] But Duke and Spencer have conflated the views of a few Jews to argue that all Jews consider themselves to be a separate ethnicity.

White supremacists build on that assumption when they insist that Jews are set on destroying white nations by introducing degeneracy. According to Duke, Hollywood, television, and mass media are their weapons of choice. Duke cites the example of Viacom, owned by Jews, which owns MTV and Nickelodeon. MTV, for decades, according to Duke, "has offered Beavis and Butthead as teen role models and currently is the largest single purveyor of race-mixing propaganda to White teenagers and sub-teens in America and in Europe."[36] For Duke, and the rest of the Alt-Right, Jews, who own or at least control, American media, seek to destroy white nations with their degenerate entertainment. But, as John George and Laird Wilcox argue, extremists, such as those in the Alt-Right, "tend to believe things supported by little or no evidence" and usually "have a strong proclivity toward 'conspiracy theories,' that is, the belief that events are controlled by a small group of insiders who, with the assistance of their allies throughout society, are working for their advantage and our doom."[37]

One thing that the Alt-Right admires about Jews, however, is the fact that they have their own ethnostate in Israel. The Alt-Right seeks to create an ethnostate of their own and intend for it to be a traditional patriarchy. They believe that men, specifically white men, are superior to women and, thus, are best suited to rule. When someone tweeted to Spencer that men and women were equal, he replied that women are good "at child rearing and, maybe, dancing and singing" and that "men are superior to women at

literally everything else."[38] Spencer made his point clearer when he said that "men shall be warriors" and that "women shall birth warriors."[39] The Alt-Right's view of women illustrates its strict belief in a gendered, racialized view of society they refer to as traditionalism, the guiding principle for the ethnostate they envision. The election of a black man to the presidency in 2008, his reelection in 2012, and the possibility of a female president in 2016 violated the fundamental tenets of that traditionalist belief. "Women," tweeted Spencer during the campaign, "should never be allowed to make foreign policy. It's not that they're 'weak.' To the contrary, their vindictiveness knows no bounds."[40] Thousands of Alt-Right men on Twitter agreed.

Alt-Right women agreed too. A prominent branch of Alt-Right women calls itself "Trad," short for the term traditional and, on Twitter, they frequently use the hashtag #TradLife to expound and promote their beliefs for a traditional society. To these women, a traditional society means a society ruled by white men who are supported domestically by white women. This idea stems from the nineteenth-century "ideology of domesticity, which had the immediate effect of isolating women's work in the home while at the same time making them answerable for the moral vision of American society."[41] Catherine Beecher, a popular writer of domesticity in the nineteenth century, painted a picture of domesticity in her writings that said "the home, where women presided, was the central institution of American life, and the domestic role of women was the linchpin of social unity."[42] The ideology of domesticity prescribed strict gender roles that society was expected to adhere to in order for the nation to thrive. In that world, women's main, and perhaps even only, role is to create a tranquil domestic sphere in which they raised boys to grow into leaders and girls to grow into the women who support such men. World War

II, however, required people to rethink gender roles when women left the home to take men's places in the workforce after men were called to war. After the War, the U.S. saw a revival in domesticity in reaction to war-time changes and in response to the threats the Cold War posed. In the 1950s, Americans "create[d] a family-centered culture" that they believed "might ward off the hazards of the age."[43] Conservatives, and especially Alt-Right women, continue to promote the traditional family as a way to save American society.

For "trad" women to adhere to a traditional life, they must follow strict guidelines in all tasks. All cooking, for example, must be authentic. Women must use basic ingredients or make ingredients from scratch, including bread. For example, Kami, a prominent TradLife woman on Twitter, "cook[s] everything from scratch, use[s] only fresh butchered meats and fresh vegetables nothing artificial," and she "make[s] [her] own bread and lunch meat."[44] They also use conventional cooking methods; these women do not believe in using microwave ovens. In January 2018, Kami tweeted that she made popcorn, and she made it clear that she did not use a microwave to prepare it.[45] Another woman, known as Scarlett Shoa'Hara, tweeted that "nothing makes [her] feel more accomplished than catching, cleaning, cooking, and eating a fish entirely by [her]self."[46]

TradLife women envision a society like the U.S., and other Western countries, that resembles what they think households were like in the 1950s in all aspects. They follow strict gender roles; women must always be as feminine as possible and never masculine in any way. To do so, they wear only dresses and skirts, clothes which they claim they make at home, so they are always presentable. For these women, traditionalism means natural hair colors and styles as well as modest and feminine

clothing, which should be worn at all times—even at political rallies. They believe that that women should "have appropriate hair" and "dress appropriately" if they want to be taken seriously.[47] Appropriate hair and dress means hair that is not shaven, ironed skirts and blouses, and shoes that have a modest heel. "Trad" women wear only a little bit of makeup. Such traditionalism, they believe, is the heart of U.S. culture. Twitter user Madelynn advocated that all women should "go back to [their] roots" and "pick up embroidery, cooking, sewing. House making is an art every woman can master."[48] Such roots stem from the idea of a Western civilization and culture that refers to a traditional white society where women are always modest in terms of dress and how they act as opposed to a supposed wild culture of a different ethnicity in which women might not wear clothes at all or fix their hair in an extreme way such as coloring it an unnatural color or shaving part or all of it off. The woman's most important role, though, is to make as many white babies as possible; this is how Alt-Right women contribute to the fight against the supposed white genocide.[49]

For these women, racism goes hand-in-hand with allegedly traditional gender roles, and there is no better example of this than Ayla Stewart. Stewart, like many "trad" wives, makes the point that she chose her life. She claims that had been a feminist, or on the path to being a feminist, before choosing what she considered to be the proper role for white women in the United States. In that way, her public self is both proscriptive and prescriptive in that she outlines inappropriate gendered behavior by modelling what she considers to be appropriate. On her website, wifewithapurpose.com. Stewart's bio reads: "Christian, wife, mom of 6, author/educator, Nationalist pundit on white Western heritage and God's love for all His children. Former feminist. #TradLife."[50] Stewart's,

and other Alt-Right women's, views on gender roles are inseparable from their white supremacist beliefs. Before Twitter suspended her account in December 2017 for her racist comments, Stewart fiercely promoted white culture and strict traditionalism. Stewart claims to be a "recovering feminist" and in fact majored in women's spirituality after being primed throughout high school to be a feminist, but that was only the start on the path that led her to her white supremacy and a traditional life.[51]

Stewart described that journey in a video in September 2015, which she posted on her YouTube channel titled "Wife With A Purpose." In the video, Stewart states that she had embraced feminism because it empowered her as a person, but she turned against feminists because they preach that women should hate men, a message she argues has threatened the foundation of the world. To protect that foundation, she could no longer be one of them.[52]

Stewart insists that feminists threaten the world, or at least the Western world, because they undermine the stability of households, which she and others see as the building block of that world. Feminists do so, she claims, by taking away everything that is important to men who rule both that small world of households and the broader world outside households. While her long entries rarely stay on one topic, she makes clear that she supports a patriarchal society and that feminists have ruined that. A long selection reveals the tone, message, and meandering nature of her statements, but it also exemplifies her typical journey from feminism to the Alt-Right. In Stewart's case, feminism is to blame for all that is wrong with society. Somehow, feminists, and feminists alone, took away a man's ability to provide food, shelter, and obtain sex. Feminists have also liberated women from doing their makeup and hair to please a man.

Additionally, according to Stewart, feminists have made it so women are entitled to not only a man's attention but also to a comfortable and idle life at a man's expense after all of the work it took men to build Western culture. For Stewart, the world would not be what it is without men, and feminists will be the end of the world, or at least the culture and society that men have built. She argues:

> Feminism ruins men. … food is really easy to get, whether you just work the average job and can afford to buy … enough food for yourself, or whether you're on food stamps, either way, food is amazingly easy to get in respect to historically how difficult it's been for our ancestors. You've got food, housing … in America, super, super easy … even if you're homeless and you're living in a shelter, you're living in your car, you're still doing, like, a lot better than most of our ancestors, and of course a lot better than people living in poverty in other places in the world. So food, shelter … is taken care of for men in our culture, and sex now is taken care of with pornography, and the internet is everywhere. … You don't have to be wealthy to have a Tracfone and sit near a library … even if you're living out of your car or in a box, and you can sit and look at porn all day long, you just have to have a wi-fi signal. … the phone costs almost nothing at Walmart, you can get them for free through social services. … No matter how poor you are, you have access to twenty-four-seven hardcore pornography. So that takes away men's three drives: … Providing food, providing shelter, and obtaining sex with women. … So why would men … try to navigate this world of feminism? You add on top of it that women are … fat screeching harpies … [If a man] compliments her LinkedIn profile picture … she's gonna publicly shame him for being part of the patriarchy and for harassment, why would men ever think of coming anywhere near a modern woman? … Everything is provided for them, and we are not worth obtaining anymore. … Woman are fat, they don't take care of themselves, … they wear either very little makeup or it looks like they look like clown shows, they don't do their hair … and once you even obtain a relationship with this woman, she's going to be a screeching, nagging, harpy. You're going to work eight, nine, ten hours a day, you're gonna come home, and she is still going to expect you to do the dishes and the cooking and the cleaning and whatever else she decides that you need to do because you're not pulling your weight … while she sits on the couch. That has become modern women because of feminism.[53]

While many of Stewart's speeches sometimes change subjects without clear connections, the Syrian refugee crisis that grew around the civil war in that country gave Stewart a specific event on which she could focus her disdain for feminism in the United

States. Syria erupted in civil war in 2011 and, in the ensuing years, millions of people fled the violence of it and sought refuge in other countries, including the United States. The influx of refugees, however, upset many U.S. citizens, especially white supremacists who did not want nonwhites from overseas further threatening their declining majority and perceived decline in power. White nationalists such as Stewart cared little for the causes of the crisis or for why these "invaders," as she referred to them, sought refuge.[54] What really bothered Stewart, and other white nationalists, was their belief that the refugees would bring crime and dissolution to the countries they migrated to.

For Stewart, the real culprit was those "feminized" Western men who were allowing Syrian refugees into the United States. Those men, she said, had succumbed to the indoctrination of feminists so thoroughly that they had lost their logic and, instead, behaved emotionally. Logical white men should, as Stewart implored, "say no" to Syrians seeking refuge from daily bombings and even worse violence. Those men should close their borders to protect their women and families like men should. In "Welcome Refugees?? I blame feminism, this is why," Stewart lamented that Western nations "are welcoming the migrants with open arms, teddy bears, lollypops, [and] cash." Clearly, feminism was to blame. According to Stewart, it instilled in people a sense of humanitarianism that was driven by "an emotional perspective." Feminism was, and is, she said, "not a very logical perspective."[55] Stewart's disdain for feminism, and the feminization of men that often accompanies it, grows out of the Alt-Right's strict traditionalism.

Whereas Ayla Stewart represents a branch of traditionalist-oriented Alt-Right women, political commentator Ann Coulter represents perhaps a broader image of Alt-

Right women, particularly regarding their feelings on nationalism and immigration. While Stewart blames feminism for the emotional decisions that led to the influx of immigration that has allegedly wreaked havoc on American society, Coulter blames liberals, the media, and politicians from both parties. "America's suicidal immigration policies," argued Coulter, "are the single biggest threat facing the nation." Coulter maintains that not only will immigrants ruin the country, they will lead Democrats into power because once immigrants become citizens and acquire the vote, they will side with their sympathetic supporters. Worse, for Coulter, no Republican politician appeared ready to take a forceful stance on immigration restriction because of white guilt and their fear of political defeat. "Republicans," wrote Coulter, "act embarrassed about having whites vote for them." Such embarrassment, as well as the fear of being labeled a racist, prevents politicians from acting on immigration, and Coulter believes that liberals and the media have made it that way. Coulter argues that the media's "goal … is to prevent Americans from thinking about immigration. Mass-immigration advocates keep banning words, so no one can ever talk about what is being done to the country."[56] Banned words allegedly include "alien" and "illegal," which conservatives have used to dehumanize immigrants. In Coulter's view, liberals have promulgated political correctness to such an extent that they have prevented politicians from taking a tougher stance on immigration restriction. The flow of immigrants into the U.S. and politicians' failure to control it caused white supremacists, both male and female, to grow increasingly fearful of the nation's fate. They sought a political candidate who could prevent what Coulter and others saw as inevitable.

Besides their racism, Taylor, Duke, Spencer, Stewart, and Coulter, as well as their followers, shared broader yet similar concerns. Together, they worried that since the start of the Civil Rights movement, and especially since Democrats gained political power in the 1990s, the country was heading in the wrong direction. As new nonwhites rose to political power and as more nonwhites moved into the country, the population was losing those values that had shaped the American populace for generations. For these white supremacists, that decline was most evident in the elections of Bill Clinton and Barack Obama to the presidency, the increase in nonwhite immigrants, the decline of traditional gender roles, and the increased pressure of people who supposedly pushed a politically correct perspective in American culture after the Civil Rights movement. The threat these threads represented came together in 2016 in Hillary Clinton's candidacy for president. She stood for all the perspectives that white supremacists despised and feared. To thwart her rise to power, they sought a candidate who supported what they wanted, a candidate who would build the country in their vision. For them, that candidate was Donald Trump.

In many regards, Trump began gaining popularity as a candidate during the primary elections in the spring and summer of 2016 as his campaign brought together those previously unconnected groups of white supremacists. They initially expressed their support online, primarily through Twitter and particularly through memes. On social media websites such as Twitter, the Alt-Right united in, and expressed, their support for Trump through what is known as meme culture. In meme culture, Alt-Right users promote their ideology by posting pictures that present some idea or belief and that are usually accompanied by some type of joke. Indeed, the Alt-Right prides itself on using

memes to attack and to mock liberal ideas and, especially, Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton.

The Alt-Right has discovered that they could use memes, specifically, and social media more generally, to effectively spread its ideologies. A study conducted by the Pew Research Center found that "20% of social media users say they've modified their stance on a social or political issue because of material they saw on social media, and 17% say social media has helped to change their views about a specific political candidate."[57] Throughout the election season, the Alt-Right relentlessly circulated memes across the internet that intended to discredit Trump's opponents. Once Trump secured the Republican nomination, members of the Alt-Right used a similar strategy to attack a different target. From July to the election, they kept up a near-constant barrage of memes that attacked Hillary Clinton, espoused their racism or biased perspectives, or both. One Twitter user posted a meme that included a picture of the burning Twin Towers from September 11, 2001 with Clinton's signature logo, an arrow pointing forward, over the buildings, along with the phrase "She's with them."[58] Another Twitter user, seeking to use Clinton's husband's past affair against the candidate, posted a meme featuring a picture of former president Bill Clinton with the text, "I always choose someone other than my wife...shouldn't you?"[59] And another Twitter user posted a meme with a picture of a diabolical-looking Hillary Clinton held by bloody hands with the text, "Victims of Benghazi cry out from their graves, Don't elect Hillary as president!"[60]

Trump quickly realized that he could gain support among members of the broader Alt-Right if he followed their lead on social media. On October 13, 2015, Trump retweeted a Pepe the Frog meme that portrayed a character similar to Pepe. The caption

read, "You Can't Stump the Trump."[61] The Pepe meme originated in a 2005 comic that "depict[ed] Pepe and his anthropomorphized animal friends behaving like stereotypical post-college bros: playing video games, eating pizza, smoking pot and being harmlessly gross." By 2009, the meme found itself on the online forum 4chan.org, where it had evolved into a symbol of racism and anti-Semitism.[62] In September 2016, in the midst of the 2016 presidential campaign, the meme had become so identified with white supremacists that the Anti-Defamation League designated the meme a hate symbol.[63] Although no longer frequently attributed to Trump, the Alt-Right continues to circulate the meme on social media, although the meme has been modified into what is known as a Groyper. The Groyper is a frog that resembles Pepe with its hands clasped under its chin. The new meme represents smugness, particularly over Trump's victory and the increasing popularity of the Alt-Right. Alt-Right white supremacists, particularly those who advocate National Socialism, can be easily identified on Twitter because they often use Pepe the Frog or Groyper avatars, or they simply use a frog emoji in their username, as Richard Spencer had for several months.

Even though they supported the same candidate as did conservatives, members of the Alt-Right separated themselves from those mainstream groups. They regarded mainstream conservatives as too left and too weak to run the country. To attack conservatives who failed to embrace the peculiar brand of racism espoused by the Alt-Right, they began referring to mainstream conservatives as cuckservatives, or simply cucks, terms that exploded over social media during the 2016 presidential campaign. While the label refers to conservatives who "want to be seen as nice and tolerant," it is used to castigate anyone who strives to be politically correct.[64] Put simply, cucks are

conservatives who are not conservative enough. These perspectives, initially invoked by paleoconservatives who believed Ronald Reagan was too liberal, took on new meaning in the 2016 presidential election. For the Alt-Right in 2016, cuck and cuckservative epitomized what they considered to be fake conservatism, a perspective they argue is based on not enacting harsh enough restrictions on immigration, capitulating to political correctness, and not embracing a far-right, white nationalist ideology that could positively affect a variety of U.S. policies both nationally and internationally.

That "cuck" grows out of "cuckold" illustrates the connection that supposed real conservatives, as well as members of the Alt-Right, make between their white supremacy and highly developed sense of hypermasculinity. To that end, white nationalists classify males as either alpha males or beta males. They, of course, are the alpha males, the strong leaders who would never be made into cuckolds. They are strong at home, control their wives, and they are strong in society as well. Conversely, betas are weak, and white nationalists have used the term to specifically describe conservatives who, in their opinions, are weak. For example, David Duke frequently described Evan McMullin, a candidate in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, as a beta. McMullin, formerly a Republican, ran as a member of the Independent Party. McMullin's switch from the Republican Party meant he had given up on the ideals held and fought for by conservatives. According to Duke, that is why McMullin is a cuck, or beta. Cucks and betas, according to white nationalists, possess lower levels of testosterone, as does anyone who supports them.[65] More than that, and emphasizing that idealized and heightened sense of masculinity, cucks are men who fail to control or satisfy their wives and have, as Alan Rappeport wrote, "lost sight of their futures."[66]

When put together—the accusations of political and social weakness and failure to uphold racial purity combined with "sexual humiliation"—the phrases become, as white nationalist Kevin MacDonald point out, "devastatingly effective."[67] Thus, cucks have, allegedly, lost their manhood, their racial identity, their usefulness to the Right, their political viability and, thus, a place in the emerging future political world. The political world of the United States, as the Alt-Right sees it, centers around white interests, hypermasculinity, and traditional social and cultural values. Anyone who deviates from that strict perspective risks being labeled a cuckservative. No one was safe, and no one was spared the accusation. After a video emerged in July 2016 of Vice Presidential candidate Mike Pence saying that "America has always and will always be a welcoming nation" regarding immigration, Richard Spencer retweeted it and wrote that "Mike Pence officially sucks. #Cuckservative."[68]

To the Alt-Right, Trump, unlike Pence, is no cuck. On the contrary, Trump became a hero. Trump's campaign gave the Alt-Right the ammunition it needed to freely express and then pursue its desire for a white ethnostate as well as the ability to abandon political correctness and, in doing so, freely express their misogyny and racism. "Many whites," according to Jared Taylor, "police their language to a remarkable degree," and have admitted to being "afraid to disagree with a black person for fear of being thought racist."[69] To white supremacists' delight, Trump denounced political correctness throughout his campaign, and he did so in a way that appealed to them. For example, when he announced his candidacy in June 2015, he asserted that Mexican immigrants were drug dealers and rapists.[70] His claim made many Alt-Right voters "ecstatic."[71] In March 2016, Trump tweeted that "Obama, and all others, have been so weak, and so

politically correct, that terror groups are forming and getting stronger! Shame."[72] On July 4, 2016, he tweeted that "with Hillary and Obama, the terrorist attacks will only get worse. Politically correct fools, won't even call it what it is - RADICAL ISLAM!"[73] In this sense, Trump connected political correctness with Islamic terror and fanned the flames of hate against Muslims. Trump's constant denouncement of political correctness, combined with his growing popularity, gave white supremacists the courage to express their racist views more openly and, as it turned out, more aggressively.

Trump also frequently made disparaging, misogynistic remarks about actress Rosie O'Donnell as well as fellow Republican presidential candidate Carly Fiorina. At the Republican primary debate in August 2015, moderator Megyn Kelly asked Trump about his past comments calling women "fat pigs" and "slobs," and Trump replied with "only Rosie O'Donnell."[74] In a September 2015 *Rolling Stone* interview, Trump said about Fiorina: "Look at that face! … Would anyone vote for that? Can you imagine that, the face of our next president?! … I mean, she's a woman, and I'm not [supposed to] say bad things, but really, folks, come on."[75] In March 2016, Trump retweeted a meme with an unflattering picture of primary opponent Ted Cruz's wife next to a flattering picture of his own wife with the caption, "a picture is worth a thousand words."[76] Coming from a man who ran for, and won, the presidency, Trump's misogynistic and politically incorrect comments made it acceptable for white supremacists to freely make disparaging comments about women and attack minorities.

Perhaps even more appealing than a newfound freedom of speech, Trump's remarks gave white nationalists hope that they could make their homelands exclusively white, or, at the very least, ruled solely by whites again. Trump ran a fiercely nationalistic

campaign focused on white Americans, and the Alt-Right loved it. He frequently used the phrase "America First," once used by the Ku Klux Klan, throughout his campaign, emphasizing that he planned to focus solely on Americans if elected president. For the Alt-Right, "Trump [was] the first opportunity voters [had] to re-enfranchise themselves and disenfranchise the globalist plutocrats."[77] The Alt-Right saw a Trump victory as an opportunity to repel globalist forces that allegedly sought to impose multiculturalism and diversity onto the United States. For far too long, members of the Alt-right seethed as globalist forces, according to them, impelled the U.S. to absorb immigrants and cater to minorities' interests while disregarding those of whites and, in some cases, putting whites in danger. Kate Steinle, for example, a white woman from San Francisco, California, was shot by an undocumented immigrant in July 2015. Shortly after Steinle's death, Trump tweeted support for Kate's Law, which would increase penalties for "illegal" immigrants.[78] Not once, however, did Trump tweet support for Philando Castile, an unarmed black man shot by a police officer in July 2016, nor did he express support for any legislation designed to combat police brutality against African Americans. Trump also frequently expressed support for a ban on Muslim immigration throughout his campaign and released a statement that it should be shut down; that statement has since been taken down from Trump's websites. Taken together, the Alt-Right increasingly saw Trump as someone who would always put white Americans first and who would return the U.S. to a nation where whites once again retained hierarchical rule.

Decades of social progress for minorities, and eight years of an African American president who built on it, generated a more forceful white supremacist reactionary movement among various groups who shared goals. All of that culminated in the 2016

U.S. presidential election and led to those groups' unification under the Alt-Right to support Republican candidate Donald Trump. The social progress made by minorities had damaged whites' pride, and, to the Alt-Right, endangered white heritage, identity, and culture. Additionally, President Obama launched policies that steered the nation back toward liberalism. The Supreme Court, for example, with two new justices appointed by Obama, struck down bans on same-sex marriage. Obama enabled millions of Americans, including minorities, to gain access to affordable healthcare. Above all, a nonwhite became the leader of the free world, and that horrified white supremacists. They began to adopt race realism, a train of thought promoted by Jared Taylor, as a way to discuss racial differences while masking their racism. They began to fight against what they viewed as a forceful imposition of diversity and multiculturalism, which they saw as a prelude to white genocide. They also rebelled political correctness, which hindered their ability to freely express their racism and misogyny. White supremacists looked for a way to retaliate against what they perceived as an assault on traditionalism carried out by liberals and Jews. They found hope in Trump when he ran for president. Trump, with his campaign focused on extreme nationalism, racism, immigration restriction, and assault on political correctness, represented an opportunity for whites to revive their traditional values and hierarchy, and white supremacists from all branches united as the Alt-Right to support him. Trump tapped into the Alt-Right's fears and desires as a way to further draw in support from them and anyone else who might be teetering on the line between conservatism and extremism and, in doing so, won the presidency.

CHAPTER V

EPILOGUE

On August 12, 2017, white supremacists from around the United States gathered at Emancipation Park in Charlottesville, Virginia, for a Unite the Right rally to bring together members of the Alt-Right in protest of the planned removal of a Confederate statue. The night before the event, white supremacists marched around the University of Virginia campus in the heart of Charlottesville, carrying tiki torches and chanting "you will not replace us" as well as "Jews will not replace us."[1] Counterprotesters also attended the rally, and violence between the groups erupted later that day. Two known leaders of the Alt-Right, Baked Alaska and Richard Spencer, were sprayed with mace, dozens of small fights broke out around campus and in downtown Charlottesville, and everyone was forced to retreat from the park. The most violent incident, however, occurred when James Fields, a white supremacist from Ohio, drove his car into a crowd of counterprotesters, killing 32-year-old Heather Heyer, who had come to the rally to protest the Alt-Right and the increasing incidences of racism across the country. The Charlottesville rally placed contemporary white nationalism front-and-center in the news even more so than it had been during the 2016 U.S. presidential election. More than that, the protest revealed the several branches that the Alt-Right encompassed. The rally's

attendees included members of the Ku Klux Klan, the League of the South, the Traditionalist Worker Party, and notable Alt-Right figures such as Richard Spencer and David Duke, all of whom attended the rally to unite once again around their shared ideological perspectives, this time to protest efforts to symbolically erase white heritage.

While the rest of the country hotly debated the events that transpired in Charlottesville, President Donald Trump did nothing to ease growing tensions. Rather than hold white supremacists responsible for the chaos they provoked at the rally, Trump pointed out that counterprotesters bore equal responsibility for the upheaval, violence, and death that weekend. Trump condemned "in the strongest possible terms this egregious display of hatred, bigotry and violence," but he insisted that perpetrators of that violence were "on many sides. On many sides."[2] His comments sparked an immediate uproar. White House officials tried to quiet the rising storm by telling reporters from ABC News that Trump "went off script and used his own words Saturday when he made that controversial decision to condemn 'many sides' of the unrest in Charlottesville, Virginia, rather than to single out white supremacists."[3]

By going "off script," Trump did more than rattle the media. In one sense in his statement, Trump appeared to be condemning the violence in Charlottesville, but he was trying to do so without angering his significant base of white supremacist supporters. Three days later, Trump's efforts to retain his support from white supremacists became clearer. During a press conference, Trump corroborated the claim that he added the many sides comment himself when he reread his original statement to a reporter and omitted it. Trump refrained from calling Fields's act of driving his car through a crowd of protesters an act of domestic terrorism. Instead, he argued the debate over labeling the act was

simply “legal semantics.” When a reporter brought up that Senator John McCain had blamed the Alt-Right for the violence, Trump aggressively told the reporter to “define Alt-Right to” him and then asked, “what about the Alt-Left that came charging at the, as you say, the Alt-Right? Do they have any semblance of guilt?” He went on to describe some of the violence he had allegedly observed perpetrated by counterprotesters.[4] Taken together, Trump’s remarks make clear that by coalescing around their shared perspective, the strands of the white supremacist/white nationalist community exerted considerable power in a presidential election.

After the violence in Charlottesville, Trump refused to single out for criticism that critical portion of his base. Instead, he defended the Alt-Right because its members had worked tirelessly to get him elected. To show them support, Trump described the events in Charlottesville in a way that put blame on everyone involved: “you had a group on one side that was bad, and you had a group on the other side that was also very violent. And nobody wants to say that, but I'll say it right now.” In doing so, Trump deflected and diffused criticisms of the Alt-Right as the instigator of the violence. For Trump, the counterprotesters were violent while the white supremacists were simply bad. At the same time, he voiced his support of what initially drew the Alt-Right to Charlottesville—the removal of the statue of a leader of the Confederacy—by criticizing what he saw as the attempts by counterprotesters to impose a politically correct view of American history at the expense of men Trump and the Alt-Right saw as heroes. After wondering aloud which Founding Father’s legacy might next be tarnished by the Left, Trump ignored the tiki torches, marching, and racist and anti-Semitic chanting when he defended the Alt-Right’s protest, which, according to him, was quiet and subdued, unlike that of the

counterprotesters.[5] The incident revealed that the Alt-Right had chosen wisely, and that the president they helped elect was not going to forget their support.

As this thesis has shown, whites' fear of losing their supremacy and majority in the U.S. has been present in the nation for over 150 years, and it fundamentally shaped U.S. politics. The original Ku Klux Klan represents an early moment when whites organized to restore and then to preserve their dominance after Constitutional amendments passed during Reconstruction freed African Americans from slavery and gave black men the right to vote, which resulted in political advances for them. Whites panicked at the thought of blacks voting or running for office, which blacks did in the immediate post-Civil War period. Whites reacted by terrorizing African Americans into submission. Dressed in white robes and hoods to resemble ghosts, Klansmen rode horses through Southern towns at night scaring blacks into hiding inside their homes, fleeing into the woods, or fleeing town altogether. Klan members also manned the polls during elections and intimidated African Americans to prevent them from voting. They also terrorized whites, particularly white Radical Reconstructionists, who sought political equality for blacks. Using oftentimes violent tactics, the first Klan ensured that white men retained their dominant political power. Congress, however, helped put an end to the first Klan through legislation that allowed the government to use martial law to protect citizens' social and political rights.

Despite government legislation passed to stop them, whites refused to give up the battle to secure their dominance. The film *The Birth of a Nation* portrayed the Klan as heroes to a Southern town devastated by black savages and inspired a new generation of whites to form a second iteration of the Klan. The film proved so influential that the Klan

recruited millions of members from all around the United States. Like the first Klan, the second Klan fought to maintain white supremacy, but it also focused on racially purifying the U.S. and restoring its traditional values. The influx of immigrants in the 1920s made whites worry that their culture was endangered. More significantly, immigrants might be elected into office and pass legislation that favored their interests over those of whites. To prevent that, Klansmen again used violence to intimidate minorities, and they ran in and won local elections, winning seats on city councils, particularly in the Midwest. The second Klan, however, faded from the national stage because it was too decentralized. A third iteration of the Klan emerged in the post-World War II period largely in response to the Civil Rights movement, begun in the 1950s. Although smaller in number than the previous Klans, the third Klan does not lack a significant number of members. More than that, its geographic reach exceeds that of previous Klan organizations.

The Civil Rights movement also inspired the rise of other white supremacist organizations. All of them shared a goal. They strove to maintain whites' majority and dominance in U.S. society and politics. Neo-Confederates, for example, created an ideological perspective from their often-flawed historical memory of the Civil War and Antebellum Southern society. They yearn for the restoration of Southern traditions and values, especially white supremacy and Christian morality. To legitimate their outlook, however, Neo-Confederates rewrote history to portray the South as the victim of Northern economic, political, and social aggression during the Civil War, and they deny that the War was fought to preserve the right of whites to own African Americans. The history of those issues and events, however, reveals otherwise. The League of the South, the most prominent Neo-Confederate organization, dedicates itself to saving whites from

the alleged war raged against them by African Americans, supported by Northern whites, who want to dominate them in society and politics.

Grassroots resistance groups in the South such as the Citizens Councils also emerged in response to the *Brown v Board* decision in 1954 that declared segregated schools unconstitutional. White Southerners refused to send their children to school with black children, who they deemed inferior and destructive to white society. They fought school and then societal integration any way they could, sometimes even resorting to violence against African Americans, though they were never linked to any crimes. Citizens' Councils formed through the core belief that miscegenation, in any way, would destroy the white race. Therefore, defying the federal government's attempts to forcefully integrate blacks into society became necessary if whites wished to maintain their status and the society their ancestors had built.

In the post-World War II era, politicians tapped into whites' racism and fears of becoming outnumbered by blacks as well as those of blacks getting themselves elected into office and ultimately destroying white society. Richard Nixon, for example, persuaded white voters with promises of law and order, which served as coded language for cracking down on African Americans who were moving into white suburban neighborhoods. Similarly, Ronald Reagan insisted he would reform welfare as one of his top priorities. To emphasize the issue of welfare as a problem, Reagan promulgated the myth of the welfare queen. He did so often by describing a fictional black woman who bore children as a way to collect welfare checks and live off of the federal government. Despite the fact that whites make up the majority of welfare recipients, this became a stereotype for African Americans, and middle-class whites were only too happy to accept

and promote it. They had become fed up with seeing African Americans advance in society and move closer to equality. Politicians became aware of this and tapped into it to acquire support from middle-class whites.

Minorities, however, continued to make gains in the United States, which only fueled whites' fears of domination by nonwhites. Many minorities won political offices, particularly in the U.S. Congress. In 2001, only 14 percent of Congressional seats were held by minorities; by 2015, that number had jumped to nearly 21 percent.[6] Moreover, a nonwhite won the presidency in 2008, won reelection in 2012, and implemented policies to help minorities to continue making societal gains. Those gains accompanied rapidly changing demographics. In 2005, whites made up 67 percent of the U.S. population, but that number is expected to decrease by 20 percent by 2050.[7] White supremacists refuse to let this happen for various reasons. As Jared Taylor argues, for example, they believe that nonwhites will destroy the country because they are genetically predisposed to do so. Most significantly, they want to remain a majority in their country. Their fear of losing power to people they perceive as inferior terrifies them.

The significant gains made by minorities caused the fear of white genocide. Many whites believe that white genocide is real and promoted by liberal politicians and Jews. They argue that the U.S.'s efforts to diversify the nation represent the attempt of the social, and in many cases literal, genocide of whites and their traditions. They believe that liberal school curricula condition students to hate whites through textbooks that emphasize whites' horrible deeds in the past while they glorify minorities, and they believe that schools make white students feel guilty for being white. Some also believe that Jews play a significant role in white genocide as part of a Zionist conspiracy to

dominate the world. David Duke argued that diversity serves Jews' interests because it results in division, which Jews can use to increase their power. Therefore, Jews encourage the U.S. to embrace multiculturalism. Jews also participate in the genocide of whites by pushing degeneracy onto U.S. society that encourages race-mixing. In this sense, white genocide also refers to the erosion of traditional white values.

For white nationalists, including women, their construction of a white, patriarchal social order from their fictionalized history of the United States in the 1950s exemplifies traditional white values. In their view of that society, women completely submitted to men, and did not work outside the home. Rather, their work entailed cleaning, authentic cooking, making clothes, and, most importantly, raising children. The Alt-Right wants to recreate that nostalgic, imagined community today. They want a world in which women produce as many white babies as possible to combat the country's changing demographics.

From the perspective of the Alt-Right, opponents of these views such as feminists and people who promote political correctness, as well as left-leaning politicians, are facilitating the decline and, ultimately, the destruction of the United States. Feminists, for example, have pushed the ideas that women should have careers just like men and that women do not have to become mothers as society has conditioned them to do. In that sense, to the Alt-Right, feminism has contributed to the destruction of traditional U.S. society with its assault on the nuclear family, which provides the foundation for that traditional culture.

To the Alt-Right, political correctness, allegedly pushed by liberals and feminists, has also destroyed traditional U.S. society by aiding in the erosion of white culture and

whites' freedom of speech. Ann Coulter argued that Americans see immigration as the nation's most serious threat and that politicians do not listen to them because speaking badly about immigrants is not politically correct and would cost them minority votes. Therefore, for Coulter, immigrants remain free to swarm into the U.S. and modify its culture by pushing theirs and eradicate that of whites. Moreover, political correctness not only undermined white American culture, it helped erode white Americans' freedom of speech. If a white person speaks out on immigration, or in any way deemed negative in the slightest sense about any other nonwhite, he or she is immediately labeled a racist. According to the Alt-Right, if a white man says that he believes women should focus on raising children, he is immediately labeled a sexist. White nationalists believe that political correctness rules the U.S. and that it has forced them to lose their rights.

The 2016 U.S. presidential election saw various branches of white supremacists unite as the Alt-Right to support Donald Trump, who abandoned political correctness and coded language, because they believed he would save their country and put whites' interests first. The Alt-Right sought a candidate who was not a mainstream conservative, and they found that in Trump. Trump proclaimed his intentions to restrict nonwhite immigration to the U.S., and he announced that political correctness had ruined the country and that it had to be done away with; in other words, people should be able to say what they want, racist or not, without worrying about hurting other people's feelings. White supremacists could not have been happier. In Trump, their dreams of a white ethnostate could come true. Giddy with a newfound ally in a white man running a presidential campaign that promised the freedom to express racism and promised to put white Americans' interests first, the Alt-Right embarked on a campaign of their own that

included producing and circulating oftentimes hateful and blatantly false memes on the internet. Worse, Trump participated with them. After gaining and maintaining the support of white supremacists around the U.S., and the world, Trump won the election.

Appealing to white supremacists has been a priority of U.S. politicians for decades. Politicians realize the importance of riling up white voters with mythical stereotypes of minorities. Politicians need votes, so they fuel whites' fears and essentially scare people into voting for them. They have also realized the importance of social media and the significance of memes in a campaign.

Trump's candidacy and presidency has brought together white supremacists, and politicians are now building on, and expanding, that foundation. Paul Nehlen challenged, and lost to, Paul Ryan in the 2016 primary for the House of Representatives seat that represents the first district of Wisconsin, but he is once again running for that same seat in 2018. Nehlen expressed full support for Trump's candidacy in the 2016 election, and he continues to express, and fuel, concern for whites' rights. Nehlen has become another hero to the Alt-Right by conducting himself as one of them. He makes and circulates his own hateful memes, and he has starting using white supremacists' language in his campaign speeches and tweets. In a Twitter exchange with a black journalist, Nehlen referred to the journalist as Tyrone, a common and stereotypical name invoked by the Alt-Right when referring to African American men.[8] Until Twitter suspended his account for his virulent anti-Semitism in February 2018, he also frequently tweeted the new and popular white supremacist slogan, "It's Okay to be White," a slogan that seems innocent but that fights against the perceived, and false, notion that minorities are waging a race war against whites. Finally, Nehlen appeals to anti-Semitic white supremacists with his

use of three parentheses on each side of the name of a Jew, or a word that refers to a Jew, as well as by supporting the claim that Jews are not white. In a heated Twitter exchange with Jewish lawyer Ari Cohn, Nehlen referred to Cohn as a "(((bigot)))" and accused him of "[pretending that he was] white for the purposes of starting a race war" with him.[9] Although Nehlen's influence on white voters in Wisconsin remains to be seen, he is applying the tried-and-true tactic of appealing to white supremacist voters, as Trump did throughout the 2016 campaign. Trump, as well as other U.S. politicians, as this thesis has shown, was and is aware of his support from white supremacists. He appealed to them to win the presidency, and, if he chooses to run for reelection in 2020, he must retain their support and continue to appeal to them. It is a path Donald Trump established in 2016.

NOTES

CHAPTER ONE NOTES

1. Richard B. Spencer, Twitter post, August 27, 2016 (4:26 a.m.), accessed February 26, 2018, https://twitter.com/RichardBSpencer/status/769496233614319616.

2. Gary Langer, "Trump Approval is Low but Steady; On Charlottesville, Lower Still," ABC News/Washington Post Poll, Langer Research Associates, August 21, 2017, accessed March 23, 2018, www.langerresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/1190a1TrumpandCharlottesville.pdf.

3. Alan Taylor, *American Revolutions: A Continental History, 1750-1804* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2016); Staughton Lynd, *Class Conflict, Slavery, and the United States Constitution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

4. James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); John Ashworth, *The Republic in Crisis, 1848-1861* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012); William Pencak, "The Civil War Did Not Take Place," *The American Journal of Semiotics* 17, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 7-29.

5. Douglas A. Blackmon, *Slavery By Another Name: The Re-Enslavement of Black Americans from the Civil War to World War II* (New York: Anchor Books, 2008).

6. Allen W. Trelease, *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971), quotes on xi and 51. The literature on the first Ku Klux Klan is comprehensive. It includes, but is not restricted to: David Chalmers, *Hooded Americanism: The History of the Ku Klux Klan* (Chapel Hill, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Wyn Craig Wade, *The Fiery Cross: The Ku Klux Klan in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); and Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877* (New York: Harper Collins, 1989).

7. Nancy MacLean, *Behind the Mask of Chivalry: The Making of the Second Ku Klux Klan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), xii.

8. Kathleen M. Blee, *Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 3.

9. Ibid., 127.

10. Euan Hague, Heidi Beirich, and Edward H. Sebesta, eds. *Neo-Confederacy: A Critical Introduction* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008), 10.

11. Ibid., 79.

12. Ibid., 81.

13. Carol M. Swain, *The New White Nationalism in America: Its Challenge to Integration* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), xv.

14. Ibid., 3.

15. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (New York: Verso, 1991), 6.

16. James M. McPherson, "Was Blood Thicker than Water? Ethnic and Civic Nationalism in the American Civil War," *American Philosophical Society* 143, no. 1, (Mar., 1999): 103, accessed April 4, 2018, https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3181978.pdf.

CHAPTER TWO NOTES

1. Nashville *Republican Banner*, Feb. 16, 1868, copied in Batesville *North Arkansas Times*, April 18, 1868, cited in Allen W. Trelease, *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1971), 56-57.

2. Edward E. Baptist, *Creating an Old South: Middle Florida's Plantation Frontier before the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 120-153.

3. Eric Foner, *A Short History of Reconstruction, 1863-1877* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1990); James M. McPherson and James K. Hogue, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction*, 4th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009).

4. Trelease, *White Terror*, 51.

5. "Tennessee: Political Troubles Anticipated—Rebel Hatred of the Federal Government—Outrages by the Kuklux Klan—The Position of the Blacks," *New York Times*, August 14, 1868, accessed July 10, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9802E6DC1E3CE13BBC4C52DFBE668383679FDE.

6. Jack Hurst, *Nathan Bedford Forrest: A Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), 275-277.

7. Nathan Bedford Forrest, Letter to *Avalanche*, May 20, 1868, p.2., cited in Hurst, *Nathan Bedford Forrest*, 296.

8. Trelease, *White Terror*, 74.

9. U.S. Congress, "Report of the Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States" (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1872), 52. Hereafter referred to as KKK Report.

10. Ibid., 7.

11. Ibid., 17.

12. Davison and Foxx, *Nathan Bedford Forrest*, 427.

13. Allen W. Trelease, *Reconstruction: The Great Experiment* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1972), 120-146.

14. Ibid., 432.

15. Trelease, *White Terror*, 93.

16. KKK Report, 61.

17. "A Member of the Kuklux Klan Killed in Mississippi, *New York Times*, April 24, 1868, accessed July 10, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9D0CE4DB1230EE34BC4C51DFB2668383679FDE.

18. John C. Reed, "What I Know of the Ku Klux Klan: Part I - The conditions which compelled the creation of the Ku Klux Klan, its purposes and its organization," *Uncle Remus's Magazine for January 1908*, Sunny South Publishing Company, 1908, 24, accessed July 6, 2017, https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=6nNNAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&hl=en&pg=GBS.PP1.

19. KKK Report, 7.

20. John C. Reed, *The Brothers' War* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1906), xxiii, accessed July 6, 2017. https://books.google.com/books?id=RhpCAAAAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false.

21. Trelease, *White Terror*, 94.

22. "THE FURY OF PATIENT MEN; When American Communities Have Taken the Law Into Their Own Hands Patience and Fury. Pennsylvania 'Rangers.' The 'Minute Men.' Lynch Law. Mafia in New Orleans. Work of Vigilantes. Ku Klux in the South," *New York Times*, August 10, 1919, accessed July 12, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9A00E7DA1338EE32A25753C1A96E9C946896D6CF.

23. Hurst, *Nathan Bedford Forrest*, 279.

24. KKK Report, 31-32.

25. *House Miscellaneous Documents*, 41st Congress, 2d sess., No. 53, cited in Trelease, *White Terror*, 175.

26. "The Kuklux Klan in Tennessee—Gov. Brownlow Declines to be a Candidate for Vice-President," *New York Times*, April 16, 1868, accessed on July 10, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9E07E2DC1730EE34BC4E52DFB2668383679FDE.

27. KKK Report, 69.

28. "The Burning of the Quakers' Mills in Logan County by the Kuklux—A Despicable Outrage," *New York Times*, September 24, 1868, accessed on July 10, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9C05EFD91330EE34BC4C51DFBF668383679FDE.

29. Trelease, *White Terror*, 321.

30. *House Miscellaneous Documents*, 40th Congress, 3d sess., No. 52, 79-80, cited in Trelease, *White Terror*, 229.

31. "Tennessee: Political Troubles Anticipated--Rebel Hatred of the Federal Governemnt--Outrages by the Kuklux Klan--The Position of the Blacks," *New York Times*, August 14, 1868, accessed July 11, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9802E6DC1E3CE13BBC4C52DFBE668383679FDE.

32. "The Political Behavior of the Blacks," *New York Times*, April 26, 1868, accessed on July 11, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9401E6DB1730EE34BC4E51DFB2668383679FDE.

33. Ibid.

34. "Louisiana: Commercial Communication with Cuba—Impeachment—The Kuklux Sensation," *New York Times*, May 24, 1868, accessed on July 10, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9A04E2D81730EE34BC4C51DFB3668383679FDE.

35. "Riot in Gretna—The Mob Order Away the Police," *New York Times*, October 24, 1868, accessed on July 11, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9902E5DB1E3CE13BBC4C51DFB6678383679FDE.

36. Reed, "What I Know," 25.

37. Susan Lawrence Davis, *Authentic History, Ku Klux Klan, 1865-1877* (New York: Susan Lawrence Davis, 1924), 125, accessed July 30, 2017, https://archive.org/stream/authentichistor00davi#page/n161/mode/2up.

38. Trelease, *White Terror*, 388.

39. Enforcement Act of 1871, Public Law 42-22, 42d Congress, 1st sess. (April 20, 1871), accessed August 1, 2017, https://www.loc.gov/law/help/statutes-at-large/42nd-congress/session-1/c42s1ch22.pdf.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid.

42. KKK Report, 54.

43. Trelease, *White Terror*, 418-421.

44. *The Birth of a Nation*, directed by D.W. Griffith (David W. Griffith Corporation, 1915), accessed July 20, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I3kmVgQHIEY&t=122s.

45. Charles O. Jackson, "William J. Simmons: A Career in Ku Kluxism," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 50, no. 2 (December 1966): 351, accessed August 9, 2017, https://www.jstor.org/stable/40578787?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.

46. Ibid., 352.

47. Ibid., 353.

48. William J. Simmons, *The Klan Unmasked* (Atlanta: Wm E. Thompson Publishing Co., 1923), 18-19, accessed August 9, 2017, https://ia800800.us.archive.org/12/items/TheKlanUnmasked/TKU.pdf.

49. Ibid., 28.

50. Ibid., 34.

51. Robert M. Fogelson and Richard E. Rubenstein, *Mass Violence in America: Hearings on the Ku Klux Klan 1921* (New York: Arno Press & The New York Times, 1969), 120-121.

52. Simmons, *The Klan Unmasked*, quotes on 38 and 50-51.

53. Nancy MacLean, *Behind the Mask of Chivalry: The Making of the Second Ku Klux Klan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), quotes on 5 and 15.

54. Ibid., 53.

55. Ibid., 41.

56. Simmons, *The Klan Unmasked*, 50-51.

57. Ibid., 157.

58. "GEORGIA MOB SLAYS NEGRO. Prisoner Convicted of Shooting is Killed Near Monticello," *New York Times*, October 29, 1919, accessed August 7, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9C0CE4DC1138EE32A2575AC2A9669D946896D6CF.

59. "BRAND NEGRO WITH ACID AFTER FLOGGING HIM; Masked Whites in Dallas Burn 'K.K.K.' on Bell Boy's Forehead," *New York Times*, April 3, 1921, accessed August 7, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9407E2DD103FEE3ABC4B53DFB266838A639EDE.

60. William D. Jenkins, *Steel Valley Klan: The Ku Klux Klan in Ohio's Mahoning Valley* (Kent: The Kent State University Press, 1990), 16.

61. Simmons, *The Klan Unmasked*, 127-128.

62. Ibid., 27.

63. "KLAN WINS IN OHIO CITIES. Youngstown, Portsmouth and Akron Elect Men Endorsed by It," *New York Times*, November 7, 1923, accessed August 15, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive/pdf?res=9500E0D91739E033A25754C0A9679D946295D6CF.

64. Jenkins, *Steel Valley Klan*, 47.

65. "KLAN CANDIDATES SWEPT OHIO CITIES; Lost Only in Steubenville, Where an Anti-Ku Klux Organization Started After Riots," *New York Times*, November 8, 1923, accessed August 15, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive/pdf?res=9507E5D81739E033A2575BC0A9679D946295D6CF.

66. Simmons, *The Klan Unmasked*, 55.

67. Hiram Wesley Evans, “"The Klan's Fight for Americanism." *The North American Review* 223, no. 830 (1926): 58-60, http://www.jstor.org/stable/25113510.

68. Kathleen M. Blee, *Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), quotes on 1, 2, and 109.

69. William Rawlings, *The Second Coming of Invisible Empire: The Ku Klux Klan of the 1920s* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2016), 235.

70. “THE KLAN'S INVISIBLE EMPIRE IS FADING; Nation-Wide Survey Indicates That Ridicule and Dissension Have Caused Membership to Drop EMPIRE OF KLAN NOW DECLINING,” *New York Times*, February 21, 1926, accessed August 16, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive/pdf?res=9A07EFDE1339E633A25752C2A9649C946795D6CF.

71. “Cleveland Klan Parade Forbidden,” *New York Times*, June 23, 1926, accessed August 8, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive/pdf?res=990DE6DC1E3AEE3ABC4B51DFB066838D639EDE.

72. “MIAMI NEGROES VOTE, DEFYING KLAN THREAT; Went to Polls in Record Number for the City, an Official Says,” *New York Times*, May 3, 1939, accessed August 10, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive/pdf?res=9805E5DA123AE532A25750C0A9639C946894D6CF.

73. “Klan Disbands as National Body; Claimed 5,000,000 Roll in 1920s,” *New York Times*, June 5, 1944, accessed August 17, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive/pdf?res=9807EFDA143EE03BBC4D53DFB066838F659EDE.

74. Leonard S. Rubinowitz, "The Courage of Civil Rights Lawyers: Fred Gray and His Colleagues," *Case Western Reserve Law Review* 67, no. 4 (Summer 2017): 1235, accessed February 28, 2017, http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=4&sid=a2b3d366-f5c5-42d5-be92-dd0e9df6ed99%40sessionmgr4007.

75. “KLAN SYMBOL REAPPERS; Fiery Cross Placed at House of Negro Lawyer in Richmond,” *New York Times*, August 11, 1955, accessed August 19, 2017, http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9A02E4D7103AE53BBC4952DFBE66838E649EDE.

CHAPTER THREE NOTES

1. Allen W. Trelease, *Reconstruction: The Great Experiment* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1972), 200-204.

2. William Pencak, "The Civil War Did Not Take Place," *The American Journal of Semiotics* 17, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 11; For more on how the Civil War resulted from concerns over slavery rather than states' rights, see Charles B. Dew, *Apostles of Disunion: Southern Secession Commissioners and the Causes of the Civil War* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001).

3. Ibid., 18.

4. James Ronald Kennedy and Walter Donald Kennedy, *The South Was Right!* (Gretna: Pelican Publishing Company, 1994), 9.

5. Ibid., 234.

6. Ibid., 226.

7. See secession documents in James W. Loewen and Edward H. Sebesta, eds., *The Confederate and Neo-Confederate Reader: The "Great Truth" about the "Lost Cause,"* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010), 111-117, 127-129, 130-144, 153-159.

8. South Carolina Secession Convention, "Declaration of the Immediate Causes Which Induce and Justify the Secession of South Carolina from the Federal Union," December 24, 1860, in Loewen and Sebesta, *The Confederate and Neo-Confederate Reader*, 114-115.

9. "Mississippi Secession Convention, 'A Declaration of the Immediate Causes Which Induce and Justify the Secession of the State of Mississippi from the Federal Union,' January 26, 1861," in *The Confederate and Neo-Confederate Reader*, 127.

10. Ibid., 128.

11. "Alabama Secession Convention, 'Resolution of Resistance," January 7, 1861, and 'Ordinance of Secession,' January 11, 1861," in *The Confederate and Neo-Confederate Reader*, 131.

12. "Texas Secession Convention, 'A Declaration of the Causes Which Impel the State of Texas to Secede from the Federal Union,' February 2, 1861," in *The Confederate and Neo-Confederate Reader*, 141.

13. Ibid., 143.

14. Walter D. Kennedy, *Myths of American Slavery* (Gretna: Pelican Publishing Company, 2003), 117.

15. Ibid., 119.

16. Euan Hague, Heidi Beirich, and Edward H. Sebesta, eds. *Neo-Confederacy: A Critical Introduction* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008), 6.

17. Michael Hill, "What is the League of the South?" League of the South: Survival, Well-Being, and Independence of Southern People, last modified March 19, 2017, accessed January 30, 2017, http://leagueofthesouth.com/about/.

18. Clyde Wilson, "Dispelling Southern Myths," *The Free Magnolia: The Voice of Southern Life and Culture* 1, no. 1 (January-March 2007), 4.

19. Hill, "What is the League of the South?"

20. Hague, Beirich, and Sebesta, eds. *Neo-Confederacy: A Critical Introduction*, 144.

21. Franklin Sanders, "Culture as a Weapon," *The Free Magnolia* 3, no. 3, 5.

22. Franklin Sanders, "The Silent Genocide: Part I," *The Free Magnolia* 1, no. 4 (October-December 2007), 1.

23. Ibid., 3.

24. Michael Hill, "How long, white man?" League of the South, August 14, 2016, accessed November 6, 2017, http://leagueofthesouth.com/how-long-white-man/.

25. Ibid.

26. Ibid.

27. Neil R. McMillen, *The Citizens' Council: Organized Resistance to the Second Reconstruction, 1954-64* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 11.

28. Ibid., 16.

29. John Bartlow Martin, *The Deep South Says "Never"* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1957), 1.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid., 2.

32. Ibid., 3.

33. Ibid., 16.

34. Thomas Pickens Brady, "Black Monday," quoted in Martin, *Deep South Says "Never,"* quotes on 16, 17, and 19.

35. McMillen, *The Citizens' Council*, 124-125.

36. Ibid., 128-137.

37. Ibid., 217.

38. "Conservative Headlines," last modified January 31, 2018, accessed February 5, 2018, http://conservative-headlines.com.

39. Dylann Roof, quoted in "Inside the White Supremacist Group that Influenced Charleston Shooting Suspect," by Josh Sanburn, *Time*, June 22, 2015, accessed February 5, 2018, http://time.com/3930993/dylann-roof-council-of-conservative-citizens-charleston/.

40. Michael Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right: The Origins of the Christian Identity Movement* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 4.

41. Chester L. Quarles, *Christian Identity: The Aryan American Bloodline Religion* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2004), 68.

42. The staff at Divine Truth Ministries, "Mission Statement," DivineTruth.org, last modified March 18, 2017, accessed March 20, 2017, http://divine-truth.org/mission-statement/.

43. Paul R. Mullet, Twitter bio, accessed March 26, 2017, https://twitter.com/pastormullet.

44. Pastor Paul R. Mullet, "The 'Jews:' An introduction," DivineTruth.org, last modified March 24, 2017, accessed March 24, 2017, http://divine-truth.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/THE-JEWS.pdf.

45. Pastor Paul R. Mullet, "Seventh Commandment Forbids Race Mixing," DivineTruth.org, March 17, 2017, accessed March 24, 2017, http://divine-truth.org/2017/03/17/seventh-commandment-forbids-race-mixing/.

46. Ibid.

47. Ibid.

48. Thomas J. Sugrue, "Crabgrass-Roots Politics: Race, Rights, and the Reaction against Liberalism in the Urban North, 1940-1964," *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (Sep., 1995), quotes on 564 and 561-562, accessed February 1, 2018, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2082186.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A3f5c9c884bd5dc9218cf772751566a24.

49. Ibid., 565-566.

50. Ibid., 569.

51. Lee Edwards, *Goldwater: The Man Who Made a Revolution* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 1995), quotes on xix and 236.

52. Barry M. Goldwater with Jack Casserly, *Goldwater* (New York: Doubleday, 1988), 196.

53. George Wallace, quoted in Jody Carlson, *George C. Wallace and the Politics of Powerlessness: The Wallace Campaigns for Presidency, 1964-1976* (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1981), 24.

54. Stephan Lesher, *George Wallace: American Populist* (New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1994), 421.

55. J. Michael Ross, Reeve D. Vanneman, and Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Patterns of Support for George Wallace: Implications for Racial Change," *Journal of Social Issues* 36, no. 2 (1976): 69-91, accessed March 28, 2018, https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6e0c/4cc05f292e9aef82ed7ab783cd4c19f6e546.pdf.

56. Matthew D. Lassiter, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 1-5; Sugrue, "Crabgrass-Roots Politics," 552-553.

57. Lassiter, *The Silent Majority*, 234.

58. Ibid., quotes on 301, 306, and 312.

59. Leonard Zeskind, *Blood and Politics: The History of the White Nationalist Movement from the Margins to the Mainstream* (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 2009), 47.

60. Thomas W. Evans, *The Education of Ronald Reagan: The General Electric Years and the Untold Story of His Conversion to Conservatism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006).

61. Peter Schweizer and Wynton C. Hall, eds., *Landmark Speeches of the American Conservative Movement* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 42.

62. Ronald Reagan, "'Welfare Queen' Becomes Issue in Reagan Campaign," *New York Times*, February 15, 1976, accessed March 19, 2017, http://www.nytimes.com/1976/02/15/archives/welfare-queen-becomes-issue-in-reagan-campaign-hitting-a-nerve-now.html?_r=0.

63. Ibid.

64. Ronald Reagan, "Radio Address to the Nation on Welfare Reform," The American Presidency Project, February 15, 1986, accessed on March 19, 2017, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=36875.

65. Hague, Beirich, and Sebesta, eds. *Neo-Confederacy: A Critical Introduction*, quotes on 26 and 29.

CHAPTER FOUR NOTES

1. Joseph Goldstein, "Alt-Right Gathering Exults in Trump Election with Nazi-Era Salute," *New York Times*, November 20, 2016, accessed March 5, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/21/us/alt-right-salutes-donald-trump.html?_r=0.

2. "White nationalist Richard Spencer punched in the face on camera," *The Washington Post*, January 20, 2017, accessed March 5, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/video/national/white-nationalist-richard-spencer-punched-in-the-face-on-camera/2017/01/20/e44dd490-df82-11e6-8902-610fe486791c_video.html.

3. Richard Spencer, host, "The Uses and Abuses of Nietzsche" (podcast), *Radix Journal*, December 29, 2011, accessed March 5, 2017, http://www.radixjournal.com/podcast/podcast/237.

4. David Duke, Twitter post, August 14, 2017 (6:38 a.m.), accessed December 20, 2017, https://twitter.com/DrDavidDuke/status/897089950570737664.

5. Richard Spencer, "Richard Spencer Interview | What is the Alt-Right? (Pt. 1),"Youtube video, 20:14, posted by Roaming Millennial, posted May 2, 2017, accessed February 16, 2018, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mlOv3BXSyJM&t=730s.

6. Max Blau, Sara Ganim, and Chris Welch, "Richard Spencer's appearance at Texas A&M draws protests," *CNN*, December 7, 2016, accessed December 22, 2017, http://www.cnn.com/2016/12/06/politics/richard-spencer-texas-am/index.html.

7. Spencer, "What is the Alt-Right?"

8. Paul Gottfried, "The Decline and Rise of the Alternative Right," *Taki's Magazine*, December 1, 2008, accessed February 16, 2018, http://takimag.com/article/the_decline_and_rise_of_the_alternative_right#axzz57ZyksyWJ.

9. Spencer, "What is the Alt-Right?"

10. Kevin DeAnna, "The Alternative Right," *Taki's Magazine*, July 26, 2009, accessed February 16, 2018, http://takimag.com/article/the_alternative_right/print#axzz57ZyksyWJ. For more on the significance of identity, see Samuel P. Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2004).

11. Jared Taylor, "Interview with Jared Taylor," in *Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism in America*, edited by Carol M. Swain and Russ Nieli (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 88.

12. Ibid.

13. Jared Taylor, *White Identity: Racial Consciousness in the 21st Century* (Oakton: New Century Foundation, 2011), xvii.

14. "Our Issues: 'The Philosophy of Race Realism,'" *American Renaissance*, accessed December 18, 2017, https://www.amren.com/about/issues/.

15. "Our Issues: 'Race and IQ,'" *American Renaissance*, accessed December 18, 2017, https://www.amren.com/about/issues/.

16. Jared Taylor, "White Nationalism: A Symposium," Interview with Jamie Glazov, Frontpagemag.com, January 10, 2003, accessed March 8, 2017, http://archive.frontpagemag.com/Printable.aspx?Artld=20346.

17. Ibid.

18. Jared Taylor, "What the Founders *Really* Thought About Race," *Radix Journal*, July 26, 2016, accessed February 26, 2017, http://www.radixjournal.com/the-red-pill/2016/7/26/what-the-founders-really-thought-about-race.

19. Taylor, *White Identity*, 61-62.

20. David Duke, "Interview with David Duke," in *Contemporary Voices*, edited by Swain and Nieli, 170.

21. "About David Duke," Southern Poverty Law Center, accessed April 17, 2017, https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/individual/david-duke.

22. David Duke, *My Awakening: A Path to Racial Understanding* (Covington: Free Speech Press, 1998), 538, accessed August 18, 2017, https://ia801906.us.archive.org/18/items/MyAwakening1998-DavidDuke/MyAwakening1998-Dr.DavidDuke_text.pdf.

23. Carol M. Swain and Russ Nieli, eds. *Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism in America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 166-167.

24. Ibid., 172.

25. Duke, "Interview with David Duke," 173.

26. David Duke, "Dr. David Duke: Who I am and What I Really Believe," DavidDuke.com, November 14, 2015, accessed March 17, 2017, http://davidduke.com/dr-david-duke-really-believe/.

27. David Duke, "Interview with David Duke," 183.

28. For more information on The Order, a white supremacist organization, as well as ideas that continue to inspire white supremacists, see Andrew Macdonald, *The Turner Diaries* (Hillsboro: National Vanguard Books, 1980).

29. David Lane, "88 Precepts," United Klans of America, last modified August 21, 2017, accessed August 21, 2017, http://www.theuka.us/the-seven-symbols-of-the-klan.html.

30. Traditionalist Worker Party, "25 Points," Tradworker.org, accessed December 1, 2017, https://www.tradworker.org/points/.

31. Traditionalist Worker Party, Tradworker.org, accessed December 1, 2017, https://www.tradworker.org/.

32. David Duke, Twitter post, June 18, 2017 (5:35 a.m.), accessed June 18, 2017, https://twitter.com/DrDavidDuke/status/876418144709029889.

33. David Duke, *Jewish Supremacism: My Awakening on the Jewish Question* (Covington, LA: Free Speech Press, 2002), 111-112.

34. Dr. Patrick Slattery, "Times of Israel writer insists 'Jews are not white,'" Davidduke.com, August 30, 2015, accessed on December 19, 2017, http://davidduke.com/times-of-israel-writer-insists-jews-are-not-white/.

35. Richard Spencer, Twitter post, May 15, 2016 (9:21 a.m.), accessed December 19, 2017, https://twitter.com/RichardBSpencer/status/731882144524423170.

36. Duke, *Jewish Supremacism*, 127.

37. John George and Laird Wilcox, *Nazis, Communists, Klansmen, and Others on the Fringe: Political Extremism in America* (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1992), 7.

38. Spencer, Twitter post, February 6, 2016 (10:46 p.m.), accessed December 26, 2017, https://twitter.com/RichardBSpencer/status/696223568284114945.

39. Spencer, Twitter post, February 7, 2016 (9:34 p.m.), accessed December 26, 2017, https://twitter.com/RichardBSpencer/status/696567793211146240.

40. Spencer, Twitter post, September 26, 2016 (7:10 p.m.), accessed December 26, 2017, https://twitter.com/RichardBSpencer/status/780590283675217920.

41. Margaret Marsh, *Suburban Lives* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990), 22.

42. Ibid., 12.

43. Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1988), 11.

44. Kami, Twitter post, July 20, 2017 (2:21 p.m.), accessed February 21, 2018, https://twitter.com/Highheeled_Kami/status/888101689961533440.

45. Kami, Twitter post, January 8, 2018 (4:04 p.m.), accessed February 21, 2018, https://twitter.com/Highheeled_Kami/status/950473286655254528.

46. Scarlett Shoa'Hara, Twitter post, July 3, 2017 (10:18 p.m.), accessed February 21, 2018, https://twitter.com/ShoaHara/status/882061092817686528.

47. Ayla Stewart, "My Advice to Women Protesting Trump," YouTube video, 5:07, March 30, 2016, accessed December 30, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U-2eKovyWks.

48. Madelynn, Twitter post, September 5, 2017 (2:45 p.m.), accessed February 21, 2018, https://twitter.com/MaddieTheGamer/status/905139741628227584.

49. "Tara McCarthy Urges Young, White Women to Start Having Babies to Save the White Race," Angrywhitemen.org, June 12, 2017, accessed February 21, 2018, https://angrywhitemen.org/2017/06/12/tara-mccarthy-urges-young-white-women-to-start-having-babies-to-save-the-white-race/.

50. Ayla Stewart, wifewithapurpose.com, accessed December 29, 2017, https://wifewithapurpose.com/.

51. Ayla Stewart, "Feminism - My History With It and My Rejection of It," YouTube video, 49:39, September 12, 2015, accessed December 29, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=__5BCUTzzpQ.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid.; For more on the significance of anti-feminism and what influenced Stewart, see Helen B. Andelin, *Fascinating Womanhood* (Santa Barbara: Pacific Press, 1963).

54. Ayla Stewart, "Welcome Refugees?? I blame feminism, this is why," YouTube video, 27:57, September 14, 2015, accessed December 30, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bTp1Pq6koQs&t=37s.

55. Ibid.

56. Ann Coulter, *¡Adios America! The Left's Plan to Turn Our Country into a Third World Hellhole* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 2015), quotes on 271, 278, and 31.

57. Monica Anderson, "Social media causes some users to rethink their views on an issue," Pew Research Center, November 7, 2016, accessed January 5, 2017, http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/11/07/social-media-causes-some-users-to-rethink-their-views-on-an-issue/.

58. Johnny Dee, Twitter post, November 5, 2016 (7:21 p.m.), accessed February 23, 2018, https://twitter.com/Johnny_Capione/status/795088637637496832.

59. Donna, Twitter post, November 3, 2016 (2:49 p.m.), accessed February 23, 2018, https://twitter.com/Whskrbskt/status/794295490032476160.

60. Russian Spy, Twitter post, October 30, 2016 (11:53 a.m.), accessed February 23, 2018, https://twitter.com/KingMurfee/status/792801617175277568.

61. Donald Trump, Twitter post, October 13, 2015 (1:53 a.m.), accessed April 2, 2017, https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/653856168402681856.

62. Jessica Roy, "How 'Pepe the Frog' went from harmless to hate symbol," *Los Angeles Times*, October 11, 2016, accessed April 2, 2017, http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-pepe-the-frog-hate-symbol-20161011-snap-htmlstory.html.

63. Anti-Defamation League, "Hate on Display™ Hate Symbols Database," ADL.org, accessed February 23, 2018, https://www.adl.org/education/references/hate-symbols?cat_id[146]=146.

64. Kevin MacDonald, "The Cuckservative Phenomenon," The Occidental Observer – White Identity, Interests, and Culture, July 30, 2015, accessed February 3, 2017, http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2015/07/the-cuckservative-phenomenon/.

65. David Duke, Twitter post, February 22, 2017 (3:14 p.m.), accessed March 17, 2017, https://twitter.com/DrDavidDuke/status/834541836777746432.

66. Alan Rappeport, "From the Right, a New Slur for G.O.P. Candidates, *New York Times*, August 13, 2015, accessed January 6, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/13/us/from-the-right-a-new-slur-for-gop-candidates.html.

67. MacDonald, "The Cuckservative Phenomenon."

68. Richard Spencer, Twitter post, July 15, 2016 (8:18 a.m.), accessed January 6, 2018, https://twitter.com/RichardBSpencer/status/753972040068046848.

69. Taylor, *White Identity*, 99.

70. "Full text: Donald Trump announces a presidential bid," *Washington Post*, June 16, 2015, accessed January 6, 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2015/06/16/full-text-donald-trump-announces-a-presidential-bid/?utm_term=.d418baa8f885.

71. Ann Coulter, *In Trump We Trust: E Pluribus Awesome!* (New York: Sentinel, 2016), 4.

72. Donald Trump, Twitter post, March 22, 2016 (12:17 p.m.), accessed February 23, 2018, https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/712357600621432832.

73. Donald Trump, Twitter post, July 4, 2016 (8:34 a.m.), accessed February 23, 2018, https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/749989709275885568.

74. Phoebe Connelly, "Donald Trump jokes about calling women 'fat pigs, dogs': 'Only Rosie O'Donnell,'" *Washington Post*, August 6, 2015, accessed February 23, 2017,

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2015/08/06/video-donald-trump-takes-a-swipe-at-rosie-odonnell/?utm_term=.5e5eaefe35c6.

75. Alan Rappeport, "Donald Trump's Uncomplimentary Comments About Carly Fiorina," *New York Times*, September 10, 2015, accessed February 23, 2018," https://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/09/10/donald-trumps-uncomplimentary-comments-about-carly-fiorina/.

76. Donald Trump, Twitter post, March 23, 2016 (8:55 p.m.), accessed February 23, 2018, https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/712850174838771712.

77. Coulter, *In Trump We Trust*, 24.

78. Trump, Twitter post, July 13, 2015 (12:15 p.m.), accessed January 8, 2018, https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/620672963499675648.

CHAPTER FIVE NOTES

1. Hawes Spencer and Sheryl Gay Stolberg, "White Nationalists March on University of Virginia," *New York Times*, August 11, 2017, accessed December 27, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/11/us/white-nationalists-rally-charlottesville-virginia.html.

2. Donald J. Trump, Response to violence in Charlottesville, August 12, 2017, cited from ABC News video, August 15, 2017, accessed January 8, 2018, http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/trump-ad-libbed-sides-remark-response-charlottesville-violence/story?id=49208397.

3. Justin Fishel and Katherine Faulders, "Trump ad-libbed 'many sides' remark in response to Charlottesville violence," ABC News, August 15, 2017, accessed January 8, 2018, http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/trump-ad-libbed-sides-remark-response-charlottesville-violence/story?id=49208397.

4. Donald J. Trump, "Trump's Full, Heated Press Conference on Race and Violence in Charlottesville (Full) | NBC News," YouTube video live stream, 16:37, August 15, 2017, accessed January 8, 2018, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QGKbFA7HW-U.

5. Ibid.

6. Kristen Bialik and Jens Manuel Krogstad, "115th Congress sets new high for racial, ethnic diversity," Pew Research Center, January 24, 2017, accessed January 9, 2018, http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/01/24/115th-congress-sets-new-high-for-racial-ethnic-diversity/.

7. Jeffrey S. Passel and D'Vera Cohn, "U.S. Population Projections: 2005-2050," Pew Research Center: Hispanic Trends, February 11, 2008, accessed January 9, 2018, http://www.pewhispanic.org/2008/02/11/us-population-projections-2005-2050/.

8. Paul Nehlen, Twitter post, November 30, 2017 (9:10 p.m.), accessed January 11, 2018, https://twitter.com/pnehlen/status/936462459325632513.

9. Paul Nehlen, Twitter post, December 18, 2017 (4:03 p.m.), accessed January 11, 2018, https://twitter.com/pnehlen/status/942908297287471105.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

The American Presidency Project. Last modified March 19, 2017. Accessed March 19, 2017. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu.

American Renaissance. Last modified July 26, 2017. Accessed July 26, 2017. https://www.amren.com/.

Andelin, Helen B. *Fascinating Womanhood*. Santa Barbara: Pacific Press, 1963.

Angry White Men. Last modified February 21, 2018. Accessed February 21, 2018. https://angrywhitemen.org/.

The Birth of a Nation. Directed by D.W. Griffith. David W. Griffith Corporation, 1915. Accessed July 20, 2017. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I3kmVgQHIEY&t=122s.

Coulter, Ann. *¡Adios, America! The Left's Plan to Turn Our Country into a Third World Hellhole*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 2015.

Coulter, Ann. *In Trump We Trust: E Pluribus Awesome!* New York: Sentinel, 2016.

Conservative Headlines. Last modified January 31, 2018. Accessed February 5, 2018, http://conservative-headlines.com.

DavidDuke.com. Last modified March 17, 2017. Accessed March 17, 2017. https://davidduke.com/.

Divine Truth Ministries. DivineTruth.org. Last modified March 18, 2017. Accessed March 20, 2017. http://divine-truth.org.

Duke, David. *Jewish Supremacism: My Awakening to the Jewish Question*. Covington: Free Speech Press, 2002. Accessed July 26, 2017. http://ia902609.us.archive.org/12/items/JewishSupremacismByDavidDuke/jewish-supremacism-david-duke.pdf.

Duke, David. *My Awakening: A Path to Racial Understanding*. Covington: Free Speech Press, 1998. Accessed July 26, 2017. https://archive.org/details/DavidDukeMyAwakening/DavidDukePart1MyAwakening00.mp3. PDF - https://ia801906.us.archive.org/18/items/MyAwakening1998-DavidDuke/MyAwakening1998-Dr.DavidDuke_text.pdf.

Duke, David. Twitter Feed. Accessed July 26, 2017. https://twitter.com/DrDavidDuke.

East Coast Knights of the True Invisible Empire. Last modified August 19, 2017. Accessed August 19, 2017. http://www.eastcoastknightsofthetrueinvisibleempire.com/.

Evans, Hiram Wesley. "The Klan's Fight for Americanism." *The North American Review* 223, no. 830 (1926): 33-63. Accessed August 16, 2017. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25113510.

Fogelson, Robert M. and Richard E. Rubenstein, eds. *Mass Violence in America: Hearings on the Ku Klux Klan 1921*. New York: Arno Press & The New York Times, 1969.

The Free Magnolia: The Voice of Southern Life and Culture. Accessed February 26, 2017. http://www.freemagnolia.org.

Goldwater, Barry M. with Jack Casserly. *Goldwater*. New York: Doubleday, 1988.

Kennedy, James Ronald, and Walter Donald Kennedy. *The South was Right!* Gretna, LA: Pelican Publishing Company, 1994.

Kennedy, Walter D. *Myths of American Slavery*. Gretna: Pelican Publishing Company, 2003.

League of the South. Last modified July 26, 2017. Accessed July 26, 2017. http://leagueofthesouth.com/.

Library of Congress. Accessed July 14, 2017. https://www.loc.gov/.

Loewen, James W. and Edward H. Sebesta, eds. *The Confederate and Neo-Confederate Reader: The "Great Truth" about the "Lost Cause."* Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010.

Macdonald, Andrew. *The Turner Diaries*. Hillsboro: National Vanguard Books, 1980.

MacDonald, Kevin. "The Cuckservative Phenomenon." July 30, 2015. The Occidental Observer – White Identity, Interests, and Culture. Accessed February 3, 2017. http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2015/07/the-cuckservative-phenomenon/.

Martin, John Bartlow. *The Deep South Says "Never."* New York: Ballantine Books, 1957.

Mullet, Paul R. Twitter Feed. Accessed March 26, 2017, https://twitter.com/pastormullet.

NBC News. "Trump's Full, Heated Press Conference on Race and Violence in

Charlottesville (Full) | NBC News." YouTube video live stream, 16:37. August 15, 2017. Accessed January 8, 2018. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QGKbFA7HW-U.

Nehlen, Paul. Twitter Feed. Accessed January 11, 2018. https://twitter.com/pnehlen.

The New York Times. Last modified July 26, 2017. Accessed July 26, 2017. http://www.nytimes.com.

Radix Journal. Last modified July 26, 2017. Accessed July 26, 2017. http://www.radixjournal.com/.

Reed, John C. *The Brothers' War*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1906. https://books.google.com/books?id=RhpCAAAAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false

Reed, John C. "What I Know of the Ku Klux Klan." Parts I-III. *Uncle Remus Home Magazine*. January 1908. Accessed July 12, 2017. https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=6nNNAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&hl=en&pg=GBS.PP1.

Roaming Millennial. "Richard Spencer Interview | What is the Alt-Right? (Pt. 1)." Youtube video, 20:14. May 2, 2017. Accessed February 16, 2018. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mlOv3BXSyJM&t=730s.

Schweizer, Peter and Wynton C. Hall, eds. *Landmark Speeches of the American Conservative Movement*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007.

Simmons, William J. *The Klan Unmasked*. Atlanta: Wm E. Thompson Publishing Co., 1923. Accessed July 26, 2017. https://ia800800.us.archive.org/12/items/TheKlanUnmasked/TKU.pdf.

Spencer, Richard. Twitter Feed. Accessed July 26, 2017. https://twitter.com/RichardBSpencer.

Stewart, Ayla. "Feminism - My History With It and My Rejection of It." YouTube video, 49:39. September 12, 2015. Accessed December 29, 2017. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=__5BCUTzzpQ.

Stewart, Ayla. "My Advice to Women Protesting Trump." YouTube video, 5:07. March 30, 2016. Accessed December 30, 2017. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U-2eKovyWks.

Stewart, Ayla. "Welcome Refugees?? I blame feminism, this is why." YouTube video,

27:57. September 14, 2015. Accessed December 30, 2017. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bTp1Pq6koQs&t=37s.

Swain, Carol M., and Russ Nieli, eds. *Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Taki's Magazine. Last modified February 16, 2018. Accessed February 16, 2018. http://takimag.com/#axzz58h0GeYp2.

Taylor, Jared. "What the Founders *Really* Thought About Race." *Radix Journal*. July 26, 2016. Accessed February 26, 2017. http://www.radixjournal.com/the-red-pill/2016/7/26/what-the-founders-really-thought-about-race.

Taylor, Jared. *White Identity: Racial Consciousness in the 21st Century*. Oakton: New Century Foundation, 2011.

Traditionalist Worker Party. Last modified December 1, 2017. Accessed December 1, 2017. https://www.tradworker.org/.

Trump, Donald. Twitter Feed. Accessed April 2, 2017. https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump.

United Klans of America. Last modified August 21, 2017. Accessed August 21, 2017. http://www.theuka.us/past.html.

United States Congress. "Report of the Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States." Washington: Government Printing Office, 1872.

WhiteGenocide.info. Last modified December 18, 2017. Accessed December 18, 2017. http://whitegenocide.info/.

Wife With A Purpose. Last modified December 29, 2017. Accessed December 29, 2017. https://wifewithapurpose.com/.

Secondary Sources

ABC News. Last modified January 8, 2018. Accessed January 8, 2018. http://abcnews.go.com/.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. New York: Verso, 1991.

Anti-Defamation League. Last modified February 23, 2018. Accessed February 23, 2018.

https://www.adl.org/.

Ashworth, John. *The Republic in Crisis, 1848-1861*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Baptist, Edward E. *Creating an Old South: Middle Florida's Plantation Frontier before the Civil War*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Barkun, Michael. *Religion and the Racist Right: The Origins of the Christian Identity Movement*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Blackmon, Douglas A. *Slavery by Another Name: The Re-Enslavement of Black Americans from the Civil War to World War II*. New York: Anchor Books, 2008.

Carlson, Jody. *George C. Wallace and the Politics of Powerlessness: The Wallace Campaigns for Presidency, 1964-1976*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1981.

Chalmers, David M. *Hooded Americanism: The History of the Ku Klux Klan*. 3rd ed. Durham: Duke University Press, 1987.

CNN. Last modified December 22, 2017. Accessed December 22, 2017. https://www.cnn.com/.

Davis, Susan Lawrence. *Authentic History, Ku Klux Klan, 1865-1877*. New York: Susan Lawrence Davis, 1924. Accessed July 30, 2017. https://archive.org/stream/authentichistor00davi#page/n9/mode/2up.

Davison, Eddy W. and Daniel Foxx, *Nathan Bedford Forrest: In Search of the Enigma*. Gretna: Pelican Publishing Company, Inc., 2007.

Dew, Charles B. *Apostles of Disunion: Southern Secession Commissioners and the Causes of the Civil War*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001.

Edwards, Lee. *Goldwater: The Man Who Made a Revolution*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 1995.

Evans, Thomas W. *The Education of Ronald Reagan: The General Electric Years and the Untold Story of His Conversion to Conservatism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.

Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*. New York: Harper Collins, 1989.

Foner, Eric. *A Short History of Reconstruction, 1863-1877*. New York: Harper & Row,

Publishers, Inc., 1990.

George, John and Laird Wilcox. *Nazis, Communists, Klansmen, and Others on the Fringe: Political Extremism in America*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1992.

Hague, Euan, Heidi Beirich, and Edward H. Sebesta, eds. *Neo-Confederacy: A Critical Introduction*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008.

Huntington, Samuel P. *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon & Shuster Paperbacks,2004.

Hurst, Jack. *Nathan Bedford Forrest: A Biography*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.

Jackson, Charles O. "William J. Simmons: A Career in Ku Kluxism." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 50, no. 2 (December 1966): 351-365. Accessed August 9, 2017. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40578787?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.

Jenkins, William D. *Steel Valley Klan: The Ku Klux Klan in Ohio's Mahoning Valley*. Kent: The Kent State University Press, 1990.

Lassiter, Matthew D. *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Lesher, Stephan. *George Wallace: American Populist*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1994.

Los Angeles Times. Last modified April 2, 2017. Accessed April 2, 2017. http://www.latimes.com/.

Lynd, Staughton. *Class Conflict, Slavery, and the United States Constitution*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

MacLean, Nancy. *Behind the Mask of Chivalry: The Making of the Second Ku Klux Klan*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

MacLean, Nancy. "Neo-Confederacy Versus the New Deal: The Regional Utopia of the Modern American Right" in *The Myth of Southern Exceptionalism*, ed. Matthew D. Lassiter and Joseph Crespino. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Marsh, Margaret. *Suburban Lives*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1988.

McMillen, Neil R. *The Citizens' Council: Organized Resistance to the Second*

Reconstruction, 1954-64. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

McPherson, James M. and James K. Hogue. *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction*. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009.

McPherson, James M. "Was Blood Thicker than Water? Ethnic and Civic Nationalism in the American Civil War." *American Philosophical Society* 143, no. 1, (Mar., 1999): 102-108. Accessed April 4, 2018. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3181978.pdf.

Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1975.

Pencak, William. "The Civil War Did Not Take Place." *The American Journal of Semiotics* 17, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 7-29.

Pew Research Center. Last modified January 5, 2018. Accessed January 5, 2018. http://www.pewresearch.org/.

Quarles, Chester L. *Christian Identity: The Aryan American Bloodline Religion*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2004.

Rawlings, William. *The Second Coming of the Invisible Empire: The Ku Klux Klan of the 1920s*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2016.

Ross, J. Michael, Reeve D. Vanneman, and Thomas F. Pettigrew. "Patterns of Support f for George Wallace: Implications for Racial Change." *Journal of Social Issues* 36, no. 2 (1976): 69-91. Accessed March 28, 2018, https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6e0c/4cc05f292e9aef82ed7ab783cd4c19f6e546.pdf.

Rubinowitz, Leonard S. "The Courage of Civil Rights Lawyers: Fred Gray and His Colleagues." *Case Western Reserve Law Review* 67, no. 4 (Summer 2017): 1227-1275. http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=4&sid=a2b3d366-f5c5-42d5-be92-dd0e9df6ed99%40sessionmgr4007.

Southern Poverty Law Center. Last modified April 17, 2017. Accessed April 17, 2017. https://www.splcenter.org/.

Sugrue, Thomas J. "Crabgrass-Roots Politics: Race, Rights, and the Reaction against Liberalism in the Urban North, 1940-1964." *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (Sep., 1995): 551-578. Accessed February 1, 2018.

http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2082186.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A3f5c9c884bd5dc9218cf772751566a24.

Swain, Carol M. *The New White Nationalism in America: Its Challenge to Integration*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Taylor, Alan. *American Revolutions: A Continental History, 1750-1804*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2016.

Time. Last modified February 5, 2018. Accessed February 5, 2018. http://www.time.com.

Trelease, Allen W. *Reconstruction: The Great Experiment*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1972.

Trelease, Allen W. *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971.

Wade, Wyn Craig. *The Fiery Cross: The Ku Klux Klan in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

The Washington Post. Last modified August 22, 2017. Accessed August 22, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/.

Zeskind, Leonard. *Blood and Politics: The History of the White Nationalist Movement from the Margins to the Mainstream.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009.