

INTERSECTIONS OF IDEOLOGIES: COMPARISONS OF THE KU KLUX KLAN,
THE SKINHEAD MOVEMENT, AND WHITE MAINSTREAM AMERICA

by

Caitlyn L. Carr
A Thesis
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Arts
Anthropology

Committee:

_____ Director

_____ Department Chairperson

_____ Dean, College of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Date: _____ Spring Semester 2015
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Intersections of Ideologies: Comparisons of the Ku Klux Klan, the Skinhead Movement,
and White Mainstream America

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Anthropology at George Mason University

By

Caitlyn L. Carr
Bachelor of Science
York College of Pennsylvania, 2006

Director: Andrew Bickford, Professor
Department of Anthropology

Spring Semester 2015
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to Mom and Dad, who fought for me and were always in my corner, but above all, who understand everything.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank George Mason University and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences for providing the space and resources to conduct this research. I would also like to thank the chair of my committee, Professor Andrew Bickford, for the guidance, mentoring and advising throughout my graduate studies, which challenged me to narrow my scope, but expand my thought processes. I would like to thank Professor Cortney Hughes-Rinker and Professor Linda Seligmann for their thorough and thoughtful edits, without which this thesis would not be concise and clear. My amazing cohort, especially Michelle, who understand the work that went into this better than anyone. My wonderful, understanding, and supportive friends and family. And mostly, my parents, who believe that with a little bit of elbow grease, anything can be accomplished, even the seemingly insurmountable.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract.....	v
1. Stirrings of White Hate in the United States.....	1
Statement of Research Problematic.....	13
Methodological Considerations.....	15
2. Dehumanization of the Other.....	18
3. Whiteness as an Exclusive Construct.....	35
4. “Real” Masculinity.....	51
5. Guilt and Blamelessness.....	69
6. The Conceptualization of Space.....	79
7. Moving Forward.....	95
Bibliography.....	101
Biography.....	112

Abstract

INTERSECTIONS OF IDEOLOGIES: COMPARISONS OF THE KU KLUX KLAN, THE SKINHEAD MOVEMENT, AND WHITE MAINSTREAM AMERICA

Caitlyn L. Carr, M.A.

George Mason University, 2015

Thesis Director: Dr. Andrew Bickford

This thesis discusses the intersections of the dogma of the white supremacy movement and a particular subset of the mainstream United States. Specifically, it considers how the ideologies of the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement overlap with that of white, Christian America. The approach taken is anthropological; this thesis combines previously conducted studies of these far-right, pro-white groups with firsthand research of both the mainstream and white supremacist online media in order to more fully contextualize these groups in the culture in which they live. After analyzing the historical setting and context of these white supremacist groups in relation to white, Christian America, this thesis looks at several important and overarching themes. These include the dehumanization of the Black, female and “un-American” Other; the idea that whiteness is exclusively constructed to include only certain individuals; and masculinity as constructed in the same way: rather exclusively and violently. Additional themes

include the management and shifting of guilt and blamelessness from the in-group, as well as the conceptualization of space as the control of more abstract constructs, such as religion and marriage.

Through the combination of secondary and primary research, this thesis finds that the messages, mores, ideologies, and themes present in both the white supremacy movement and in the white mainstream come from the same fundamental place. It seeks to develop these connections as complex in nature. Historically, these connections have sometimes been much more overt; for instance, in some places, support for these groups or for racist ideology has been outwardly celebrated. However, the present connections between the Ku Klux Klan, the Skinhead movement, and white mainstream America are often more difficult to detect, though no less important. This thesis seeks to illuminate these connections, in the hopes of aiding those who seek to sever them completely.

Chapter 1: Stirrings of White Hate in the United States

Background

The year 1861 marked the beginning of something brand new in the United States; Civil War broke out between states north and south of the Mason Dixon line over the right to secede from a Union of geography and of ideas; the most notable of these was Southern support for institutionalized slavery. This war brought victory, prosperity and unification for the North, but social disorder, financial ruin, and despair for the gentry in the South (Gaffney 2011: 57). Deep, irreparable scars were left on the life that ‘once was’ in the South: men who at one time controlled large plots of land, stocks of money, and the lives of other humans suddenly found themselves having to discover new ways to support their families (Wagner 2002: 743). Lavish parties and luxurious lifestyles were replaced by the begrudged effort to learn how to farm one’s own land and to cook one’s own food without the aid of slavery. Additionally, these men and women were forced to abandon the set of mores that once dictated a very particular and clear social order; where there was once no question that white individuals were seen as superior to their black counterparts, now this delineation was not so clear. Legally, both black men and white men were now “men”: black individuals were no longer considered property to be bought and sold (Wagner 2002: 757). However, although white Americans were forced to

change the type of interactions they had with black Americans, they did not shift their underlying mindset, still treating those who were once slaves as second-class citizens (Kagan 2009: 252).

In response to their discontent with the outcome of the Civil War, small groups of Southerners, composed largely of farmers, sharecroppers, and veterans, banded together to ride through their neighborhoods and towns at night, disguised in white hoods and terrorizing those black citizens who were attempting to carve out a new identity in the nascent society (Campbell Bartoletti 2010: 23). The first of these groups of riders came out of Pulaski, Tennessee in 1866; however, these men were vocal and zealous enough to inspire white citizens of other states to follow in their wake (Campbell Bartoletti 2010: 56). These men saw themselves as the only heroes brave enough to carry on the ill-lost war, and felt ready and able to restore the past social order and lavish way of life which was normative before the conflict (Lewis & Serbu 1999: 142). Initially, though these groups lacked the large numbers and organization that would allow them to carry out any mass violence, they made up for it in enthusiastic vigilantism (Campbell Bartoletti 2010). However, over time, as local support and political approval for these groups increased, membership would grow, driven by their imperative of restoring valor to a once-gilded South (Campbell Bartoletti 2010: 13). They were ardently driven to a romantic, Anglocentric notion the life they felt was not so far gone, one in which social mores and hierarchy were immobile and placed them at the zenith (Lewis & Serbu 1999: 142). This political support also meant that Black Americans, some of whom had only recently gained the right to vote and be seen as legal citizens, saw a greater number of lynchings,

beatings, and verbal violence, but had no recourse to defend themselves (Campbell Bartoletti 2010: 114). The most organized and outspoken group of white citizens who targeted Black individuals were known as the Ku Klux Klan. With the formation of the Ku Klux Klan, white hate in the United States became formalized, as it was definitively shaped by this group during Reconstruction. Members of the Klan were products of their environments. Their ideologies developed in response to the instability they encountered because of the Civil War. As this thesis will show, the values that drove these initial adherents are still held in high regard by the modern construction of this group.

This thesis seeks to address and highlight those places that the ideology of this group, as well as that of the newer Skinhead movement, intersect with certain ideologies, themes, and paradigms in the mainstream United States, on both an overt and a subliminal level. Consequently, what will become apparent is that as was the case with early constructions of this group, the Ku Klux Klan, as well as the Skinhead movement, continues to appropriate and consciously misuse images, ideas, and mores from the mainstream United States in order to more effectively perpetuate their hate-filled agenda. In the context of this thesis, the “mainstream” is defined as a subsection of the United States from which those who enter the white supremacy movement come. This specific population is important to analyze against far-right extremist groups because the dogma of both intertwine. Additionally, the interconnections between the two are important to explore because although some group adherents are born to parents who are already involved in the white supremacy movement, a number of individuals also join the movement as adults; it is these people who comprise the case studies in Raphael

Ezekiel's *The Racist Mind: Portraits of American Neo-Nazis and Klansmen*, as well as the experiences of T.J. Leyden in *Skinhead Confessions* and Frank Meeink in *Autobiography of a Recovering Skinhead*. Thus, in many cases, it is this part of the United States' population which directly influences the membership numbers of the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan, and the historical and social situation of this subset of the mainstream cannot be ignored in a discussion of white supremacist values. This means that for the purpose of this thesis, the "mainstream" is defined as being white; not only is racial homogeneity an imperative for these groups, but because of this, they are homogeneously white in makeup. The "mainstream" is also that group of United States' citizens who ascribe to a Christian faith. In the context of the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan, the Christian faith that is practiced by seventy-six percent of Americans becomes directly misconstrued and abused through the creation of the Christian Identity movement (Gallup 1993). Additionally, those in the white "mainstream" do not belong to one of the more than thirteen-hundred extremist groups established in the United States, but rather, adhere to much more moderate political philosophies (Carmichael 2013). In short, they are that subsection of white America that comprises a part of the almost ninety-seven million Americans to watch the 2014 National Football League Super Bowl, or some of the forty-three million Americans to watch the 2014 Academy Award Oscars; they are that vast majority of white Americans who participate in those everyday, mundane activities that are seemingly inconsequential (Stampler 2014, Yahr 2014).

What must also be addressed in a discussion of both the white, mainstream United States and the white supremacy movement is the idea of class. It is interesting to note that these groups are comprised of individuals from all walks of life. For instance, a hugely widespread and well-known Skinhead group known as the Hammerskins describe their membership as “a leaderless group of men and women who have adopted the White Power Skinhead lifestyle. [They] are blue collar workers, white collar professionals, college students, entrepreneurs, fathers and mothers” (*Who We Are . . .*, Hammerskin Nation). This means that for the sake of this thesis, the definition of the mainstream transcends the level of class. Just like in the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement, the themes that are explored through the white mainstream speak to individuals in all socioeconomic groups. Micaela di Leonardo offers an interesting perspective on how class crosscuts these far-rightist groups in “White Ethnicities, Identity Politics, and Baby Bear’s Chair”. She posits that “identity is the product of historical contestation, a response to oppression . . . essentially the emotive component of political action – or inaction” (di Leonardo 1994: 169). While her theory has clear implications of class struggle, she also points to the fact that in the nineteen-seventies, “journalistic and scholarly accounts alike advanced the notion that white ethnics were an unjustly repressed, maligned, ignored . . . segment of the American population” (di Leonardo 1994: 172). These same authors also argued that “tied to the notions of the nature of white ethnic Americans was the construct of the white ethnic community, which journalists, academics, and individual white ethnics themselves proclaimed an endangered but surviving inner-city institution” (di Leonardo 1994: 172). In di

Leonardo's theory, class structure is important to the identity of these "white ethnic" groups (di Leonardo 1994: 173), but what is equally, if not more important, are the ethnic ties of these communities. From the mentality of these "white ethnic" groups, what has been retained by white supremacist ideology is the idea of a binding ethnic tie, regardless of whether those belonging to the in-group experience the same social position.

In order to understand the historical relationship between the white mainstream and the white supremacy movement, this chapter will give a brief overview of some of the national and world events that helped give shape to the dogmatic messages of the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement, as well as how those same events developed a particular rhetoric in the white mainstream. What will follow is a timeline of those events that helped precipitate the development of the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement in more recent history. These events are chosen because they have had a lasting impact on the entire United States. While this is true of every event, certain items are cited more frequently in modern narratives as having a more resonant impact, and will be examined herein.

Following the Civil War, in the year 1914, the United States saw the start of World War I. What was unique about this war was that for the first time, the United States created alliances with other nations to engage with an enemy that could be delineated geographically from itself with ease. This, in turn, translated to a distinct difference between the domestic front and the front lines of battle in those countries perceived as antagonistic. This was very different from the Civil War, in which those conceptualized as the enemy were seen marching in the front yards of those citizens of

the Union and the Confederacy. For the first time since the establishment of the white supremacist movement, some Americans saw those who were white in one of two polarized ways: as 'one of us', and thus as a friendly figure, or as those who were dangerously foreign, *simply* by looking at the continent in which one inhabited or the uniform one wore; after the war, these same individuals were able to definitively distinguish who was victor and who experienced loss (Capozzola 2002:1355). This conceptualization of space, as well as this idea of winner juxtaposed to loser, is still very important in the context of the Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movement: the in-group is delineated from others, with important consequences.

Following World War I, the United States was faced with the catastrophic economic crash of the Great Depression. Many Americans rushed to banks to withdrawal their savings, only to find their accounts, along with their homes and jobs gone (Galbraith 2009: xi). As was the case in the South in 1865, those who had once surrounded themselves with luxury now found that they had nothing, and had to rebuild their entire lives. Emphasis and value were placed on the power of individual effort and the idea that if one simply worked hard enough, one would be able to garner a more full life; this was bred out of necessity when lost inheritances had to be replaced by individually-earned, weekly and daily paychecks (Kennedy 1999: 172). Essentially, each person became responsible for his or her own life. This idea of personal accountability is still of utmost importance in the Ku Klux Klan and the subsequent Skinhead movement, where individuals, especially men, are assessed as valuable to the group based on their own violent contributions (Ezekiel 1995, Meeink 2009, Dobratz & Shanks-Meile 2000).

Those who enthusiastically volunteer to commit and support violence against those not a part of the in-group are welcomed to the fold, while those who reject this violence are excluded from the in-group.

A decade later, individual citizens in the United States were beginning to recover from the economic crash and subsequent depression, but the lack of money had caused a level of discontent in international feelings: tensions between countries grew, when “in early 1939 . . . the British treasury had begun to seize control of all gold holdings, foreign securities, and dollar balances held by British nationals” (Kennedy 1999: 466). Then, President Roosevelt warned that “if Great Britain goes down . . . the Axis powers will control the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, and the high seas – and they will be in a position to bring enormous military and naval resources against this hemisphere. It is no exaggeration to say that all of us, in all the Americas, would be living at the point of a gun” (Kennedy 1999: 468). The message here was blatant. The “good” American citizen must support the United States and its allies; anything less than total support was akin to consciously placing one’s fellow Americans in danger. This culminated on December 6, 1941, when the economic and cultural tensions that had been building came to a head. President Roosevelt received a correspondence from the Emperor of Japan: here Roosevelt found no more promise of diplomatic relations, and the United States began increased involvement in World War II (Kennedy 1999: 515). Through advertisements and national campaigns, this push to be a ‘good’ United States’ citizen through a show of total dedication and loyalty to the war effort, was increased: good citizens made sacrifices to aid the fighting overseas. This tension, which created

general support for the war effort in the United States and resulted in the polar ideas of “good American citizen” and “bad individual”, are still highly relevant in the context of the Ku Klux Klan, who conceptualize the “bad individual” in a complex, antagonistic way. More generally, the completely bad Other, a concept which is discussed in Chapter Two, is juxtaposed with the in-group, which is seen as completely good (kkk.bz).

In the United States, World War II brought radical shifts in social structure. More specifically, the war dramatically altered gender relations. Before the war, those accepted, ‘traditional’ gender roles that dictated that a heterosexual, nuclear family was correct saw husbands working outside the home to provide for their wives and children, while wives worked inside the home to keep order, to cook, and to raise children. During World War II, the absence of men in the United States precipitated the exodus of women from their kitchens and to the jobs once held by their husbands, as well as to the production of the weapons, munitions, and rations that supplied the soldiers (Weinberg 1994: 496). However, “the national assumption, by men and often women, was that after the war was over, women would return home from the military and the factories (where jobs were considered the rightful due of male veterans)” (Solaro 2006: 10). Two oppositional images of the United States’ housewife appeared: the prewar image of the woman who was totally dependent on her husband, and that of the woman who was essential to the war effort, and therefore an important figure in the life of the United States’ soldier. The image of the subservient, voiceless woman and that of the fully independent woman continued to resonate to oppositional ends in the postwar period; it still appears throughout white, mainstream United States culture, and is appropriated with

complex ramifications by the Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movement, as is demonstrated in this thesis. In these groups, women are valued strictly for their reproductive capacity, and thus, for their ability to produce new movement adherents, rather than for their own individual contributions; like many Others, they are seen as inherently inferior, and their status is juxtaposed to that of the “superior” white male (Simi & Futrell 2010).

After World War II, the Civil Rights movement, and its effects on all Americans, also provided fuel for the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan. For the first time, black Americans were making full use of the agency granted to them as citizens of the United States, though not without significant recoil from white Americans. Quickly, peaceful boycotts against mandatory seating on buses and segregation in schools spread through the South, and then beyond: these simple acts of civil, nonviolent resistance were sometimes met with violent retribution from white individuals (Orum 1972: 2, Burnson 1986: 39). Black citizens, faced with anger and hatred from the white population, were also sometimes confronted with economic intimidation, and “since most jobs in the South were controlled by whites, it was easy for southern racists to ensure that blacks who attempted to register to vote or were active in the desegregation movement lost their jobs” (Burnson 1986: 39). What becomes clear is that within the white mainstream, a certain amount of violence and marginalization was sometimes overlooked or tolerated by the average white American in order to maintain a particular social hierarchy, a hierarchy which ensured that Black Americans, seen as fundamentally inferior, were consistently granted less agency and power than their white counterparts (Harris 1995: 284). Elements of this attitude are still seen in the white, mainstream United States, the

Ku Klux Klan, and Skinhead movement, though to varying degrees; individuals in these pro-white, far rightist groups see their in-group as superior to every targeted Other, which is strictly and absolutely placed outside of the boundaries of this in-group. As is discussed in Chapter Two, the Other, especially the Black Other, still experiences marginalization at the hands of the white mainstream, while this attitude translates to overt violence and terror directed at the Other in the far-right, racist movement.

At the same time as racial tensions were colliding during the Civil Rights movement, tensions of a different nature were brimming during the conflict of the Cold War. Because of the fear of invasion by communism from the Soviet Union, “the years after 1945 were dominated by security concerns that permeated all sectors of society” (Smith 1992: 307). As the Cold War developed, an attitude of heightened national security crystallized in the United States, and ideas concerning disease, sexual behavior, and gender took on new forms (Smith 1992: 308). This had several implications. The first of these was a campaign that championed the heteronormative family structure. Specifically, there existed a belief that a strong, heteronormative, nuclear family was one that could most effectively ward off communism, and that those families that did not follow this pattern invited the “disease” of communism into their home and country (Smith 1992: 313). Additionally, the general attitude during the Cold War was that each individual citizen was personally responsible for keeping communism out of the United States; that is, if every individual was diligent enough in watching for the “disease”, then it could be kept at bay. However, it was only with the aid of *every* citizen that the United States would be victorious in their war against communism. To some citizens, this

translated into the idea that every personal association could potentially be infected with the germ of communism, and therefore, one must report a suspected communist supporter to the House Committee on Un-American Activities (Carleton 1987: 15). The country went on 'high alert' status in what became known as the 'Red Scare'; every person, even those once implicitly trusted, could be the enemy. This meant that some individuals were always on the lookout for those supporting this political ideology, in order to protect those who were not communist. This idea of protection of the in-group, in order to ensure victory, resonates well past the end of the Cold War, both as it is appropriated by the white supremacy movement in the United States and, in a very different way, in the white, United States' mainstream.

Due largely to the strong influence from the British Skinhead movement that these far-right extremist groups experienced during the nineteen-sixties and nineteen-seventies, the white supremacy movement in the United States now looks rather different from that which was originally formed immediately following the Civil War. This influence not only shifted the outward appearance of group members to also include shaven-head, combat boot wearing individuals, but the influence of the Skinhead movement also saw the participation of younger men and women ("Intelligence Report" 2012: 5). This Skinhead movement in the United States was conceptualized as a racist group, in sharp contrast to its British counterpart, which was largely based on the support of anarchy ("Intelligence Report" 2012: 3). Its first directive was loyalty to others within the movement, but one of the most important imperatives became an effort to terrorize those not born on United States' soil: the movement was first seen in Dallas, Texas, with

“violent racist attacks on immigrants and blacks” and then spread throughout the country, garnering national news headlines (“Intelligence Report” 2012: 4). However, what both the Skinhead movement and the more established Ku Klux Klan shared was an ideology of exclusion toward those perceived of as different. To these groups, this meant that these outsiders must be removed from the space perceived as their own, preferably through the use of both overt physical and psychological terror, conceptualized as justified (Simi & Futrell 2010: 10). This thesis will attempt to decode those underlying messages concerning violence which exist in the Ku Klux Klan, Skinhead movement, and white mainstream, in order to gain a fuller understanding of how these groups conceive of their own members and those who are not a part of their in-group.

Statement of Research Problematic

The vast majority of research on the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement comes from several disciplines, including sociology, history, psychology, and journalism. Current research on the far-right movement from these fields lacks the integrative approach of anthropology, or a holistic or contextual view of this population that could be offered by anthropology: historically, most studies conducted on the Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movement do not analyze these groups using any sort of synchronic perspective, but rather, present only a simple ethnographic sketch. Thus, this thesis will begin to fill this gap, and offer an anthropological analysis of these two groups, as well as of the white, United States’ mainstream. This means that the white supremacy movement

in the United States is not looked at as an anomalous entity, as other disciplines have come to see it (Chalmers 1987, Dobratz & Shanks-Meile 2000, Ezekiel 1995). Rather, the anthropological lens sees it as a part of the larger cultural whole in which it is situated, appropriating and inappropriately misusing white mainstream paradigms, mores, and images. In order to analyze Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead groups this way, this thesis seeks to answer three questions:

- 1) What messages from white, mainstream United States' society do the Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movements appropriate and misuse in order to further perpetuate their own theoretical platform? What are the similarities and differences of the messages of the white mainstream and white supremacist movement? How does the Skinhead movement and Ku Klux Klan use those actions from the white mainstream which are subliminal and use those which are overt?
- 2) What does it mean to be completely human, both within the Ku Klux Klan/Skinhead movement and within white, mainstream United States society? How are "Man" and "Woman" defined? Furthermore, how are the concepts of Good Hero and Evil Other developed and perpetuated uniquely and similarly within both spheres? How do these terms relate to a specific matrix of humanness?
- 3) What are the implications of the Skinhead and Ku Klux Klan groups appropriating messages from white, mainstream, United States society? How does this affect the effectiveness of those attempting to combat these movements?

Methodological Considerations

Although this study will utilize previously conducted research from other disciplines on the Skinhead movement and Ku Klux Klan, the approach to the mores, paradigms and imagery of the movement are grounded in anthropological thought and theory. This is necessary because studies of these two groups in the United States which come from a strictly anthropological background are entirely absent. Thus, in order to gain this unique and contextual perspective, this thesis will use an integrative approach to looking at existing projects. Essentially, theories of white hate grounded in psychology, sociology, history, and journalism, and ethnographic sketches of the Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movements, are compounded using an anthropological lens to create an entirely new perspective of these groups. This allows one to understand these groups in their cultural context much more completely. Additionally, various anthropological theories of masculinity, space, and symbols have proven to be exceptionally important, and will be extrapolated upon in this thesis.

This paper consists of two elements. First, it is an integrative review of the literature which exists within and about the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement (Campbell Bartoletti 2010, Dobratz & Shanks-Meile 2000, Ezekiel 1995, Leyden 2008, Meeink 2009, Simi & Futrell 2010, MacLean 1994, The Knights Party website, Stormfront), as well as an introduction to several theorists who may be able to give insight into these groups. The second part of this thesis consists of original research. It seeks to discover how both the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement appropriate and misuse messages from the white mainstream, and thus examines how the paradigms,

themes, and messages of the white supremacy movement in the United States intersect with those of the white mainstream in the United States. This means that it examines the everyday as a continuously lived event by actors in both the white mainstream and the Ku Klux Klan/Skinhead movement, which is experienced in two different ways.

What is absent from this study is any sort of firsthand fieldwork conducted with the white supremacy movement. This is for several reasons. Primarily, the length of time needed to develop an adequate level of rapport with a far-rightist group in order to conduct productive, in-depth fieldwork is not conducive to a study of this type. These groups are inherently close-lipped with their information, in order to protect their own interests. Also, the violent nature of far-right, racist groups and the lack of funding for safety precautions for myself as a researcher while conducting participant observation makes work in these settings impossible. Thus, not only is rapport essential for the integrity of the information garnered, but also for the safety of the researcher; this is a precedent which has been set by other ethnographers (Ezekiel 1995).

The scope of this project was narrowed to those themes and ideals which are most apparent throughout both the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement. Chapter Two, “Dehumanization of the Other”, examines the images in the white mainstream and white supremacy movement that surround those who are considered an Other, and how these individuals are subsequently dehumanized. Chapter Three, “Whiteness as an Exclusive Construct”, will examine how both the white mainstream and these rightist groups use and work with the concept of whiteness; this concept will be demonstrated to be entirely intersectional. In chapter Four, “‘Real’ Masculinity”, the concept of masculinity will be

examined. Specifically, “real” masculinity as a component of heroism, and the implications of the lack of masculinity within the white mainstream and the Ku Klux Klan/Skinhead movement, are dissected. Chapter Five will examine how both the white supremacy movement and the white mainstream tackle the issues of blamelessness and a lack of accountability; guilt and atonement are managed and disseminated in ways which are both unique and similar in each group. Chapter Six analyzes how both the white, mainstream United States and white hate groups delineate the space surrounding them. Can this space be owned? What constitutes space? How is this space protected? Ideologies intersect in both spheres, with drastic consequences for the in-group and for the Other.

Chapter 2: Dehumanization of the Other

One important facet of white supremacist appropriation of white mainstream messages, images, and ideas are those that concern the treatment of those not considered a part of the in-group. Herein, what will be demonstrated is that while the white mainstream United States definitively separates the in-group from those who belong, the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement does more than this: both far-right racist groups marginalize and violently target those who are not considered to belong to the group. Thus, those ideas and messages which exist in the white mainstream concerning the Other, as well as how to treat those considered an Other, are taken to the extreme in these right-wing fringe groups; however, the fundamental messages of both are the same. What will be addressed in the subsequent discussion is how those messages from the white, mainstream United States, which are often rather subliminal in nature and thus, more difficult to detect, are used explicitly in the Skinhead movement and Ku Klux Klan.

What must first be defined is what particular Others will be analyzed in the following discussion. Though the white supremacy movement has, at times, targeted all individuals who they see as different from themselves, there are several groups which are singled out for persecution more frequently, and are the subject of this chapter. Historically, the most highly persecuted and targeted Other are those of African

American ethnicity, who are conceived of as wholly inferior and completely bad (The Knights Party website, www.kkk.bz). Additionally, a consideration of women as Other presents a complex area of analysis, as women belonging to the in-group and existing outside the space of this group are targeted. Finally, a discussion of those considered authentically American, versus those who are considered ‘alien’, will be undertaken.

Regardless of which Other is being discussed, what becomes clear is that ideas concerning those who are not a part of the in-group have drastic, and sometimes violent, implications in the real-world of both the white, mainstream United States and the white supremacy movement. However, though messages regarding the Other come from the same fundamental paradigms, they are reified in different ways and taken to varying extremes, thus affecting the Black, female, and “un-American” Other in different ways. Finally, what will also become clear is that ideas surrounding a Black, female, or “un-American” Other are constructed with exclusive boundaries: one either belongs to the in-group or is excluded, and the line delineating the two is clear.

Anthropologist Victor Turner sheds light on the construction of ideas surrounding the Other in his article “Symbolic Studies,” an important piece that concerns how human cultures attach meaning to various neutral signifieds; it is through the specific meanings attached to these objects, concepts, and other humans that groups construct a subjective view of the world, through the use of verbal signifiers (Turner 1975: 149). Turner also demonstrates that “it does not matter whether the things shared are religious or political symbols . . . The point is that the person or party who controls the assignments of ‘meaning’ to them can also control the mobilizational efficacy their central cultural

position has traditionally assigned to them” (Turner 1975: 146). That is to say that to be in control of the way that those in a group interpret or give meaning to neutral symbols is to be in control of the members of that group. This is important to consider in a discussion of the Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movement, because just as is the case in the white, United States mainstream, certain symbols become more important in the exercise of control to those who occupy positions of power within these groups. In the case of the white supremacy movement, those who occupy these spaces of power come to dominate because of their adherence to these symbols, such as the Other as a target for violence, and the time they have dedicated to their group (Ezekiel 1995, Meeink 2009). Additionally, Turner’s theory becomes important in the context of the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement because of his assertion that “symbols are triggers of social action – and of personal action in the public arena. Their multivocality enables a wide range of groups and individuals to relate to the same signifier-vehicle in a variety of ways” (Turner 1975: 155). This means that the antagonistic and hateful ways these white supremacist groups discuss the Other directly correlate with how group adherents treat those outside the in-group on a daily, real-world basis: rhetoric matters because it has real-world effects. Turner’s theory of the significance of symbols matters in the context of both the white mainstream, and the white supremacy movement.

In the white mainstream, one can still find evidence of the dehumanization of Black individuals; this dehumanization has a long and violent history in the United States, and has had a lasting impact on those who still live this history. While relations between those who are white and those who are black has at times reached the point of

physical confrontation, current ethnic interactions can be classified as non-violent marginalization, in the sense that those who are white use their position of privilege in order to maintain an unequal social and hierarchical advantage. The non-violent marginalization of the nonwhite subset of the population begins at a young age. Kolhatkar writes of the very real “preschool-to-prison” experience of black individuals (especially for young men) in the United States, citing Ann Arnett Ferguson who theorizes that “black boys in particular are perceived differently starting in school” (Kolhatkar 2014). She is also troubled by “the increasing presence of campus police officers who arrest students for insubordination, fights and other types of behavior that might be considered normal ‘acting out’ in school-aged children. In fact, black youth are far more likely to be suspended from school than any other race” (Kolhatkar 2014). Instead of the nurturing and support that white students receive, black students are seen as a nuisance and problem to be brushed aside and removed from the school system, as is evinced by the disproportionate number of suspensions. Most telling of all is her assertion that “there is also potentially a systematic devaluing of positive attributes among black children . . . Very early on, some kids are being educated towards innovation and leadership and others may be educated towards more menial or concrete social positions” (Kolhatkar 2014). From a young age, black individuals are channeled into positions which will create a lack of social power and agency for them. This lack of power leads to a lack of voice, creating a very real dehumanizing effect; in the vast majority of cases, dark skin is akin to dehumanization, and is a shortcut to marginalization within the educational system.

In these pro-white, far-right extremist groups, violence towards the Other has consistently taken shape as a magnification of this kind of racist dehumanization from the white mainstream. Though the target of this violence has shifted, and the language developed out of this rhetoric has changed over time, the fundamental message of dehumanization remains constant. In the Ku Klux Klan, language surrounding dehumanization is much more overt. For instance, those areas that are largely either populated by black individuals or are friendly and open toward black citizens are referred to as *jungles* (“Eastern-Shore White-Patriots”). The idea here is to present the image of black individuals as animals, inhabiting a jungle, rather than as humans. This explicit language in this group is prolific. When asked what he would do if the Klan gained any sort of social power, one adherent answered, ““What I’d like to do . . . [if] whites ever once get into power, that would be the thing to do: castrate the males, Jewish and nigger males, castrate them and sterilize the females, chain them in the yard like dogs”” (Ezekiel 1995: 18). Unlike in the white, mainstream United States, here there is no allusion to the dehumanization of the Black Other. It is overtly accomplished in a violent way, with the explicit portrayal of the Other as an animal. In the Skinhead movement, the Black Other is dehumanized in a similar way; black individuals are blatantly referred to as nonhuman. In one interaction, a former Skinhead adherent remembers attending a party when he was very young, in which he was told to leave his “pet” outside: by this, the Skinhead speaker was referring to the black individual that accompanied him to this party (Leyden 2008: 40). At Skinhead gatherings, language concerning a Black Other often surrounds effigies being burned, rather than individual, real-world interactions. Thus, discussions involve

fantasies of the total destruction of Black individuals (Simi & Futrell 2010: 52), and rather than speaking about the Black Other using actual interactions, this Other is reduced to stereotypes, just as in the white mainstream educational system.

Edward Said deconstructs the Western perspective of the Other in his book *Orientalism*. Here, Said talks about the way that Western academia, and subsequently Western laypeople, see the ‘Orient’; he equates this concept not only with those countries, but with all people who identify as Asian. However, his theory and premises can very easily and logically be used to describe how those in the white supremacy movement conceptualize their own ‘othered’ population. Just like in Said’s analysis, a strict dichotomy is developed: the domestic in-group population and the foreign, ‘alien’ Asian population. Said describes an Orientalist scholar as one who has an “enthusiasm for everything Asiatic, which was wonderfully synonymous with the exotic, mysterious, profound, seminal” (Said 1977: 164). What he posits is that “when a learned Orientalist traveled in the country of his specialization it was always with abstract unshakeable maxims about the ‘civilization’ which he had studied; rarely were Orientalists interested in anything except proving the validity of these ‘truths’ by applying them without great success to uncomprehending, hence degenerate, natives” (Said 1977: 165). The similarity between these Orientalists and those who adhere to white supremacist ideology is striking: there is no appreciation for objective, analytical fact, but rather, a myopic, close-minded perspective which searches exclusively for evidence that supports their claims about those groups considered the Other. Inevitably, these groups encounter information concerning the Other which does not fit into their pre-developed scheme, and

this new information is dealt with in a way which is convenient for them. “It is finally Western ignorance that becomes more refined and complex, not some body of positive Western knowledge which increases in size and accuracy. For fictions have their own logic, and their own dialectic of growth or decline” (Said 1977: 175). That which does not complement or agree with those preconceived notions and stereotypes already in place concerning the Other are simply ignored, explained away, or considered pathological (Said 1977: 180). This occurs in the white mainstream and in the far-right racist movement, but to a much greater degree in the rightist movement.

What must also be considered are the ramifications of the othering which occurs in the white supremacy movement and the white mainstream United States. It is important to keep in mind that “this kind of classification has a logic to it, but the rules of the logic by which a green fern in one society is a symbol of grace and in another is considered maleficent are neither predictably rational nor universal” when examining the intersections between the Ku Klux Klan, Skinhead movement, and white, United States mainstream (Said 1977: 167). In this way, when one applies Said’s idea regarding group epistemology to the white supremacy movement, the result is jarring: to adherents of these movements, the way in which the Other is constructed is not borne of intellectual pathology, but because this is how they have constructed the Other through careful, albeit ill-informed and selective, development. Though Said is only analyzing the way that Asian countries and the Asian diaspora are viewed from a Western perspective, his theory has clear applications within the scope of the white supremacy movement. These far-right extremist groups have developed extensive pseudoscientific theories about the

superiority of white skin, and more specifically, of those who adhere to white supremacist ideology; for instance, the Ku Klux Klan posits that it is because of genetic inferiority that AIDS is “a disease of not only homosexuals, but a disease of nonwhites” (*Aids is a Racial Disease*, 2010). Thus, Said’s ideas help to bridge an important analytical gap between the white identity movement and the white, mainstream United States. Though ideas may manifest differently, they come from the same use of gross stereotypes.

While Said discusses this kind of dehumanization in the white mainstream from a historical perspective, examples of this kind of violence are still present in what appear to be the most benign levels of this group. Narratives exist here that argue in favor of the idea that if one is not American, then one is not a fully, actualized human being, and worthy of those rights that are attached to humanness. For instance, attitudes concerning authenticity of American identity have increased following the September 11th attacks, and have become more exclusive in nature. An example of this is the National Football League’s zenith event, the Superbowl, which occurs every winter. During the Superbowl of 2014, Coca-Cola released a commercial that featured the song “America the Beautiful” sung in various languages, including English. Reactions to the commercial from the mainstream, especially from those who are living in the white mainstream, were decidedly split, and ranged from excitement to disgust; one individual replied that “America is an English, Christian country. Coca-Cola, keep it that way,” while another stated, “Good . . . poison all of those [*expletive*] with your [*expletive*] product. They don’t speak English anyway” (“Official Coca-Cola ‘Big Game’ Commercial 2014 –

America is Beautiful” 2014). The underlying attitude here is that to be American, one must be an English speaker, and that this qualifies one to belong to the in-group, or those who belong in the United States. Without this belonging, one loses the basic right to life, and should be “poisoned.”

In the context of the white supremacy movement, this attitude is made explicit on a larger scale. It is shared by a large number of adherents. Those who are not American are seen as openly hostile to the lives of both ‘true’ Americans, and to the lives of those who belong to the movement. The Ku Klux Klan believes that

citizenship was a privilege bestowed upon white Christians. Other races have been permitted to reside in America, but they never were granted citizenship in the U.S. Today, we have millions of non-whites enjoying the benefits of citizenship when it was never intended for them . . . Every African nation, which has reverted to Negro rule, has ended in bloody chaos and mass killings. It seems non-whites are incapable of non-violent, republican self-rule. [*Alien Invasion*, The Knights Party Website]

Those who are non-white but legally recognized by the government as a citizen are also viewed as inauthentic. Additionally, to be a white individual and not have United States’ citizenship, but residing in the United States, is to be an unauthentic American in the eyes of the white power movement. As in the more conservative factions of the white mainstream, these individuals are consistently referred to as “aliens”: these individuals are seen as something other than human.

Though the United States claims to be a country welcoming of the ‘tired, poor, huddled masses’, journalist Edwin Black presents a very different picture of this nation from a historical perspective in his book, *War Against the Weak*. Black demonstrates how the in-group was created through the development of an exclusive definition: this

definition had finite parameters and absolute criteria for belonging, such as skin color and intellectual capacity, and those who did not belong to this group were considered intrinsically pathological (Black 2012: 78). His narrative analyzes the creation of an Other in the framework of eugenics, the pseudoscientific movement in which individuals were “selected because of their ancestry, national origin, race or religion, [and then] forcibly sterilized, wrongly committed to mental institutions where they died in great numbers, prohibited from marrying, and sometimes even unmarried by state bureaucrats” (Black 2012: xv). Grossly stated, those considered to be undesirable were treated with an attitude of violent neglect, left without medical care or the care of those social welfare programs granted to those who were considered worthwhile. He also demonstrates how this attitude continues to have negative consequences for certain groups of people. For instance, in the past, this exclusionist paradigm led to forced sterilizations and divorces, while in the modern period, the idea that only certain individuals may reproduce has led to cloning, in vitro fertilization with the decision to reproduce only the best genetics, and advanced genetic engineering (Black 2012: 427). Essentially, what science is doing is setting the stage for “a world where people are once again defined and divided by their genetic identities. If that happens, science-based discrimination and the desire for a master race may resurrect” (Black 2012: 428). When the eugenics movement reached its peak in the United States, subsequent marriage and miscegenation laws mandated that the in-group and the Other not mix, and delineated these boundaries, in part, along racial lines (Black 2012: 175).

Presently, while overt eugenics may not exist in the white mainstream, those attitudes which underlie it are still definitively present in the white supremacy movement. Eugenics oversimplified those problems, such as poverty and illness, that modern scientific and medical thinkers see as highly complex and demanding of an integrative approach. However, though this oversimplification has been abandoned by the white mainstream medical community, it is still appealing to the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement, which in pseudoscientific papers posits that complex, enigmatic diseases and social issues have rather simple solutions: for instance, the Klan argues that

young people must be warned of the terrible consequences they may face as a result of socializing with non-whites. And interracial couples should be especially avoided. AIDS is a disease of non-whites. It originated from a mutated cancer almost exclusive to Jews and now spread throughout the races . . . Even white homosexuals have a natural immunity to the disease simply because of their race. They contract it however, because they continually expose themselves to the virus via their filthy lifestyle and in addition often sleep with non-white homosexuals. [*Aids is a Racial Disease* 2010]

This disease, which in the medical community is still not completely understood, is reduced here to a simple cause-and-effect chain: because white individuals associate with non-white individuals, they contract AIDS, and in white supremacist ideology, this still seen as a disease inflicted on the white, heterosexual population by the “completely bad” Black or Jewish homosexual Other. If those of the former group simply avoid contact with those of the latter, this disease will be contained to those who maliciously spread it. Clear connections to the antiquated and incorrect eugenics movement exist in this analysis of AIDS. This is reminiscent of those miscegenation laws established during the

eugenics movement. Here, if one avoids contact with the Other, then one may avoid a host of catastrophic diseases.

The thought processes used to classify women as an Other is also akin to that used to classify Others in the eugenics movement, though the real-world implication of this kind of delineation look very different from those which were used in the outdated and pseudoscientific movement. The widely-perused white supremacist website, *Stormfront*, hosts a dating forum, which is filled with advertisements for those looking for a partner and those advertising themselves. Though the content of the narratives is widely varied, the common thread throughout is that ethnic heritage is of primary importance. One such posting reads:

Guys: If you desire to find a woman, make **one** post, with the following information . . .

1. Your age and a brief description of what you look like, and your ethnic heritage
2. Your motive (do you want to get married and have children?)
3. Your religious persuasion
4. If you have children already, it might be good to say so
5. Your interests
6. What kind of **woman** you desire
7. One interesting fact about yourself! [*Talk*, Stormfront.org]

The responses on this thread allude to a woman's heritage and physical appearance being of utmost importance when determining her eligibility as an intimate partner. Those women who do not have the desired characteristics should not be considered for a relationship: they may not have the 'correct' hair color, height, or build. Additionally, narratives within the Ku Klux Klan overwhelmingly argue two things concerning abortion. First, that "no matter the motive, love of ease, or a desire to save from suffering

the unborn innocent, the woman is awfully guilty who commits the deed” (*Anti-Abortion quotes from early Suffragists*, 2010), and second, that to be a mother is the prime directive of the “good” white woman (*Woman to Woman*, 2010). Thus, those who are considered genetically superior are myopically encouraged to reproduce both their genetic makeup and the ideology of the movement in the form of future generations. Notably, women under the influence of the eugenics movement were also encouraged to carry on their ‘superior’ genetics.

Additionally, in these groups, monogamy is something to which one does not necessarily adhere, because women are cast as objects used for sexual gratification and for the reproduction of adherents to the movement, and thus are not given the full respect that men are given (Meeink 2009: 83). Often, this translates to a one-sided dynamic in intimate relationships, especially in the Skinhead movement, where adherents are generally younger. For instance, one ethnographer recounts a typical experience with two informants in which

“she [the female Skinhead] interrupted us an hour after midnight because she was having cramps; she needed to get to a doctor. I drove them to the hospital and waited for quite a long time with Raymond [the male Skinhead]. Raymond had talked a lot about this pregnancy and his pride in it; nevertheless, he was insensitive and self-absorbed throughout this incident.” [Ezekiel 1995: 267]

The woman is reduced to the status of her uterus. Raymond is concerned about the way her pregnancy affects him, and shows no concern for her health. The only individuals, then, that are *not* treated as objects to be used are male adherents. In the movement, this

results in relatively little power for women in the family dynamic (Simi & Futrell 2010: 32).

This dehumanization of women as a specifically targeted Other is also present in the white mainstream outside of the issue of reproduction. The popular website, YouTube, allows individuals to connect with others in ways that were not possible before the instant connectivity of the Internet. However, a disturbing element of this is the bullying and frank dehumanization, especially of women, that occurs in this framework. For several years, young women of various ethnicities and ages created thousands of videos to be viewed under the search terms “Am I Pretty or Ugly?” Commenters here would judge them based solely on their appearance. In several of these, the young women appeared almost topless (*Am I Pretty or Ugly*, Youtube.com). Here, women are reduced from complex personalities and individual histories to a one-dimensional body and face. Just as was the case during the time of eugenics, individuals are classified and rated according to a set of preconceived notions, rather than accepting differences as part of natural human variation. This continues to occur in the context of the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement, where women are valued principally for their ability to reproduce adherents to the movement.

A highly charged, though more narrow, dialogue within the anthropological community is the analysis of genocide. This comes from an applied perspective and from a more academic, theoretical perspective. Genocide is defined as the mass killing of a group of people based on race, religion, or political affiliation in order to create a sense of an in-group which is completely distinct from an Other, who must be totally erased from

the space of the in-group (Hinton 2002: 3). In her essay “Inoculations of Evil in the U.S.-Mexican Border Region,” Carole Nagengast hypothesizes that the cultural constructions created regarding the border between the United States and Mexico might “constitute potential first steps toward what might in other times and places and in the absence of political controls, become widespread ethnic violence that could culminate in genocide” (Nagengast 2002: 326). She goes on to discuss the violence, both actualized and symbolic, that Latino individuals face during border-crossing and during their time spent in the United States: those en route face sexual assault and beatings from recognized Border Patrol agents and from lone vigilantes, as well as encountering the loaded ‘drug runner’ stigma upon entering the United States (Nagengast 2002: 332). There is a clear connection between this attitude and overt hatred of the Other in the white supremacy movement:

It is . . . largely underclass status that makes certain people susceptible to violence, whether it is manifested symbolically or physically. It is their ambiguity as both sub- and superhuman that allows dominant groups to crystallize the myths about the evils that subordinates represent, whether they are citizens, residents and holders of green cards, or undocumented. This justifies first symbolic and then all too often physical violence against them. And that requires the implicit agreement of ordinary nice people who have been inoculated with evil, who learn to take myths at face value, and who do not question the projects of the state in defense of a social order that requires hierarchy. [Nagengast 2002: 338]

Nagengast argues that although the average citizen might not actively participate in movements which support overt hate and extreme versions of exclusivity, such as the Ku Klux Klan or the Skinhead movement, or the government-sponsored Border Patrol, there are similarities in the way that those who are ‘othered’ are treated in all levels of white society, in the form of dehumanization. In some spheres, such as the white supremacy

movement or the Border Patrol, this equals overt violence against those who are targeted. In the white mainstream, this dehumanization takes shape in the form of marginalization.

This is further supported by Nancy Scheper-Hughes, who expands on this premise of complacency throughout the United States' culture at large in her article "Coming to Our Senses: Anthropology and Genocide." Herein, she analyzes what she describes as a 'genocidal continuum,' positing that "it is essential not to lose sight of the ease with which the abnormal is normalized and the deaths of our 'anthropological subject' rendered inevitable or routine" (Scheper-Hughes 2002: 364). Though the author is speaking of the way that a small, academic group of anthropologists could become jaded to the suffering of others, her conclusions support Nagengast's own: one does not need to actively participate in violence against an Other to sanction or show approval of that violence. What is needed, rather, is neglect and complacency towards that particular Other.

In the white, mainstream United States, the Ku Klux Klan, and the Skinhead movement, ideas about the Other create a 'correct' way to exist in relation to those not considered to be a part of the in-group. Specifically, these ideas tell actors in those groups how to relate to those around them, and what social position each actor may possess. In the white supremacy movement, those who are excluded from the in-group are completely dehumanized, treated with disrespect and robbed of their agency. In the white, mainstream United States, those who are not a part of the in-group are treated with nonviolent marginalization and assessed one-dimensionally. Dehumanization as a lived experience has real consequences on a daily basis for Black Americans, women, and

those considered not authentically American. Because these groups very clearly define who cannot belong, they also must define who can belong. In the case of the white mainstream, the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement, those who belong are classified as 'White.' However, as whiteness is a very complex and exclusive construct, it will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 3: Whiteness as an Exclusive Construct

An important concept which should be addressed which analyzing the way in which the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan appropriate and misuse messages, ideas and paradigms from the white, mainstream United States is how these extremist groups construct whiteness and those whom they see as fitting into this category. In order to fully understand the complexities of this idea, several questions should be asked. Who is white? Who is not white? What does it mean to be white or not white? Can a person be fully white? What are the ramifications for those individuals who do not qualify as white? What is “whiteness”? Moving through this discussion, it is important to remember that just as individuals are either part of the in-group or not, they are also either white or not: this categorization of “not” leaves no room for a “good” non-white person and a “bad” non-white person, within the scope of the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement. All those who are excluded from the category of “white” are targeted with the same rhetoric by these far-right groups, using the same misappropriated messages from the white mainstream. However, the difference between extremist ideology and mainstream ideology is that in the white mainstream, these ideas, messages and paradigms take on a subliminal characteristic, while in the white supremacy movement, they are overt, though both support the idea that to be white is to be superior.

In the case of both the white power movement and the white, mainstream United States, whiteness is a space of privilege. As is demonstrated, whiteness is deliberately constructed and owned so that those who are considered white occupy a higher space in the social hierarchy than those who are not classified as white. An important element of this construction is that whiteness is developed along a matrix; skin color plays a nominal role, with other characteristics required of an individual to belong to this category. However, in order to analyze whiteness, one must first consider how race as a general concept is perceived by both the white mainstream and white supremacist groups, and then how whiteness is subsequently constructed within the confines of that paradigm. This discussion will extrapolate upon the similarities in the construction of whiteness between the white, mainstream United States, the Ku Klux Klan, and the Skinhead movement, which has very real and very different consequences in all three groups. Finally, this discussion will consider how this idea of “whiteness” has contributed to a real-world social hierarchy, and the intricacies of this hierarchy in the white, mainstream United States and the white supremacy movement.

Scott MacEachern reflects on this idea of race in anthropology in his article “The Concept of Race in Contemporary Anthropology.” He hypothesizes that race

is in reality a kind of ideology, a way of thinking about, speaking about, and organizing relationships among human groups . . . this ideological understanding of race may use the language of physical features when talking about group differences, but biology is fundamentally important to the ways that these groups are defined [MacEachern 2011: 36]

In this light, race becomes a cultural construct, not a biological derivative, which means the way that groups see other groups is entirely constructed by the group, rather than

strictly from observance of an objective set of categories. MacEachern also discusses race from a historical perspective, describing a long period of Western thought in which individuals of White, African, and Asian appearance or ancestry were thought to descend from three very distinct and entirely separate genetic lineages, a theory known as polygenesis. When it was a widely accepted and undisputed paradigm in the scientific community, polygenesis had dangerous effects in the lay community: “Africans and Native Americans were even at various times described as species intermediate between ‘real’ humans and apes,” and unfortunately, “traces of polygenesis are still to be found in the writing of racist organizations today” (MacEachern 2011: 39). Because race is mistaken as a real, genetically linked construct, rather than one which has no basis in objective fact, it is used as one justification for the dehumanization of the Black, female, and foreign Other. Central to MacEachern’s thesis is the idea that this attitude, present in the far-right, also exists in the white mainstream, even up to the levels of academia. This has been true from the time of Lewis Henry Morgan’s development of the theory of *cultural evolution*; here, he hypothesized that “society had progressed from a hunting-and-gathering stage (which he denoted by the term ‘savagery’) to a stage of settled agriculture (‘barbarism’) and then on to an urban society possessing a more advanced agriculture (‘civilization’)” (Lewis Henry Morgan 2015). This thought process supported the belief that non-Western, non-white peoples were inherently inferior to those living in industrialized, capitalist cultures. The fundamental premise underlying cultural evolution is still present in the white supremacy movement, and in some ways, in the white mainstream. That is, the “assumption that race is fundamental to all aspects of human

interaction, with the characteristics of different groups permanent for the long term . . . is an excellent crutch for people who would prefer not to occupy themselves with the plight of people who are poor, powerless, and disadvantaged” (MacEachern 2011: 54). The author’s contention is that in the white mainstream, these attitudes lead to a disadvantage for those who are not a part of the hegemony, as these people are largely ignored or swept under the rug.

Francine Barone further concludes that the white mainstream reinforces a hardline, absolutist idea of race in her contribution to *Anthropologies – A Collaborative Online Project* entitled “Race and the public perception of anthropology.” In this piece, she focuses on the formal teaching of race in the educational system, and concludes that in this capacity as well as throughout the white mainstream at large, “dismissing fixed racial categorization as biologically unsubstantiated has done little to eradicate the very real presence of race in everyday life” (Barone 2013). The issue here is not only that these categories that are labeled “race” do exist, but more importantly, that they are having very real and sometimes very negative social consequences. A particularly unfortunate result of such a reified, immutable definition of race is outlined in the American Anthropological Association’s “Statement on ‘Race’”, which is especially pertinent to relationships between groups in Western societies. Though the Association concedes that “physical variations in the human species have no meaning except the social ones human put on them,” it also establishes that those same meanings have created “a rigid hierarchy of socially exclusive categories underscored and [have] bolstered unequal rank and status differences, and provided the rationalization that the

inequality was natural” (“*Statement on Race*” 1998). Thus, if one believes that racial lines are biologically derived and therefore concrete, excluding any evolutionary changes, then it becomes much easier for the white hegemonic power structure to reinforce its position of dominance. An ideology of inequality is created in which certain individuals, by nature of skin color, belong on top.

Another consequence of this immutability of racial categories and boundaries is the attempt to solve the problem of inequality through the use of a ‘color-blind’ perspective, in which the actor attempts to ‘un-see’ racial categories. Barone believes this fosters the problem of inequality and racism just as greatly as standing by outdated and incorrect racial categories as absolute. Here she cites VandenBroak, who posits that “despite the fact that race is socially constructed and that true color-blindness would be wonderful [. . .] racism exists as a fundamental thread that permeates every context of everyday life. So, to approach any situation from a ‘color-blind’ stance denies the reality of the lived experience of racism” (Barone 2013). The push to ignore an individual’s experience of race, even if one accepts that it is only a social construct and thus, culturally dependent, is to ignore the struggle faced by a great number of minority individuals.

Anthropologist Jason Antrosio also writes of the very real experience of race in “Anthropology on Race – Seizing the Holistic Moment.” Here, he analyzes how race as a social construction has created a system of hierarchy which naturally advantages a very specific subset of the population. He posits that “racial organization and racist inequalities continue to structure U.S. society with marked social and biological

consequences” (Antrosio 2011). Thus, though race may not be a biological delineation in the way that we have defined it, what matters are the reified outcomes of that definition. In other words, race may not be “real,” but of concern are its very real consequences. Antrosio also hypothesizes that “there are discrepancies in IQ by race, just like there are health discrepancies . . . We now know those are biological but not genetic, and . . . these discrepancies can be ameliorated – if we have the political will and commitment” (Antrosio 2011). Antrosio believes that those diseases and problems that we attribute to genetics, such as sickle cell anemia as a disease of African lineages, or higher IQ as attributed to Asian heritage, are only a product of stereotyping and the sort of funneling that Kolhatkar referred to in her discussion of the ‘preschool-to-prison’ pipeline, rather than actual genetic linkages (Kolhatkar 2014). Furthermore, the cultural construct of race creates a host of problems for those not considered most privileged on this racial hierarchy; here, specifically, is where Antrosio cites our association of lower IQ. This is not due to some biological drive, but to social constructions which disadvantage nonwhite populations (Antrosio 2011).

Though these ideas about race have very real ramifications in the space of the white, United States mainstream, they are prolific enough to be discussed cross-culturally. In her narrative *German Bodies: Race and Representation After Hitler*, Uli Linke examines how Third Reich constructions of race have had a lasting impact on the German national conscious. Her “research suggests that the German political imaginary is infused with a racialized violence that has persisted in a more or less unbroken trajectory from the Third Reich until today” (Linke 1999: 1). Just as is the case with

racism in United States' culture, this rhetoric often exists subliminally, because this racism, "while often tangibly inscribed on bodies, [remains] below the level of conscious acknowledgment" (Linke 1999: 1). Thus, it is in these subliminal and hidden spaces that mainstream ideas concerning whiteness continue to perpetuate. Again, if one returns to Kolhatkar's 'preschool-to-prison pipeline' discussion (Kolhatkar 2014), one is led to the way that young Black men are seen in the public school system. The rhetoric of "No Child Left Behind" demands that all children be given equal opportunity for advancement; however studies have proven that skin color and neighborhood dictate the resources to which a child has access (Kolhatkar 2014). Linke sees this kind of immutable racial categorization stemming from

"the psychological assault, the sense of threat . . . projected outward and affixed to concrete objects (e.g., refugees, the environment, the body). In this process, the individual's sense of terror or fear is displaced and transferred to the outside world . . . Perceived reality becomes a world of highly charged objects and sites that are attacked in their turn by uncontrollable forces, or are themselves experienced as threats." [Linke 1999: 157]

Though Linke strictly speaks of post-World War II Germany, her theory can be applied to the white, mainstream United States, and the white supremacy movement in turn. In the case of the latter, the vast majority of language which categorizes the non-white Other as "bad" is borne from a place of fear. The Ku Klux Klan proclaims that "the White Christian people have been betrayed by our nations [*sic*] political, economic, educational, and religious leaders. The Knights party is the last hope for America," which reveals a fear of the Other and of losing the country that they believe to be rightfully theirs (*Our Goal* 2010).

In her narrative *Everyday Forms of Whiteness: Understanding Race in a “Post-Racial” World*, Melanie E.L. Bush uses a synchronic perspective to analyze how a particular racial category, that is “white,” is manipulated and made manifest in highly specific contexts in order to create social categories and inequalities between those categories (Bush 2011: 1). Bush theorizes that “the border of whiteness [has] shifted during different periods in history to include or exclude various groups . . . [but that] the claim to European heritage is often less significant than whether one is identified as white in everyday interactions” (Bush 2011: 16). This is important in the context of the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement, for whom the definition of whiteness is highly complex; the idea of what it means to be white becomes even more specific than it does in the white mainstream culture, as one must belong to one of these white supremacist movements in order to be considered truly white by other movement adherents. Bush also contends that like any racial category, “white” becomes a cornerstone identifier. However, when one identifies as white, this allows that individual a certain level of privilege: “daily contact [between peoples] provides a space in which whites can assert their own perceptions and interpretations as ‘truths’ to justify broad-sweeping generalizations about Blacks, Latinos, and Asians because they feel ‘they know’” (Bush 2011: 51). This owning of truth is one advantage of being classified as white, because the rightness of one’s assumptions concerning others is only questioned if and when they do not coincide with others who are also classified as white. The author also develops a picture of the United States in which an individual must fit into a specific socioeconomic stratum in order to be classified as white. Regardless of skin color or tone, those who

exist outside of this stratum are not entitled to the privileges which constitute whiteness as a lived experience (Bush 2011: 168).

In her seminal work “White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack,” Peggy McIntosh discusses these advantages, and sets the groundwork for the theory of white privilege, which she compares to male dominance; both give certain individuals an overt advantage (McIntosh 1988). A person living with these advantages experience specific privileges that no one else has access to: protection for one’s children, the telling of a history with faces and experiences which match one’s own, and readily available and affordable housing in a comfortable area (McIntosh 1988). The underlying issue of all these disadvantages is that they create situations in which the individual without has less agency than his or her white counterparts, and therefore, is more marginalized. Furthermore, there are some white individuals who fit into this category. While it certainly cannot be argued that they have faced the same historical and social pressures that those in the black community face, it could be said that this group is existing in a state of liminality: not experiencing enough agency to be considered white, but not experiencing the unique social position on this matrix of being black.

This idea of whiteness as complex matrix is further advanced by the theory of intersectionality (McCall 2005, Nash 2008). This concept, which emerges from the feminist school of thought, is based on the idea of “the relationships among multiple dimensions and modalities of social relations and subject formations” (McCall 2005: 1771). This means that a social actor, living in a social context and interacting with other social actors, cannot logically and productively be seen exclusively as ‘black,’ ‘white,’

‘man,’ ‘woman,’ ‘young,’ ‘old,’ etc. A thorough ethnographer must completely contextualize an individual in his or her social setting. For instance, he is a Black, middle-aged, heterosexual, atheist individual. Through intersectionality, one is able to more completely understand the position that actor occupies in his or her group or culture, as well as the disadvantages or privileges he or she might encounter on a daily basis (Nash 2008: 3).

Intersectionality is based on the idea that “subjectivity is constituted by mutually reinforcing vectors of race, gender, class, and sexuality, [and] has emerged as the primary theoretical tool designed to combat . . . hierarchy, hegemony, and exclusivity” (Nash 2008: 2). All this means that not only can this theory be applied to the white mainstream, because it exists as fundamental part of the overarching hegemonic power structure, but it can also be applied to the attitudes and dogma of the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement, as these are extreme versions of the violent exclusivity and misogyny present in certain places in the white mainstream. Thus, what one applying intersectionality to the white extremist mindset should consider are “the social processes of categorization and the workings of exclusion and hierarchy that mark boundary-drawing and boundary maintenance” (Nash 2008: 5). In order to accurately analyze the beliefs of white power groups, one must ask how they use conceptions of men versus women, working class versus poor versus rich, and homosexual versus heterosexual to idealize and formulate their own ideas of “true” whiteness? This is where ideas surrounding the concept from the white mainstream, the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement intersect: they all

present as entirely complex, but place their particular construction of “whiteness” as a bedrock marker, on which all other perceived racial categories are judged.

An important sociological consideration of those intricacies which delineate whiteness is Matt Wray’s *Not Quite White*, which posits that “whiteness as a privileged category of identity . . . has been a key aspect of social domination . . . [because] those whose racial identity appears to be white fare better when it comes to social opportunities and rewards” (Wray 2006: 5). In part, this is ingrained in various social constructs and paradigms, but this is also due to the concept of whiteness existing as a developing relationship between individuals, the underlying dynamic of which is power. In this sense, “power and how power is projected must be understood as a process . . . If we see whiteness as an ongoing project or process, then different individuals and groups may enter into that imagination and projection of power” (Antrosio 2014). To this end, Wray hypothesizes that based on varying characteristics, people with white skin will enter this contest for power with varying levels of agency, as “white trash and its related slurs exhibit the general features shared by symbolic markers of stigma and dishonor. Primary among these features are effects of symbolic distancing and social exclusion through more disapproval, resulting in ‘us/them’ dichotomies that both enable and enact different forms of inequality, prejudice, and discrimination” (Wray 2006: 134). This idea of who is white, then, becomes incredibly intricate, and is not simply about one’s skin color. If one considers privileges granted to certain people and not to others based on the classification of whiteness, and how these privileges are then justified through the use of power and agency, then whiteness must be viewed as an intersectional concept.

One theorist who further expands on this idea of whiteness as intersectional is sociologist Michael Kimmel. In his ethnographic study *Angry White Men*, he develops an interpretive theory of the intersections between gender and race as they play out in the white, mainstream United States. His work considers how white, working and middle class men have reacted to certain cultural and political shifts, especially those which have occurred in the economy. Herein, he posits that “what united [these white men] is their belief in a certain ideal of masculinity” (Kimmel 2013: 13). In an era when jobs for this subset of the population are in decline, the assumption is that to be a fully functioning individual, to have full agency and to be a fully actualized *man*, is to be able to support one’s family: this is especially important for *white* men, who “seem to have gone from being ‘king of the castle,’ running virtually every single organization and institution in America to ‘the end of men’” (Kimmel 2013: 111). Thus, the in-group becomes the family, and to be white is to be able to provide protection for one’s in-group in the form of shelter and adequate financial support. Additionally, one must have absolute control and exert complete power over his in-group, as is evinced by the correlation of men with “king.”

This idea of whiteness as being intrinsic to masculinity in a real-world context is extrapolated upon by Fred Pfeil in *White Guys: Postmodern Domination & Difference*. Pfeil analyzes popular culture; more specifically, his discussion of the depiction of white men versus black men in films is telling. In quintessential action films such as *Lethal Weapon* and *Die Hard*, the strong, completely male lead is portrayed by a white actor, while black actors portray their accomplices, who occupy roles of

mildly incompetent cops who play by the rules and unproblematically love their wives and families and who, it is worth noting, hardly threaten white audiences at all – [They] are the perfect antithesis to their blond, blue-eyes white Others’ combination of steely, square-jawed efficiency and perfect murderousness [Pfeil 1996: 12]

An additional characteristic of this archetype is that of sexual prowess; these male characters are always depicted as having overt, heterosexual sex appeal. Thus, through mainstream, popular culture, the idea of whiteness has become layered. Now, not only is it associated with masculinity, but it is also associated with a proclivity for violence and a sexual desire for women. It is noteworthy that those most famous of superheroes in white, mainstream United States’ popular culture are also white. Included in this class are Spiderman, Batman, and Iron Man, to name a few. This means that to be white is to be able to protect the in-group. Overwhelmingly, this is associated with white skin.

The question then also becomes, where is white skin tone *not* associated with the classification of an individual into the category of “white?” Historically, the term “white” has only been applied to a very small subset of the population. For instance,

the Irish were characterized as racial Others when they first arrived in the first half of the 19th century. The Irish had suffered profound injustice in the U.K. at the hands of the British, widely seen as ‘white negroes’ . . . the comic Irishman – happy, lazy, stupid, with a gift for music and dance – was a stock character in American theater [Daniels 2009]

Additionally, Jewish individuals have been a constant target for negative stereotyping and violence in the white mainstream. This came to a head in 1915 with the lynching of Leo Frank, a Jewish American businessman who, after being accused and acquitted of the murder of a young girl he employed, was tried by mob rule in Atlanta (Grubin). Scapegoating of the Jewish population by the white mainstream has been a constant

theme in the relationship between these two groups. Thus, to be of a particular heritage or of a specific religion has historically eliminated one from being considered “white.”

This exclusive construction of whiteness is also present in the white supremacy movement, where one must meet certain personal standards in order to be considered a part of the movement. To experience full agency within the group, one must be considered a ‘real white man;’ only these individuals are granted positions of leadership, both within the home and in movement groups (Simi & Futrell 2010: 27). This man must be willing to protect his group and family. Not only does this rhetoric come from men in the movement, but it is also apparent in the rhetoric of women. Both speak of men outside of the movement, and specifically of those against gun control, saying:

Not only does this man not know how to use a gun, he doesn’t know the men who do, or the number of people who have successfully used one to defend themselves from injury or death. But he is better left in the dark; his life is hard enough knowing there are men out there who don’t sit cross-legged. That they’re able to handle a firearm instead of being handled by it would be too much to bear. [*The Anti-gun Male*, The Knights Party website]

Additionally, a former adherent recalls relating to those seen as a part of the in-group. He speculates that they all joined the Skinhead movement because “white kids would get tired of getting beat up, and they’d look somewhere for protection . . . My friends and I were a safe harbor and a form of real protection for them. Suddenly I became the good guy” (Leyden 2008: 92). Here, violence serves several functions: it acts to develop the idea of the ‘real white man,’ an individual who is permitted to lead the movement, and it helps to delineate white from nonwhite.

Historically, both the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement have attacked the Jewish population as an Other; because the Klan has existed in the United States for a longer period of time, the rhetoric developed by this group targeting Jewish individuals is much more violent. For instance, the Klan has consistently adhered to their belief that “Jew-devils have no place in a White Christian nation. When our [political] party is elected . . . the Government will expel the Jews and confiscate their ill-gotten wealth for the benefit for the American people” (Dobratz & Shanks-Meile 2000: 43). Similarly, messages in the Skinhead movement surrounding the Jewish population focus on the idea of the wealth of Jewish individuals, and how to take that money from them (Ezekiel 1995: 170). Because of this, Skinheads are attempting to dispel what they believe is the one of the most important misconceptions about racial lines. The influential white nationalist website, Stormfront, states that “the first, obvious, source of confusion is the fact that many Jews appear white . . . [but] due to advances in DNA testing, we can now unequivocally say that the Jews are an ethnic group that is separate and distinct from all other” (*An Introduction to Stormfront and the Pro-White Movement*, Stormfront.org). Whiteness for these groups, then, is based not only on the color of one’s skin, but also on religion affiliation.

In both mainstream and white supremacist cases, whiteness presents as a very complex construct. It is a defining characteristic based on much more than skin color. However, to be assigned this identifier entails certain privileges, especially in the white mainstream. Most importantly, whiteness becomes something which can be owned, controlled, and manipulated, and whose characteristics of which are dictated by the

hegemonic power structure. The same can be said of dominant narratives revolving around masculinity, which also presents as a complex space of ownership, and is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 4: “Real” Masculinity

A number of those items which are appropriated from the white mainstream, and then misused, by both the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement surround the idea of what makes an individual as a “real” man. Who can qualify to be a “real” man, and what characteristics automatically make a person ineligible from belonging to this category? Additionally, how does one prove oneself a “real” man? Furthermore, what are the implications of belonging to this category versus being excluded? What will be demonstrated in the following chapter is that not only do all of these questions matter, but the ramifications of qualifying as masculine have far-reaching consequences. This is true in both the white mainstream and the white supremacy movement, but manifests in different ways in each sphere. As will be demonstrated herein, those messages regarding masculinity in the white mainstream are both overt and subliminal, while those which exist in the Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movement are overpoweringly overt.

Though those messages, ideas, and mores in both the white supremacy movement and the white mainstream look very different, they come from the same fundamental place. Thus, three basic, identical themes become apparent in both. The first of these is that of normative violence. This means that violence towards those who are not part of the in-group becomes accepted in real-world settings through the language used to

discuss these individuals. Those who are expected to exemplify and manifest this are those classified as “real” men. The second theme which cuts across both the white mainstream United States and the white supremacy movement is that of the domineering male within a heteronormative family structure. Even in a time when other relationship styles are becoming more visible, narratives in both spheres dictate that the most correct and acceptable type of intimate relationship is heterosexual. Additionally, what is also seen as correct is that within the heteronormative family structure, “real” men must be the dominant partner. The final theme which is present in both the white mainstream and the far-right racist movement is a heroic narrative, present in both groups. In other words, this is the idea that in order for one to be a “real” man, one must fulfill certain characteristics which make that individual a hero. Some of these include defense of the in-group, especially those considered most vulnerable; a large-scale, final conflict with the enemy; and a resounding lack of emotion in the hero that allows the “real” man, who is fulfilling the hero narrative, to focus his efforts on defense of the in-group. It is important to explore not only the interplay of these three themes in the white mainstream United States, Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movement, but also how all three help to develop a highly specific and exclusive ideal of what it means to be a “real” man, and what qualifies one as a “real” man. As the narrative concerning masculinity in both the pro-white, far-right extremist movement and in the white mainstream is played out in complex and often subliminal ways, allowing these three themes sometimes crosscut one another, they will be shown as highly interconnected.

Matthew Gutmann's "Trafficking in Men: The Anthropology of Masculinity" begins with a survey of the differences and similarities in global and cultural conceptions of masculinity, and moves to a critique of the ways that masculinity is handled in Western academia (Gutmann 1997). The two ways that are most important in the discussion of an exclusive masculinity are the idea that "some men are inherently or by ascription considered 'more manly' than other men . . . [and] the general and central importance of male-female relations, so that masculinity is considered anything that women are not" (Gutmann 1997: 386). Because Gutmann sees these both as flaws in the way that masculinity is constructed, he makes a concerted effort to stress a female voice in the study of masculinity: this reflects the theme of the domineering male.

While Gutmann points to the fact that this is still a prevalent, underlying narrative at the academic level, this is also apparent throughout the white, United States' mainstream (Gutmann 1997). Rape is discussed in a way that indicates that in order to be a "real" man, or the most masculine, one must not only be heteronormative, but must also carry unequal weight in the context of that relationship, however short-lived or antagonistic: in general, "because of the aggressive-passive, dominant-submissive, me-Tarzan-you-Jane nature of the relationship between the sexes in our culture, there is a close association between violence and sexuality" (Herman 1984: 45). Intimate relationships between men and women are seen as naturally violent, or at the very least aggressive, where the overpowering, dominant man controls the silent and submissive woman. The resounding, widespread success of E.L. James' book series and subsequent film adaptation, *50 Shades of Grey*, perfectly represents the white mainstream acceptance

of these traditional, and sometimes violent, interactions between men and women. The man is in total control of the woman, who is completely accepting of his advances, which border on rape. Reaction within the white mainstream has been overpoweringly positive, with the book series being so successful that it has been labeled “mommy porn” (Donaldson James 2012).

In the white supremacy movement, there is strong, overt support for the maintenance of heteronormativity as an exclusive family structure. In a discussion held on *Stormfront*, a young woman seeks opinions on adjustment to life as a homemaker, and the general feeling amongst other women in a position similar to hers can be described as cowling: one woman states that “my husband prefers me at home” (“*Questions about being a ‘homemaker’?* 2015). Furthermore, the Knights’ Party, formerly known as the Ku Klux Klan, extensively discusses the topic of homosexuality in the context of parenting, asserting that “homosexuality is a mental depravity that has severe consequences for society and its social acceptance IS contagious. It is increasingly viewed by even children as a legitimate form of a romantic relationship that should receive God’s blessing. Homosexuality and miscegenation are two great sins that are undermining marriage and family” (Heslip 2010). These messages allow for only one kind of acceptable intimate relationship, where intimate interactions occur exclusively between women and men, and in which the former are subservient to the latter. Men dictate the dynamic of power between the sexes, resulting in men as the sole voice in the relationship. Furthermore, in the context of the Skinhead movement, current ethnographic research has found that “men are esteemed protectors of family and race,

and women are relegated to the subordinate . . . roles of motherhood and homemaker” (Simi & Futrell 2010: 31). Women are less valued, and granted less power in both their homes and in the movement, because they are channeled into roles which are seen as having an inherent lack of power.

Placing equal weight on the feminine voice in the discussion of masculinity as Gutmann is anthropologist Sherry B. Ortner. In her collection *Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture*, she dissects the development of masculinity in relation to femininity in the context of contemporary Western culture. Specifically, she analyzes “how actors ‘enact,’ ‘resist,’ or ‘negotiate’ the world as given, and in doing so ‘make’ the world. This making may turn out to produce the same old social and cultural thing – ‘reproduction.’ Or it may turn out to produce something new” (Ortner 1996: 1). Thus, gender, like any other personal identifier, becomes a locus of power. It is a space to navigate not only how we see ourselves, but how we see others. Furthermore, Ortner spends considerable time discussing how this performance of gender relates to social positioning; she argues “that the sex/gender system can best be understood in relation to the workings of the ‘prestige system,’ the system within which personal status is ascribed, achieved, advanced, and lost” (Ortner 1996: 59). Ortner’s contention that gender, as an expression of power, with particular attention paid to masculinity, is played out very clearly in the white mainstream United States and the white supremacy movement.

Within the scope of the white mainstream, an overarching hero narrative aids in the expression of masculine power. Conceptions of what constitutes a true hero are

reconciled with the hegemonic domination of a very particular kind of masculinity; men who fit this mold are seen as exclusively and fully “man”. This is exemplified in childhood films. Arguably, the most popular of these come from the Walt Disney franchise. Movies like *The Sleeping Beauty* (1959), *The Lion King* (1994), and *Tangled* (2010) reflect the full scope of this narrative, in a way that is accessible to children and palatable for adults. In these films, the male protagonist (Prince Phillip, Simba, and Flynn Rider, respectively) places himself in a high level of danger in order to protect the female protagonist, or in the case of Simba’s pride of lions, to protect the entirely female and entirely helpless in-group. This danger culminates in a final battle with a distinct and reified enemy, who seeks to completely eliminate the male protagonist because he is the “hero”. In the end, he emerges victorious; these stories lead the viewer to the conclusion that this is because he, as the hero, is inherently good. His goodness, in turn, is juxtaposed against the total evil of his enemy. Even those family movies which feature a strong female protagonist often portray her from the lens of male dominance: Princess Tiana, of Disney’s *The Princess and the Frog* (2009), puts aside her dreams of restaurant ownership in order to put the needs of male protagonist, the prince, above her own. She only achieves her dream of entrepreneurship with the help of this prince. The continued overwhelming reception of films released by the Disney corporation, as well as the continued occurrence of the dominant male and subservient female archetypes in these films, represent the absolute acceptance that white, mainstream United States’ culture has developed in relation to the hero narrative, even if at a subliminal level. Though movies with a strong, unattached female protagonist, such as Katniss Everdeen of *The Hunger*

Games (2012) may help to play a role in changing white mainstream ideas about this hero narrative, the mere existence of those films such as *The Princess and the Frog* and *Tangled* represent a continued acceptance of the male-as-hero paradigm, sometimes at an unconscious level: here, there is no reflection on the implications of this narrative.

In both the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement, language which supports the male-as-hero is more overt and prolific than that which exists in the white mainstream, but is equally as effective in shaping a definitive construction of “real” masculinity. In the case of the Skinhead movement, considerable time is spent discussing a perceived Jewish enemy, which is described as absolutely distinct from those who are a part of the movement, and who describe themselves as “White”. Jewish people are conceptualized as “a parasitic forest. It is injecting spiritual and cultural poison into our civilization and into the life of our people and sucking up nutrients to enrich itself and grow even more destructive” (*An Introduction to Stormfront and the Pro-White Movement*”, Stormfront.org). The assertion of the self-described ‘white nationalist’ is that “the Jews make sure that it is almost impossible for ‘good’, or at least non-treasonous, people such as Ron Paul, to win elections,” and that they are to blame for letting other kinds of ‘not good’ people, such as Muslim Americans and Mexican immigrants, into United States’ borders (*An Introduction to Stormfront and the Pro-White Movement*” 2015). So, what is the angry white nationalist to do with this information, the author then rhetorically asks? It is his duty to ‘save the world’ from these bad individuals, through activist and financial efforts; thus, he becomes the hero, saving the struggling white world (*An Introduction to Stormfront and the Pro-White*

Movement” 2015). Finally, and more explicitly, this blogger warns that “many new pro-White activists get overzealous and become discouraged when their initial heroic efforts don’t move heaven and earth right away. Plan and work for the longer term” (“*An Introduction to Stormfront and the Pro-White Movement*” 2015). The message here is clear. Adherents to Skinhead ideology see themselves as heroes and saviors; in this way, violence and power against a Jewish and foreign Other is seen as justified for the protection of the in-group.

In his narrative *The Trouble with Nature*, anthropologist Roger N. Lancaster examines what he believes is an important need to classify gender and distinguish certain behaviors as aberrant, according to the gender performing them. He posits that within the context of modern, heteronormative, Western culture, social decorum dictates that there is only one ‘right’ way to perform one’s gender (Lancaster 2003:7). While this may be equally true for men and for women, the focus here is on how this results in a specific construction of masculinity: within the scope of this discussion, Lancaster’s observation is rather significant, as both the white mainstream and the white supremacy movement have strong beliefs regarding what it means to ‘be a man’. Both groups assert, to varying degrees and in different ways, that in order for one to be seen as a “real” man, that individual must possess certain intrinsic characteristics. One of these is the enthusiastic and perhaps natural turn to violence, which then is seen as an essential part of “real” masculinity. The white, mainstream United States and the far-right, racist movement both accept this kind of violence as normal, with the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead

movement embracing this type of violence. The complexities of this in a real-world setting are the subject of the following discussion.

In the white mainstream, this proclivity is expressed through the tenant of producerism, an idea which was reified in the beginning of the twentieth century and which “asserted the dignity of labor and scorned wealthy ‘parasites’ who prospered off the honest toil of others” (MacLean 1994: 84). Traces of this paradigm can still be found in conservative rhetoric. For those of this political ilk, it has developed into the idea that those who are not working are draining the resources of those who do work hard, and as such, deserve less than those who are productive. This mentality is taken to the extreme in conservative political streams, where Latino immigrants are seen as a drain on the system simply through their existence in the United States. Deportation has been offered as a solution to the “problem” of immigration by these individuals, and is supported regardless of the potential for violence faced by Latino peoples who are sent back to their home country. However, in neoconservative thought, this violence toward the Other is justified in order to keep the in-group safe and prosperous.

In the white supremacy movement, the paradigm of producerism has led to overt violence against those who are seen as not completely contributing to the good of the in-group. In 1922, The Ku Klux Klan of Athens, Georgia did two things: first, they “showered their town with leaflets and proclaimed that no man ‘has a right to consume without producing’ and warned the unemployed and vagrants to ‘find work’” (MacLean 1994: 84), and second, they used violence to make this “warning” a real threat to citizens whom they felt were not contributing productively to their ideal culture, in which every

individual works for what he has (MacLean 1994: 156). Violence became something which was not implied as happening to the group which is targeted, as in the case of the white mainstream interpretation of producerism, but was explicitly acted upon. In the white supremacy movement, this type of poor-shaming led to violence towards those who are seen as a drain in the economic health of the United States: namely inauthentic Americans. One Skinhead blogger likens the influx of illegal immigrants to a nuclear bomb, who warns that “a nuclear accident would ‘only’ kill a few million people, but Third World immigration is a bomb that continues to go off every time a baby is born and eventually will turn the entire United States into the likes of Guatemala and Haiti, and Europe into Lebanon” (“*Part III: Money, Race, Immigration and Morality*” 2015). The implication here is that those who are not contributing to the welfare of the in-group should not be allowed to reap the benefits of that same group; in this case, the benefit is basic and life-sustaining health care. Thus, death of these individuals is seen as justified in order to protect the health and well-being of those in the movement.

R.W. Connell, a sociologist who studies and analyzes gender and, particularly, masculinity, concludes in “The Big Picture: Masculinities in Recent World History” that “it is not too strong to say that *masculinity is an aspect of institutions*, and is produced in institutional life, *as much as it is an aspect of personality* or produced in interpersonal transactions” (Connell 1993: 602). She hypothesizes that not only are a specific masculinity and maleness perpetuated because men interact with each other and with women in certain ways, but they continue to exist because they are embedded in every level of culture. In *Masculinities*, Connell analyzes the development and implications of

a highly specific hegemonic masculinity in Western thought and culture. She finds that “mass culture generally assumes there is a fixed, true masculinity beneath the ebb and flow of daily life. We hear of ‘real men’, ‘natural men’, ‘the deep masculine’” (Connell 2005: 45). Like Lancaster, Connell asserts that this highly specific and exclusive ideal of maleness and what it means to be a “real” man dictates that there is only one way to ‘be a man’. All others are considered aberrant and pathological. Furthermore, the author stresses “that masculinities come into existence at particular times and places, and are always subject to change. Masculinities are, in a word, historical” (Connell 2005: 185). To summarize, Connell sees one idea of masculinity dominating as hegemonic; this construction is seen as ‘correct’, ‘true’ or ‘real’, by nature of its value as hegemonic. However, she also explains that this masculinity comes to be dominant because of the historical instances that particular culture experiences. Because of its individual history, that culture develops a ‘correct’ way to act as a ‘real’ man (Connell 1993).

This one single, ‘correct’, hegemonic masculinity is present in the white mainstream in narratives surrounding gun control legislation. In the conservative party, attitudes concerning government intervention on individual gun ownership are largely negative, and have led to highly charged protests from citizens wishing to maintain control over their personal decisions regarding gun ownership. Often, discussions focus on the fear of an inability to protect those who cannot protect themselves; for instance, one author who staunchly supports less gun control legislation, and who writes for a conservative website, cites the time

“when Congresswomen Gabrielle Giffords and five others were shot in Tuscon, Arizona in January, [and] the man who wrestled the gunman to the ground before he could continue killing had a carry-and-conceal weapon. Said 24-year-old Joe Zamudio, who acknowledged that being armed gave him the confidence to tackle shooter Jared Lee Loughner, ‘I was ready to end his life.’” [Hunter 2012]

Hunter went onto warn that if “liberals get their way on gun control, there will be more deaths of innocents. I’m not saying liberals would want the potential murders implied in the examples here to occur. But what they want legislatively would only – inevitably – lead to more killing” (Hunter 2012). Reactions to Hunter’s editorial were polarized, but the general feeling was one of support for absolutely individual control of gun ownership. One respondent supported Hunter’s argument, saying that “concealed carriers are not commandos (mostly), but they are the cream of legal firearm owners” (Hunter 2012). Thus, the implication throughout Hunter’s piece is that true heroes exist as men who are willing to step into the line of fire and risk personal danger for the sake of those who will not. While this directly perpetuates the overarching hero narrative, spaces like children’s’ films also use this rhetoric, though more indirectly. This contributes to the embedding of this paradigm in the white mainstream, just as Connell hypothesizes.

In the Skinhead movement and Ku Klux Klan, the idea of one single ‘correct’ masculinity is developed even more overtly. Entire online forums are concerned with how to maintain individual stockpiles of guns and ammunition, how to obtain the right kinds of firearms for protection of one’s family and group, and how to develop a proficiency with one’s own weapons (*Self Defense, Martial Arts & Preparedness* 2015). This must be accomplished in order to prepare for the impending final battle with the Other, and to protect one’s space and family from this other; these are both important

elements of the hero narrative. Several researchers have found that this affinity towards weapons is largely present in men in the far-right, racist movement, who believe that they must have the means to protect the women that they see as belonging to them; the death of Mulugeta Seraw demonstrates this with tragic clarity. When Seraw, an Ethiopian immigrant, had a verbal confrontation with several members of a Skinhead faction, the conflict only escalated when one of Seraw's friends verbally attacked one of the female Skinheads (Langer 2003: 33). When this occurred, baseball bats and guns were introduced by the Skinheads, resulting in Seraw's death, and the verbal assaults from those who belong to the racist group continued, with one of the white supremacy adherents shouting "Go back to your own country!" (Langer 2003: 33). Here, the 'hero', in order to be seen as a 'real' man, must come to the rescue of the woman, who is conceptualized here as helpless. The most effective way to protect her is through the use of violence, as is demonstrated with deadly consequences through Seraw's death. As in the white mainstream, the hero is one who places himself in harm's way, preferably with the aid of a gun, in order to protect the in-group.

Andrea Cornwall and Nancy Lindisfarne discuss the place of violence in the construction of this 'correct' masculinity. They see masculinity as a "continuing process whereby people negotiate relative positions of power as individuals and as representatives of social categories such as those based on gender, age, class or ethnicity. Interpretations of violence – in racist attacks, domestic battering, child abuse or queer-bashing – depend on perceptions of legitimacy and provocation" (Cornwall & Lindisfarne 1994: 15). In many ways, this construction of violence relies on a type of

othering which Lindisfarne analyzes in her article “Variant Masculinities, Variant Virginites: Rethinking ‘Honour and Shame’”. She hypothesizes that “the rhetoric of hegemonic masculinity depends heavily on stereotypes of women, as weak, emotional, both needing support and potentially treacherous” (Lindisfarne 1991: 85). Thus, women become totally vilified and then contextualized negatively, seen as stereotypes and objects rather than as individuals. This allows for small measures of violence against them, such as spousal rape, to be repressed for longer periods. As such, “while marital rape has been illegal in every state and the District of Columbia since 1993, it is infrequently prosecuted”; now, there is no distinction between date rape, stranger rape, or marital rape, and all are considered crimes (*Marital Rape* 2015). However, the fact that the rape of one’s spouse was not considered a crime until the early nineteen-nineties is largely due to “popularly held views that only stranger rape constituted ‘real rape’ or that forced sex is ‘wifely duty’” (*Marital Rape* 2015). A wife is seen as the property of her husband, and is treated as such; attitudes which engender this belief still exist, and cause this crime to go grossly underrepresented and unprosecuted. This means that violence against her is seen only as his concern, and becomes normalized. Additionally, this also helps to subliminally develop the idea that in order to be a ‘real’ man, one must have intercourse with one’s wife.

In the Skinhead movement, rhetoric surrounding normalized violence, especially that of a sexual nature, largely revolves around ownership of the woman in question. While men are free to be involved with as many women as they choose, women in the Skinhead party must align themselves with only one man; possession and ownership of

women are incredibly important to men in the movement (Meeink 2009, Ezekiel 1995). Additionally, sexual encounters in the movement are described as lacking the romance that those in the white mainstream have come to expect, as some men describe even their own rapes as shaping them into the hardened Skinheads that they recognize themselves to be (Meeink 2009: 85). In both the white, mainstream United States and the white supremacy movement, violence becomes a fundamental part of all types of interactions, even those which should be unequivocally pleasant.

The study of masculinity, and the effect that masculinity has when acted in a real-world context, is present in various academic disciplines, including that of the critique of literature. To this end, one highly regarded discussion of gender, as well as the polarization surrounding femininity, is Klaus Theweleit's *Male Fantasies*. His premise that the deeply ingrained fear of the feminine experienced by Freikorps soldiers is especially pertinent to a discussion of the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan: not only was this lived through the German experience in World War I, but it is also an important paradigm in the white supremacy movement. In both cases, this fear helps to create a highly individualized responsibility for the well-being of one's nation (Theweleit 1987: 50). For Freikorps soldiers, this fear of women was placated through the use of two neatly-packaged archetypes, the White Nurse and the Red Nurse: though these abounded in literature, they had very real consequences in the relationships that these soldiers had, not only with the women in their lives, but with the men they fought (Theweleit 1987: 79, 90). Throughout *Male Fantasies*, Theweleit also demonstrates how this fear of the feminine is manifested in areas and recurrent cultural archetypes which

are seemingly devoid of gender, such as flooding, blood, and dirt (Theweleit 1987: 229). In the white mainstream United States, this manifested fear of the feminine is demonstrated in the discomfort men experience when discussing the female menstrual cycle. Kotex conducted and filmed a social experiment to this end, asking men to buy tampons for a woman. While all men were visibly shaken by this request, some men even refused to use the terms “period”, “vagina”, or “tampon” (*Buy Me Tampons – Social Experiment*, 2010). As these archetypes are equally evident in the Freikorps, the white, mainstream United States, and white supremacist groups in the United States, they become important to this discussion. Gender is conceptualized in more than one way, and in a dichotomous manner, and so if we understand how femininity is classified, we will have a better understanding of how masculinity is constructed (Theweleit 1987: xiii).

This view of gender is exemplified in the hero narrative, where those ideas concerning emotion emerge polarized. That is, according to this narrative, where women are allowed to connect with and express a full range of emotion, men must hide their emotions, in order to adequately protect those in the in-group. The popular culture website, BuzzFeed, interviewed six men about their experience of masculinity in United States’ culture (Rose 2014). The interviewees reported several important anecdotes:

‘I just told myself I should never cry.’
‘We don’t talk about our feelings; it’s a very macho culture.’
‘I never saw my dad cry except for once in my life, but it freaked me out. I remember thinking that there was something wrong, like, I felt like a machine had shut down.’
‘You bury emotion as much as you can . . . Then you go somewhere privately and have a little cry.’
‘I was always very much belittled for any sort of display of emotion.’
[Rose 2014]

In this way, ‘real’ men are made to feel as if the display of emotions, especially in public, is shameful. “Real” men, as real heroes, must be robotic and taciturn, in order to function with complete success. In conjunction with this, one interviewee reports that he was taught that he should not “back down from fights; don’t be afraid to pick fights” (Rose 2014). In this way, there is a reconciliation of normative violence and the hero narrative. “Real” men are devoid of any outward, extreme emotion, with the exception of violent anger directed towards the Other.

In the white supremacy movement, this lack of emotion in men is absolutely supported. There is a deliberate revision of both history and current facts in the portrayal of the relationship between the Ku Klux Klan as in-group and those who are considered Others. There is a deliberate effort to dispel what they consider the “myth” of white hate:

“when talking about the Klan, one of the first things some people think of is that associates of The Knights must really hate Negroes and other non-whites. In fact some people are so sure that this is the basic foundation of the Klan they will actually want to join for this very reason. How disappointed they must be when they find out the Klan does not hate Negroes!” [*Does the Klan Hate Negroes?* 2010]

For those in the Klan, this means that when deliberate efforts are taken to expel undesirable individuals from “their” United States, it is not out of a hatred for the Other: no emotion is involved. It is borne from a simple desire to reclaim the space that they believe is theirs (*We Are Not The Enemies of The Black Man* 2010).

For the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan, masculinity is not simply a matter of anatomy. Masculinity is derived from certain individual personality characteristics; one must possess these characteristics in order to be considered a “real”

man. The question, then, becomes: how do these “real” men in the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan justify marginalization and violence directed at those who are perceived as Others? More specifically, how do those in these groups account for any guilt that might be felt, or any blame they might experience, from their interactions with any Others? This is the subject of the following chapter.

Chapter 5: Guilt and Blamelessness

One of the more complex notions appropriated by the Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movement is blame. That is, how does one assign blame to others, or shift blame for negatively charged incidents away from oneself or one's in-group? Though this shifting is present in both the far-right, pro-white extremist movement and in the white mainstream of the United States, it manifests differently in both. As is demonstrated in this chapter, this shift may either seem inconsequential, or have rather far-reaching consequences, but the underlying method of redirecting blame from one's person or from the in-group is the same regardless of whether one is speaking of the white mainstream or the white supremacy movement. This contributes to the premise that one need not always be accountable for one's actions towards the Other; discussion will move on to show that this is especially true in conjunction with certain Others. While these two ideas in the white mainstream often translate to nonviolent marginalization, these same ideas in the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan mean targeted aggression against those who are not part of the in-group. Finally, this chapter will show that although this rhetoric is reified differently in these two spheres, they come from the same source.

To understand how these groups conceptualize, define, and work with guilt, one should turn to anthropologist Clifford Geertz and sociologist Mitch Berbrier. It is through a combination of anthropology and sociology, and the unique approaches of these two academics, that one gains a deeper understanding of how guilt is deflected in order to create a sense of blamelessness, both for the individual and the group. The main question here asks, in what ways is blamelessness created and manipulated to “our” benefit? Additionally, what function do blamelessness and the shifting of guilt serve?

Clifford Geertz develops a theory of epistemology in “Thinking as a Moral Act: Ethical Dimensions of Anthropological Fieldwork in the New States” as well as “The Way We Think Now: Toward an Ethnography of Modern Thought.” Geertz posits that thought and thought processes can relate all cultures to one another. This has to do with

how meaning in one system of expression is expressed in another – cultural hermeneutics, not conceptive mechanics . . . what once looked to be a matter of finding out whether savages could distinguish fact from fancy now looks to be a matter of finding out how others, across the sea or down the corridor, organize their significative world. [Geertz 1982: 19]

Thus, though cultures and groups show variance, some fundamental connections can be found between all. There are similarities, then, between how the white supremacy movement manages guilt as a space of control, and how the white mainstream culture also does so.

Geertz also believes that “what connects Victor Turner . . . Philippe Aries . . . and Gerald Holton . . . is the belief that ideation, subtle or otherwise, is a cultural artifact” (Geertz 1982: 20). It can be argued that as it is constructed in both the white power movement and the white mainstream, guilt is a cultural artifact. Not only is it an entirely

human construct, but the fine details of it follow the culture in which it exists. A large part of this discussion focuses on ‘responsible thought’, or “the argument that the reason thinking is serious is that it is a social act, and that one is therefore responsible for it as any other social act . . . [Thus] thought is conduct and is to be morally judged as such” (Geertz 1968: 139). If some level of thinking can be called “guilt,” the social ripples that it then causes must be analyzed from this perspective. To this end, Geertz theorizes that “as thought is conduct, the results of thought inevitably reflect the quality of the kind of human situation in which they were obtained” (Geertz 1968: 140). So, the way individuals in the white supremacy movement think, as well as how individuals in the white mainstream culture think, is resultant from their position as social actors within that group. Guilt and blamelessness are handled in very specific ways because these individuals adhere to their chosen ideology.

An example of how the white mainstream culture continues to shift blame for its own ends is demonstrated in rape culture. Though attitudes are just recently beginning to shift, the general paradigm still posits that the female victim participated in her victimization in some way. She made advances at her attacker, she wore the wrong clothes, she chose to separate herself from her friends. This is crystallized in the case of Daisy Coleman, the fourteen-year-old girl who accused a classmate of rape, and was later told by some in her community that she “was ‘asking for it’ and would ‘get what was coming’” (Coleman 2013). Her attacker was a well-liked and popular figure in the small town, “the grandson of a longtime area political figure, [and] the incident sparked outrage in the community, though the worst of it was directed not at the accused perpetrators but

at [the] victim and her family”; tensions between Coleman and the town rose until she was forced to move (Arnett 2013). Here, the female actor becomes the scapegoat, in order to preserve the full masculinity of the white male, which remained intact when charges brought against him were dropped only two months later (Arnett 2013).

Coleman, like many other women, faces blame for her own violation, so that those who are a part of the in-group can maintain their own masculine, hegemonic power.

In the scope of the white power movement, blame is shifted in order to make messages concerning movement accomplishments more palatable to those who are not a part of the in-group, guilt is manipulated. A prominent former adherent in the Skinhead movement recounts an interaction with a non-adherent during his time in the military, recalling,

‘Are you white power?’ he asked pointedly. There was no mistaking the derision in his voice – or the challenge . . .
‘Look,’ I countered, ‘Are you, or are you not, proud of being Filipino?’
‘Well, yes,’ he said, beginning to look uncomfortable again. ‘Of course I am.’
‘Well, you *should* be,’ I answered. ‘You’re Filipino and it’s important to be proud of your heritage. We’re proud of being white. It’s where we come from. We’re proud of our race, our culture, and our heritage. That’s all white power is. You’re proud of being Filipino, and we’re proud of being white. It’s that simple.’ [Leyden 2008: 70]

Not only is the logic behind white supremacist dogma greatly reduced here, but the conflict and “derision” of outside individuals are avoided by attempting to manipulate the meaning of *white power*. The in-group is presented as an organization which simply engenders pride in one’s ethnicity and lineage, rather than a violent hate of the Other. Through the use of this reductivist logic, there is an attempt to make the group more palatable, and to remove the ideology of the group from the scope of retribution by those

outside the group. This allows those who adhere to the movement to continue to practice their own set of beliefs, and feel as if their own status quo remains untouched.

Noted sociologist Mitch Berbrier has spent a considerable amount of time studying the white supremacy movement. Of particular use are his works, “Impression Management for the Thinking Racist: A Case Study of Intellectualization in Contemporary White Supremacist Discourse” and “The Victim Ideology of White Supremacists and White Separatists in the United States.” In his first piece, Berbrier presents “a case study of one wing of the white supremacist movement that strives to manage the stigma of that movement and its ideology by presenting white supremacists as nonviolent intellectuals, countering the common view of uneducated boorish terrorists” (Berbrier 1999: 411). Additionally, in attempting to appear nonviolent and largely intellectual, group members try to deflect white mainstream blame for their beliefs. “Stigma is evaded by attacking those who reject the behaviors . . . ‘We [the whites] are guilty not of negative action, they are.’ Moreover, they are the ones who are the racists, who persecute and who are intolerant” (Berbrier 1999: 421). This is not unique to the white supremacy movement in the United States. Vincent Crapanzano analyzes this in a South African setting, where he focuses on discourses between the English and Afrikaner populations; in the case of both South African ethnicities, there is a deliberate attempt to portray oneself as the victim of the other, with a deliberate ignorance of the history of the region and the abject suffering of the nonwhite population of the country (Crapanzano 1986: 19). In both the United States and South African cases,

there is an attempt to completely shift blame for psychologically harmful, violent, or openly discriminatory actions away from the in-group and onto a scapegoat.

Berbrier further details two ways of dealing with guilt and stigma: redefinition and evasion, the latter of which is more common for the United States' white supremacy movement. There is an “effort on the part of the stigmatized individual to present himself as an ordinary person’ . . . Evaders do not embrace the label; they either reject it and/or try to deflect the negative impact of labeling by offering a differing view of reality” (Berbrier 1999: 412). The processes of stigma management and image presentation in the white supremacy movement can be summarized as follows: “divided between an underground violent movement and an aboveboard political movement” (Berbrier 1999: 413). In part, this is how these groups are able to shift blame away from themselves; violence becomes secondary to the *entire* focus of the group, which is now able to reconstruct and retell some white mainstream events and acts of violence in order to restructure guilt. Thus, an ideology of victimhood becomes central to the focus of the group. Berbrier’s second article expands upon this mentality.

“The Victim Ideology of White Supremacists and White Separatists in the United States” argues that the white power movement paints the in-group as being absolutely victimized by those who exist antithetical to it, and that their unique approach to victimhood is made manifest in five underlying themes: “(1) discrimination, (2) rights abrogation, (3) stigmatization and the denial of pride, (4) loss of self-esteem, and (5) racial elimination” (Berbrier 2000: 175). Their use of this kind of rhetoric, as well as their focus of this narrative on themselves rather than on the Other, allows the group a

certain level of power and manipulation of their environment. Herein, “a ‘victim’, in this perspective is a type of person whose basic characteristic is the experience of harm. Beyond this, victims are also basically innocent and seen not to be responsible for the harm that has come to them, thereby meeting sympathetic responses” (Berbrier 2000: 177). One does not blame a victim for his or her actions in the face of trauma or threat from an imposing or attacking Other, as actions taken at this juncture are performed out of self-defense, and are therefore above reproach. Thus, if the white power movement was able to successfully construct and present its adherents as victims, then any actions taken against the Other, be they physically violent or intellectually threatening, can be rationalized by the group as justified. Furthermore, discourse in the movement concerning victimhood largely centers on surviving in a world which is seeking to eliminate them; here, a culture of paranoia abounds. “Separation becomes a matter of survival of innocent victims, rather than the ideological preference of the more powerful . . . If indeed the charge is racism, then the response comes in the form of the ‘necessity defense’” (Berbrier 2000: 186). For instance, these groups completely deny the existence of white privilege by arguing that white individuals face unfair disadvantage, to the point of total extinction. In particular, the Klan spends a great deal of time discussing what they call “white genocide”:

Soon America will be brown – will whites be treated as humanely by nonwhites as whites have treated them? The discrimination and violence perpetrated against whites in America is accomplished through the mindset Americans are being lulled into which is that white people are just parasites on the world and if there wasn’t any such thing as ‘whiteness’ ahh [*sic*] the world would be so much nicer. This is why it is so important for them to destroy white culture and heritage and to malign

our heroes and ideas in our schools and universities. [FAQ, The Knights Party Website]

A substantial part of this victimhood narrative is built upon these groups' supposed abrogation of their rights, or their defense of the rights of all white individuals. However, the fundamental fallacy herein is that "while many might interpret the encouragement of African American culture to be a part of an overall remediation and establishment of balance, white supremacists calculate justice ahistorically . . . 'white pride' exists in a vacuum outside of any historical context, whereby it means essentially the same thing . . . as does black pride" (Berbrier 2000: 181). These groups have no just cause to feel victimized. Thus, one must ask: what white mainstream messages are they misappropriating that allow them to create an entire narrative of victimhood, which enables them to feel no personal blame or guilt for the unfounded animosity they direct to the Other?

Some of these messages come from racist feelings existing outside of the Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movement. In 2013, celebrity chef Paula Deen was accused of the use of a racial slur; during investigation, she admitted to the use of this same word several times ("*Paula Deen's Cook Alleges Racism, Slurs By Celebrity Chef*" 2013). A statement released by her legal team on her behalf argued that one must understand why she used this term, as "she was born 60 years ago when America's South had schools that were segregated, different bathrooms, different restaurants and Americans rode in different parts of the bus. This is not today" (Messer 2013). This idea suggests that if one grows up under certain circumstances, then one *cannot* be held accountable for the

paradigms under which one exists and thinks, even if those paradigms are overtly harmful, degrading or dehumanizing to other individuals. Additionally, this statement asks the listener to see Deen as a victim in an equal capacity of those who are targeted by this slur. She is constructed as a victim of existing in a time when racism toward the Black Other was socially acceptable, and therefore cannot be held responsible for ascribing to attitudes borne of that time and place. If one is to accept this premise, then one must accept the violent actions of the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan; this is an impossibility, as this dogma is antithetical to modern, progressive, inclusive culture.

In the scope of the white power movement, blame is shifted from the in-group in accordance with Berbrier's victimhood narrative. If we accept that to be a victim is to gain some level of power in within the dominant, hegemonic narrative, then what becomes apparent that there is an attempt at an expression of agency through the use of this narrative. This means that actors in the white supremacy movement manipulate and use the victimhood narrative in order to achieve a sense of power over those who are actually victimized by their aggression. Language in the movement sometimes revolves around acting as a victim, living this role, and fulfilling this narrative, rather than becoming deliberately aggressive and outwardly antagonistic towards the Other. In the movement, the ideal portrayal of adherents, especially of white males, "is as both innocent victims and benevolent champions of equity and justice" (Berbrier 2000: 180). For these groups, this yields a literal interpretation of the words of white nationalist David Lane: "we must secure the existence of our people and a future for white

children” (Bebrier 2000: 184). The '14 Words' have become integral to both the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement. These advocates of white racism see the white population as facing white genocide, and it is only through their own heroic actions that their 'race' can be preserved (“Eastern Shore White Patriots”). Therefore, violence against the Other is conceptualized by those in the movement not as a flagrant use of power unjustified, but as a fight for survival; what they do see as unjustified is blame directed towards their group for what they perceive as self-defense. Actions were committed in order to secure safety for future generations and to ensure a safe living space.

In the white mainstream United States, the Skinhead movement, and the Ku Klux Klan, guilt and blame are concepts which are manipulated away from the in-group. Doing this allows those in this group to maintain their own dominance and hegemonic power, whether that power be actualized or only perceived. Finally, what must also be considered is how all three of these groups reify different ideas into the creation of a specific kind of space, in order to further increase their own power or add support to their dogma. This will be the topic of the next chapter.

Chapter 6: The Conceptualization of Space

In both the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement, the concept of space takes on very complex, meaningful characteristics. In the traditional sense, “space” is something that denotes physical geography. However, in the context of this thesis, it also defines certain less tangible concepts to far-right, racist groups. This chapter will explore religion and marriage as spaces through which adherents to these groups seek control of their environment; it will also analyze how white supremacist groups define those physical boundaries which separate the in-group from others. Both the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement treat religion and marriage as distinct, finite, and exclusive spaces which can be manipulated. Additionally, ideas concerning space that come from the white, mainstream United States are appropriated by the white supremacy movement and are then made much more violent and exclusivist. In this chapter, the fine connections between these two are explored and crystallized.

In the Skinhead movement, the Ku Klux Klan, and the white, mainstream United States, space becomes an area in which to negotiate power. In this way, the ideas of religion and marriage become like masculinity and whiteness: they are reified concepts used to reinforce a hegemonic power structure and an alternate power structure. Discussions of space in these groups revolve around space as a symbol, more so than as a

reified boundary. It is something which affects not only the geographical space where they exist, but more importantly, the ways in which individuals negotiate the dynamics of power. A study of those theorists who address space in its relationship to the structuring and exercise of power helps us to better understand these dynamics.

James Scott formulates a unique theory of space in *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. In his narrative, he analyzes the spaces that all individuals maintain on a daily basis: the creation and maintenance of a public face, or transcript, and the creation of a private face, or hidden transcript (Scott 1990: 4). These are developed as a way for those who are part of both the dominant and subordinate classes to express power and agency in an acceptable social context, but to varying degrees; the development of this public persona also allows those who are in control to maintain this hegemonic power through “the symbolization of domination by demonstrations and enactments of power” (Scott 1990: 45). This public performance creates a social interaction between classes which dictates that “if subordinates believe their superior to be powerful, the impression will help him impose himself and, in turn, contribute to his actual power” (Scott 1990: 49). Thus, the space of control for those who are already dominant remains intact, as it is perpetuated through these rituals and transcripts. It is important to note that while the hidden transcript is an element of both the dominant and subordinate classes, it is of more interest in the context of this discussion for that class which has less social power, because “the hidden transcript is, for this reason, the privileged site of nonhegemonic, contrapuntal, dissident, subversive discourse” (Scott 1990: 28).

Two anthropologists who discuss a more white, mainstream, real-world construction of space are Catherine Besteman and Hugh Gusterson. In their introduction to *The Insecure American: How We Got Here and What We Should Do About It*, Besteman and Gusterson present a bleak portrait of the current state of affairs in the United States. Currently, there is a shifting of classes, largely resultant from the economic downturn occurring in the late two-thousands: what is happening now is that “Americans may be sorting themselves into two more stable groups, the haves and the have-nots” (Besteman & Gusterson 2010: 5). However, the authors are also seeing the emergence a “‘the missing class’ . . . of about fifty million who ‘are neither officially destitute nor comfortably middle class’ but are ‘near poor’ despite being employed” (Besteman & Gusterson 2010: 4). From popular culture notions of ‘The Other 99’ to ‘The Working Poor,’ the white mainstream has again become one of reified social boundaries, with these boundaries leading one to certain political and/or social allegiances. Furthermore, Besteman and Gusterson’s discussion about the state of national healthcare in the United States, as well as its penal system, lead them to conclude that “currently the dominant theme in American culture is insecurity” (Besteman & Gusterson 2010: 14). This idea of “insecurity” is apparent in narratives revolving around immigration, climate change, and terrorism (Besteman & Gusterson 2010: 16). Though both the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement transcend the level of formal class structure, this attitude of paranoia and fear is an underlying paradigm in the construction of space for both groups.

Setha M. Low sheds light on the problematic way that fear influences the white mainstream construction of space with her description of the phenomenon of gated communities. She describes neighborhoods that see the walling off of physical boundaries in order to create a barrier between themselves and the outside world in her narrative “A Nation of Gated Communities.” She posits that while gated communities have always been present, there is such an influx now because:

the psychological allure of defended space becomes even more enticing when the news media chronicle daily murders, rapes, drive-by shootings, drug busts, and kidnappings . . . [These communities] are also producing a landscape of fear by reinforcing perceptions, among both residents and outsiders, that only life inside a ‘fortress’ and physical separation from people of other racial, cultural, and economic groups can keep one safe. [Low 2005: 35]

Attitudes in the white mainstream are moving to greater mistrust of the Other in one’s space. It is only by the removal of that Other that the in-group may remain safe. However, it is interesting to note that in this case, “fake gating as much as real gating enables home owners to feel better about their social status and place in the world in a period of social and economic transition. This evolution of fake gating from the ‘real’ thing substantiates how profoundly gating permeates American culture, replacing and reconstructing notions of ‘community’” (Low 2005: 42). Thus, gating leads the in-group, that subset which one ‘belongs’ with, to be not only physically defined as that group of individuals that one is surrounded by, but also that group that holds a shared ideology concerning the Other, dictating that the Other is fundamentally unsafe.

Emerging from the joint fields of geography and anthropology, Tor H. Aase’s “Symbolic Space: Representations of Space in Geography and Anthropology” reconciles

anthropological tradition with geographical thought; that is, how do ideological and physical boundaries converge? He hypothesizes that “in order to understand and describe society . . . we must allow for various conceptions of space which are created by human activity” (Aase 1994: 51). Aase also posits that while we must treat space contextually, but that “we must allow for multiple constructions of space” (Aase 1994: 52). This means that we must consider a culture’s concept of space holistically, as a piece of a larger picture which helps one to understand that group in its entirety. Finally, Aase hypothesizes that we can glean insights into constructions of space by examining group context indirectly: “advertisements invoke ideas of history and nature, manipulating values in the hegemonic Western ideology of the good life . . . Through symbolic processes like this, individual identity (choice of house, site, etc.) is enmeshed in the reproduction of society (the hegemonic value system)” (Aase 1994: 53). Each culture develops a right and a wrong place to exist, or a place which connotes one as good, and another which connotes one as bad.

In her article “Culture and Space – Anthropological Approaches”, Waltraud Kokot reviews anthropology’s historical relationship with the study of space. Largely, her piece is an integration of previously conducted studies, using anthropological through to uniquely interpret them. In this way, she cites and melds several important theorists’ hypotheses concerning space. She references Appadurai, who argues that

spatially based anthropological concepts have turned into veritable ‘prisons’ for regional anthropology: As he [Appadurai] argues, there can be no more study of India without references to Caste, no more study of Africa without references to lineages, and no more study of Melanesia without references to complex systems of economic exchange. [Kokot 2006: 14]

Current anthropological paradigms that focus on space dictate that it is created by the individuals who live in that culture, and therefore is based on subjective experience rather than on objective boundaries. Thus, space is developed specific to that culture because of their own historical influences, and then has an effect on that group's entire way of life, rather than just the geographical parameters which they inhabit. To support this, Kokot cites Ulf Hannerz, who, like "many others, has emphasized the importance of day-to-day interactions and face-to-face relations for the production and reproduction of 'culture'. Consequently, it is the local level on which global influences are filtered, transformed and incorporated into beliefs and practices" (Kokot 2006: 16). Like other groups and cultures, the collective identity of the white supremacy movement is passed down and transmitted through daily interactions. This identity includes ideas like how space is conceptualized, and what is considered a space to be owned. In her concluding discussion, Kokot says that "'space' is not considered as an abstract entity or a mere 'container' of human action. Instead, 'space' is seen as a conceptualisation or cultural model, and both as a medium and product of social practice. Consequently, anthropological research on culture and space asks for the meaning of spatial metaphors representing social . . . identities" (Kokot 2006: 18). Space is transformed from something that physically separates the in-group into the way that this group relates to others, as well as how groups and individuals express power in a social context. Thus, space has real-world consequences and dynamics, both in the white mainstream and the white supremacy movement.

One theorist who has a significant impact on the study of social space is anthropologist Benedict Anderson. In his study *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, he details the ramifications of what he terms “imagined communities”. He sees these as imagined “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (Anderson 2006: 6). Thus, ideas flow between group adherents and cultural actors without direct verbal or visual transmission of this dogma. Anderson compares this to the development of a plot in a novel, in which characters act and are connected to one another, often without knowledge of each other’s existence. Though a specific individual may never meet *all* others in his or her community, “he has complete confidence in their steady anonymous, simultaneous activity” (Anderson 2006: 26). In the white mainstream, and even more so in the Ku Klux Klan and Skinhead movement, this means that participants believe in the correctness of their ideology because of the belief that others hold ideas identical to their own. He also believes that “nation-ness [as] assimilated to skin-colour, gender, parentage, and birth era – all those things one can not help. And in these ‘natural ties’ one senses what one might call ‘the beauty of [*Gemeinschaft*]’” (Anderson 2006: 143). In the white mainstream, this is translated to the supposition that the physical United States, as well as the spaces of marriage and religion, are owned and controlled exclusively by those who belong to the in-group, because the language surrounding these concepts suggests this ownership and control (Benedict 2006: 144). In the same way, the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan imagines their own ownership over these

ideals, through the use of much more exclusivist and violent language which targets the Other for exclusion from geographical space, religion, and marriage.

Geographical space and those abstract concepts of spatial relations cannot be discussed without consideration of Pierre Bourdieu's "Social Space and Symbolic Power." In this piece, he hypothesizes that

on the one hand, the objective structures that the sociologist constructs, in the objectivist moment, by setting aside the subjective representations of agents, form the basis for these representations and constitute the structural constraints that bear upon interactions; but, on the other hand, these representations must also be taken into consideration particularly if one wants to account for the daily struggles, individual and collective, which purport to transform or to preserve these structures. This means that the two moments, the objectivist and the subjectivist, stand in dialectical relationship. [Bourdieu 1989: 15]

Here, Bourdieu successfully reconciles the objective, factual world with subjective experience: his argument is that it is only because of the objective world in which we live and the objective structures that we experience that we can form subjective opinions, constructions, and paradigms surrounding the concept of space. This subjective experience leads to a concrete and very real "social reality" which Durkheim spoke of as an ensemble of invisible relations, those very relations which constitute a space of positions external to each other and defined by their proximity to, neighborhood with, or distance from each other" (Bourdieu 1989: 16). This means that "we can compare social space to a geographic space . . . but this space is constructed in such a way that the closer the agents, groups or institutions which are situated within this space, the more common properties they have, and the more distant, the fewer. Spatial distances – on paper – coincide with social distances" (Bourdieu 1989: 16). The 'social reality' of groups is that

we create physical distance from those whom we feel we are ideologically different. While the downfall of this argument is that Bourdieu places it only in terms of large, vague generalities, this conclusion can be applied to the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan, both of who often “want the races to be separate, and some of these [individuals] would seek to achieve this by creating a separate white nation” (Dobratz & Shanks-Meile 2000: 2). Even if their all-white nation has not come to fruition, adherents to white supremacist ideology associate almost exclusively with other members of the group, even going so far as to only buy weapons from other white nationalists. One discussion board on *Stormfront* complains that “I can’t seem to find a list of gun companies owned by Jews or supporting Israel and I’m sure many others here would hate to support them with their hard earned dollar as well” (“*Know any Jewish owned or supporting firearm companies?*” 2015). This idea of geographical separation from a group of people seen as culturally and ideologically different also underlies Klan ideas concerning ethnic mixing. White nationalism is based on the “need to create a separate nation as a means of defending themselves” (“*White Nationalism FAQ*” 2014)

Bourdieu divides his discussion into two parts: that of social physics, which has already been considered, and that of social phenomenology. The latter analyzes the perceptions and subjective experiences of social actors (Bourdieu 1989). Bourdieu posits that “one may even explain in sociological terms what appears to be a universal property of human experience, namely, the fact that the familiar world tends to be ‘taken for granted,’ perceived as natural” (Bourdieu 1989: 18): here, the familiar becomes accepted as fact, while the alien becomes eschewed as pathological or aberrant, *simply because* the

latter is foreign. Bourdieu develops this idea concerning human thought from geographical space and extrapolates to other individuals or groups (Bourdieu 1989: 19).

Finally, Bourdieu considers the abridgement of the objective world and a group's subjective interpretation of those objectives. He theorizes that

through the distribution of properties, the social world presents itself, objectively, as a symbolic system which is organized according to the logic of difference, or differential distance. Social space tends to function as a symbolic space, a space of lifestyles and status groups characterized by different lifestyles. [Bourdieu 1989: 20]

What must also be considered is that these “differences function as distinctive signs and as signs of distinction, positive or negative, and this happens outside of any intention of distinction, of any conscious search for ‘conspicuous consumption’” (Bourdieu 1989: 20). This means that humans tend to group themselves according to preconceived differences, such as socioeconomic class, or race, and that over time, this grouping is subconscious and perpetuates itself. Ideas of space that at one point may have been consciously constructed now become subconsciously reproduced on end. One can expand upon this discussion to formulate a hypothesis of the white supremacy movement, which depends on group homogeneity. Members come to accept objective truth their vision of white separation and purity as correct: group myth has been transformed into group fact.

One abstract area which had come to be defined as a finite space to be exclusively owned, and subsequently controlled, is religion. Historically, religion has been an element of hegemonic control, one which has been used to justify the physical elimination of the Other from the space of the in-group. This mindset is still present, as

small subsets of the white mainstream continue to assert that their definition of their religion is the sole true one; in doing so, they attempt to claim ownership of the domain. Specifically, Christianity has become a main space of contention. For instance, in December 2013, Fox News' Megyn Kelly contended that Santa and Jesus are both white, would always be white, and that 'he [Santa] is what he is' ("*Megyn Kelly says 'Santa is white' remarks were tongue in cheek*", 2013). Around the same time, highly conservative *Duck Dynasty* star Phil Robertson made waves on mainstream social media and in the news for his comments to *GQ* Magazine, where he spoke at length about his own Christian beliefs, which he believes support the idea that homosexuality is a sin (Magary 2014). Reactions from the white mainstream were mixed, but were largely supportive of Robertson's bluntness; conservative voices were especially laudatory (Magary 2014). What one sees here is that in the Christian religion, certain ideas are accepted as correct and certain ones are considered aberrant and pathological. This belief system is constructed as having finite parameters; those ideas which are correct, or 'true', exist within these boundaries. Following this logic, Christianity can only be possessed by one group, because there is only one correct definition.

Borne from this space is the space of marriage; in the white mainstream, this also exists as a finite paradigm which can be constructed as true, and alternately, as pathological. Though the legalese surrounding marriage has recently been experiencing significant changes, those general attitudes which exist in the white mainstream have yet to see any watershed shift. As recently as 2013, homosexual couples were still being arrested under an "unenforceable law to ensnare men who merely discussed or agreed to

have consensual sex with an undercover agent” (Mustian 2013). Since then, laws have shifted in an effort to allow more inclusive rights for homosexual couples, while the attitudes which initially set those laws in place still remain static in some areas of the United States. Utah had perhaps been one of the strongest opponents of inclusive marriage laws; here, lawmakers and citizens fought to keep same-sex marriage from their state for as long as possible. Last year, “the United States Supreme Court . . . blocked further same-sex marriages there while state officials appeal a decision allowing such unions” (Healy & Liptak 2014). As is the case with conservative Christianity, the idea that certain intimate unions are valid, while others are not, asserts the ‘truth’ of one group’s interpretation of marriage. This means that any constructions that lay outside of these boundaries are considered incorrect. This correctness is then equated with the ownership of the space of marriage. It is worth noting that there is nothing that objectively makes one group’s conception of marriage more correct, but rather, more comfortable for that group or that individual’s history.

Ideas surrounding space also abound in the white power movement. However, these ideas are very similar to those in the white mainstream: both groups speak vocally on the ideas of geographical, spatial boundaries. In information circulated to interested parties, the Ku Klux Klan cites one of their primary goal as support for “laws requiring immediate deportation of all illegal aliens with any appeals to be made from their native land at their expense, not our taxpayers” (“Eastern-Shore White-Patriots”). The goal here is physical space between the in-group and the Other so that this dehumanized Other cannot then harm the good in-group. Additionally, the Skinhead movement hosts yearly

rallies, which “often stress international solidarity, staying bonded . . . and maintaining ‘a racial tribe of tightly knit, like minded brothers and sisters’” (Dobratz & Shanks-Meile 2000: 30). This imagery of ‘tribe’ reinforces the idea that the in-group must remain physically together in order to be safe. Without the rest of that individual’s like-minded group, that person is made to feel vulnerable and open to attack from the Other. Just as in white, mainstream gated communities, there is safety in numbers.

Religion as a space of truth is of much greater concern for the Ku Klux Klan than for the Skinhead movement. The Klan has written its own prayer, which reveals a great deal about its construction of religion as an owned space. The prayer focuses on the imagery of a knight being blessed prior to a dangerous battle:

Let us never forget that each Klansman by his conduct and spirit, determines his own destiny, good or bad. May he forsake the bad and strive for the good. Keep us in the powerful bonds of fraternal union, of Clanish fidelity toward one another and of a devout loyalty to this our great Klan movement. Let us always remember that the crowning glory of a Klansman is to serve his race, his community, his nation and his own high principles. God save our race, help us to be free people and masters of our own destiny. [“Eastern-Shore White-Patriots”]

Thus, the Klan’s brand of Christianity is one of exclusivity. Additionally, blind loyalty is shown to the group. However, what is most important here is the component of servitude to one’s race. Survival of one’s race becomes the moral imperative; one must be willing to sacrifice oneself in order to fulfill this ideal. This group also believes that “rather than being tied to Israelites, Jews are the children of the Devil” (Dobratz & Shanks-Meile 2000: 76). Thus, anything that exists outside of the Klan’s idea of ‘Christian race’ becomes aberrant, and should be destroyed. Religion becomes a space to be owned.

Scott's theory of public and hidden transcripts can also be used to explain Skinhead and Ku Klux Klan ideological intersections with the white mainstream. Both ideologies further support the idea that these groups see themselves as having to fight, for both their space and for their survival. The Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement possess a very distinct public transcript and hidden transcript; these serve as protective narratives and coping mechanisms for these groups, increasing agency for group members and deliberate ignorance by the white mainstream (Dobratz & Shanks-Meile 1997: 1). Group members often develop a public transcript which allows them to be fully-functioning members to the white mainstream, contributing to the national economy through both blue-collar and white-collar jobs (Simi & Futrell 2010: 26). A great many live in houses which are not overtly bedecked in swastikas, with bodies that are not always covered in tattoos depicting hammers or the numbers '88' (representative of the eighth letter of the alphabet; this is an abbreviation for 'Heil Hitler'). They only use visual evidence of their allegiance to the group on special occasions or when they are among other white power enthusiasts (Leyden 2008: 77). This serves to allow these individuals to live in relative peace, with their beliefs undisturbed, as well as to allow them to continue to perpetuate their ideology with only nominal interference from the white mainstream: to exist as a well-integrated citizen means one receives little argument against one's beliefs, on an individual level. However, the hidden, or in this case, private, transcript of white supremacist groups, sheds light on the full scope of their ideology. It is in their hidden transcripts, or private lives, that their true dogma is revealed because it is here that these groups express their genuine feelings about the

Other and the white, mainstream United States. Though most individuals belonging to these groups cannot claim to be part of a subordinate class, they must keep the full extent of their aggressively racist beliefs hidden in order to maintain some level of economic success within the white mainstream, because this success translates into the ability to feed one's family, while still remaining connected to the movement. This is why "Aryan homes are the most private, guarded, and valued of the white power movement's free spaces. Homes offer Aryans control over what they say and do, and they are the spaces where Aryans can close the doors and draw the blinds to hide their subversive acts from those who oppose them" (Simi & Futrell 2010: 19). Thus, in the context of the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement, the public transcript and the hidden transcript overlap only so much that the existence of the former serves to support the ends of the latter, which is seen as much more important: all social life revolves around creating and maintaining acquaintances in the white supremacy movement, while private home life acts as a total reinforcement of the attitudes and tenants of the movements (Leyden 2008: 121; Ezekiel 1999: 5). This construction of space designates very clear boundaries between the public and private spheres, and is also seen in the delineation between the in-group and others.

Finally, ideas of marriage emerge from the same place as those of religion, just as in the case with the white, mainstream United States. The basis of Skinhead and Ku Klux Klan religion is the Christian Identity movement, a belief system which was misappropriated from white, mainstream, Christian ideology and which preaches beliefs founded in hatred of the Other (Dobratz & Shanks-Meile 2000: 73). Specifically, the

Christian Identity movement is “a very conservative interpretation of the Christian Bible. This has led to a hatred of homosexuality and of homosexuals . . . They have taken these beliefs in an extreme direction to justify their hatred of Blacks, Jews, homosexuals and communists” (“*Christian Identity Movement*” 2006). Thus, the language surrounding homosexuality constructs it as a sin and as an offense for which an individual should be aggressively targeted; language herein centers on these types imaginings (Meeink 2009: 85). The Klan and the Skinhead movement believe that the only ‘right’ way to exist in an intimate relationship is heterosexually, with the male playing the dominant role.

In the case of the white power movement and the white mainstream United States, “space” takes on a much more important and complex meanings than simple geographical boundaries. Space becomes a way to exclude the Other. This is done by reifying paradigms and concepts to create a sense of possession over them; two of the most important of these are religion and marriage. Though these manifest differently in the white mainstream and the white supremacy movement, they come from the same fundamental place of exclusion and fear. By making both geographical space and these “spaces” finite and exclusive, these groups make them easier to control and manipulate in various ways that are either correct or pathological.

Chapter 7: Moving Forward

Throughout this thesis, the interconnections between the white supremacy movement and the white, mainstream United States have been explored. Specifically, the goal has been to discover the ways in which the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement appropriate different messages, themes, and paradigms from the white mainstream, then twisting and misusing them in order to create their own dogma. These ideas, as they present in the white mainstream and in the white power movement, start from the same place; variation between the two exists in the level of aggression and exclusivity.

This idea of exclusivity is seen in constructions of the “Other.” Both the white mainstream and the far-right, racist movement target specific groups of individuals based on the interaction of ethnicity, religious affiliation, gender, which creates a unique experience for each cultural actor. These individuals are subject to aggression from the Skinhead movement and the Ku Klux Klan, both of whom seek to remove the Other from their space. In the white mainstream, these Others face nonviolent marginalization, which is seemingly benign, but in many ways has ramifications just as harmful as those that come from the white supremacy movement. Some of those targeted Others are Black individuals, women who exist both in the in-group and outside of the group, and

those who are not considered authentically American. The messages concerning all three Others have dangerously powerful implications, as demonstrated in Chapter Two.

It is also important to define who *does* belong in the in-group; in the case of the white power movement and the white, mainstream United States, belonging is based on who is considered “white.” However, what was posited in Chapter Three is that for an individual to be considered “white” is dependent more on individual personality traits than on the tone of one’s skin. Whiteness is based on socioeconomic class and on gender, among other things. Though ideas concerning race are outdated and incorrect, they have lasting ramifications in the Skinhead movement, the Ku Klux Klan, and the white, mainstream United States. Specifically, if one is considered white, then one is allowed to belong to the in-group, and has a greater number of privileges and a greater amount of agency than those who do not occupy this category. In the case of this categorization, one develops a perception of history, dependent on the history of that group.

A pivotal component of whiteness is whether one can be classified as a “real” man. Like whiteness, one does not earn this label simply through anatomical or genetic assignment, but through certain personality traits. These fall into three categories. First, the “real” man must embrace the paradigm of normative violence that has developed in both the white mainstream and the white supremacy movement. Additionally, a “real” man always identifies as heterosexual; within the confines of his intimate, opposite-sex relationship, he is the dominant partner. He has complete agency, while his spouse is totally voiceless. Finally, this “real” man possesses the characteristics of a hero, and

fulfills a detailed hero narrative. His prime directive is to protect the in-group, even at the expense of his own life. Thus, masculinity becomes something to be owned and manipulated by the group; this is detailed in Chapter 4.

Chapter 5 examines two rather elusive concepts: guilt and blame. The Skinhead movement, the Ku Klux Klan, and the white, mainstream United States must find a way to deal with the blame that may be experienced for their actions, because all three construct the Other in such an exclusive and sometimes aggressive way.

Overwhelmingly, this means that the group places blame on the shoulders of those who they persecute, in an effort to present themselves as the real victims. This use of the victimhood narrative affords those in control of it a certain amount of power; this narrative dictates that it is in self-defense that the victim acts. This allows the in-group to continue to target those outside of the group, and to further develop their ideas.

This thesis also analyzed the concept of space, in the sixth and final chapter. The Ku Klux Klan, Skinhead movement, and white mainstream see space not only as a geographical delineation, but also as the ability to reify certain ideas, in order to create a sense of ownership over them. This sense of ownership creates for these groups a space of power; in possessing an object or concept, there is power. This ownership is only made possible by the assumption that one's conception of that idea, be it marriage or religion or otherwise, is the only correct one.

Underlying all of these concepts is the premise that there is a definitive in-group and an Other. The in-group belongs, and therefore possesses the characteristics of whiteness and masculinity, while the Other is fundamentally flawed and should be

removed from the space of the former because its members do not possess these characteristics. This idea permeates the notion of spaces, in which the in-group's conception of space is absolutely correct, while the Other's conception is aberrant. Finally, if the in-group targets the Other, it is premised on the belief that the Other did something to deserve this attack, or to provoke the attack. While the concept of othering is not unique to the Skinhead movement, the Ku Klux Klan, or the white mainstream United States at large, this thesis demonstrates how in these three contexts, othering has negative impacts. It is important to note that while those examples used concerning othering were isolated incidents, what they represent is that these attitudes regarding exclusivity and aggression are deeply ingrained and firmly entrenched in the rhetoric of these groups. In the white mainstream, small incidents like these occur often with few alarms raised to create any real impact, because these narratives and paradigms concerning whiteness, masculinity, blame, and space go without being questioned.

Future research into the interconnections between the white mainstream and the white supremacy movement might take several interesting directions. The research conducted herein could be expanded more deeply to include more examples of the ways in which all three groups intersect each other. This effort would only serve to strengthen the fundamental premises of this thesis. Additionally, future research might include more themes: perhaps there are other, more complex connections between the Skinhead movement, the Ku Klux Klan, and the white mainstream that could be dissected. The number of themes could continue indefinitely, but for the sake of this thesis, had to be cut short. This has potential for the topic of a dissertation. Finally, a subsequent project

which would examine the interconnections between the Ku Klux Klan, the Skinhead movement, and the white mainstream United States might explore more Others. As is demonstrated in this thesis, white nationalist groups have developed a very exclusive construction of the in-group. However, only three groups which are excluded from that category were explored herein. In order to present the depth of their aggression and exclusion, all of the groups that they consider “Other” should be analyzed.

Because this thesis approaches such heated subject matter, the final question it must ask is: why does this all matter? Why address the connections between the white power movement and the white mainstream? Additionally, should anything be done about these connections? The answers to these questions are not easy to come by. These connections matter because they drive white power groups to continue to develop their own, newer rhetoric, which changes dependent upon white mainstream pressure. For instance, once same-sex marriage came into the forefront of discussion in the white mainstream, the Ku Klux Klan magnified their focus concerning this issue, posting thirteen articles espousing their position regarding homosexuality on their website in the scope of one month (The Knights Party Website). Perhaps one step towards lessening the impact these two far-right extremist groups have on their Black, female, foreign, and homosexual Others is for white, mainstream American rhetoric to be closely examined in terms of how it also conceptualizes these same Others. In this way, perhaps awareness might raise change. It is also important to explore these intersections because this analysis demonstrates how deeply intertwined the messages, ideas, and themes of these groups are. This thesis attempted to demonstrate that the white power interpretation of

these paradigms is simply an aggressive magnification of those of the white mainstream. This means that the way that the Ku Klux Klan and the Skinhead movement interpret them cannot necessarily be viewed as anomalous; to do so diminishes the impact that they have, both past and present.

Bibliography

- Aase, Tor H.
1994 Symbolic Space: Representations of Space in Geography and Anthropology. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 76(1): 51-58.
- American Anthropological Association
1998 Statement on "Race." <http://www.aaanet.org/stmts/raceapp.htm>, accessed on March 1, 2015.
- Anderson, Benedict R. O'G.
2006 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Antrosio, Jason
Whiteness is a Project, Not a Skin Tone (blog). *Living Anthropologically*. <http://www.livinganthropologically.com/2012/05/22/whiteness/>, accessed on February 26, 2015.
- Anthropology on Race – Seizing the Holistic Moment (blog). *Living Anthropologically*. <http://www.livinganthropologically.com/2011/12/03/anthropology-on-race/>, accessed on February 26, 2015.
- Arnett, Dugun
2013 *Nightmare in Maryville: Teens' Sexual Encounter Ignites a Firestorm Against Family*. *The Kansas City Star*. <http://www.kansascity.com/news/special-reports/maryville/article329412/Nightmare-in-Maryville-Teens%E2%80%99-sexual-encounter-ignites-a-firestorm-against-family.html>, accessed on March 6, 2015.
- Barone, Francine
Race and the Public Perception of Anthropology (blog). *Anthropologies: A Collaborative Online Project*. <http://www.anthropologiesproject.org/2013/05/race-and-public-perception-of.html?m=1>, accessed on February 26, 2015.

- Besteman, Catherine, with Hugh Gusterson
 2010 Introduction. *In* *The Insecure American: How We Got Here & What We Should Do About It*. Hugh Gusterson and Catherine Besteman, eds. Pp. 1-23. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Berbrier, Mitch
 2000 The Victim Ideology of White Supremacists and White Separatists in the United States. Theme issue, "White Supremacy and Hate Crimes," *Sociological Focus* 33(2): 175-191.
- 1999 Impression Management for the Thinking Racist: A Case Study of Intellectualization as Stigma Transformation in Contemporary White Supremacist Discourse. *The Sociological Quarterly* 40(3): 411-433.
- Black, Edwin
 2012 *War Against the Weak*. Washington: Dialog Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
 1989 Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory* 7(1): 14-25.
- Burnson, George
 1986 The Black Civil Rights Movement. *OH Magazine of History* 2(1): 35-36, 39-40.
- Bush, Melanie E.L.
 2011 *Everyday Forms of Whiteness: Understanding Race in a "Post-Racial" World*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Campbell Bartoletti, Susan
 2010 *They Called Themselves the KKK: The Birth of an American Terrorist Group*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Carleton, Don E.
 1987 "McCarthyism Was More Than McCarthy": Documenting the Red Scare at the State and Local Level. *The Midwestern Archivist* 12(1): 13-19.
- Carmichael, Callie
 2013 *Anti-Government Extremist Groups Reach Record Levels, Say Experts*. CNN. <http://www.cnn.com/2013/03/05/us/splc-extremist-groups-report/index.html>, accessed on January 18, 2015.

- Chalmers, David J.
 1987 *Hooded Americanism: The History of the Ku Klux Klan*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Christian Research Institute
 1993 *Christian Identity: A Religion for White Racists*. The Nizkor Project. <http://www.nizkor.org/hweb/orgs/american/christian-identity/religion-white-racists.html>, accessed on February 10, 2015.
- Coca-Cola
 2014 Official Coca-Cola “Big Game” Commercial 2014 – America is Beautiful. <http://m.youtube.com/watch?v=443Vy310gJs>, accessed on December 28, 2015.
- Coleman, Daisy
 2013 I’m Daisy Coleman, The Teenager At The Center Of The Maryville Rape Media Firestorm, And This Is What Really Happened. XO Jane. <http://www.xojane.com/it-happened-to-me/daisy-coleman-maryville-rape>, accessed on March 6, 2015.
- Connell, R.W.
 2005 *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
 1993 The Big Picture: Masculinities in Recent World History. Theme issue, “Masculinities,” *Theory and Society* 22(5): 597-623.
- Cornwall, Andrea, with Nancy Lindisfarne
 1994 *Dislocating Masculinity: Gender, Power, and Anthropology*. In *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies*. Andrea Cornwall and Nancy Lindisfarne, eds. Pp. 11-47. London: Routledge.
- Crapanzano, Vincent
 1986 *Waiting: The Whites of South Africa*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Daniels, Jessie
 2009 Irish-Americans, Racism and the Pursuit of Whiteness. *Racism Review*. <http://www.racismreview.com/blog/2009/03/17/irish-americans-racism-whiteness/>, accessed on February 23, 2015.
- Davis, Linsey, with Melissa Lustrin
 2013 Paula Deen’s Cook Alleges Racism, Slurs by Celebrity Chef. ABC News. <http://www.abcnews.go.com/blogs/entertainment/2013/07/paul-deens-cook-alleges-racism-slurs-by-celebrity-chef/>, accessed on November 10, 2014.

Di Leonardo, Micaela

1994 White Ethnicities, Identity Politics, and Baby Bear's Chair. *In Social Text* 41:165-191. Durham: Duke University Press.

Dobratz, Betty A., with Stephanie L. Shanks-Meile

2000 "White Power, White Pride!" The White Separatist Movement in the United States. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Donaldson James, Susan

2012 50 Shades of Grey: Why 'Mommy Porn' Is Hot. ABC News. <http://www.abcnews.go.com/Health/50-shades-grey-women-turned-sexual-submission/story?id=16059118>, accessed on December 12, 2014.

Encyclopaedia Britannica Online

2015 Lewis Henry Morgan. Encyclopaedia Britannica, eds. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/392246/Lewis-Henry-Morgan>, accessed on April 1, 2015.

Ezekiel, Raphael S.

1995 The Racist Mind: Portraits of American Neo-Nazis and Klansmen. New York: Penguin Books.

Fox News

2013 Megyn Kelly Says 'Santa is White' Remarks were Tongue-in-Cheek. <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2013/12/13/megyn-kelly-responds-to-critics-over-santa-is-white-flap>, accessed on October 19, 2014.

Gaffney, Dennis, and Peter Gaffney

2011 The Civil War: Exploring History One Week at a Time (The Seven-Day Scholar). New York: Hyperion.

Galbraith, John Kenneth

2009 The Great Crash 1929. New York: Mariner Books.

Gallup

Religion. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1690/Religion.aspx>, accessed on March 29, 2015.

- Geertz, Clifford
1982 *The Way We Think Now*. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 35(5): 14-34.
- 1968 *Thinking as a Moral Act: Ethical Dimensions of Anthropological Fieldwork in the New States*. *The Antioch Review* 28(2): 139-158.
- Grubin, David
Anti-Semitism in America: The Jewish Americans. PBS.
http://www.pbs.org/jewishamericans/jewish_life/anti-semitism.html, accessed on March 6, 2015.
- Gutmann, Matthew C.
1997 *Trafficking in Men: The Anthropology of Masculinity*. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 385-409.
- Hammerskin Nation
Who We Are . . . Hammerskin Nation website. <http://www.hammerskins.net>, accessed on July 13, 2015.
- Healy, Jack, with Adam Liptak
2014 *Justices' Halt to Gay Marriage Leaves Utah Couples in Limbo*. *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/07/us/justices-block-gay-marriage-in-utah-pending-appeal.html>, accessed on March 9, 2015.
- Herman, Dianne F.
1994 *The Rape Culture*. *In Women: A Feminist Perspective*. Jo Freeman, ed. Pp. 45-53. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Heslip (Rev.)
2010 *Ignore Parents / Promote Homosexuality (?)*. The Knights Party website. http://www.kkk.bz/main/?page_id=610, accessed on January 11, 2015.
- Hunter, Jack
2012 *How Gun Control Kills*. *The American Conservative*.
<http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/how-gun-control-kills/>, accessed on November 22, 2014.
- Kagan, Neil, and Stephen Hyslop
2009 *Atlas of the Civil War: A Complete Guide to the Tactics and Terrain of Battle*. Washington, D.C.: National Geographic.

Kennedy, David M.

1999 *Freedom From Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kimmel, Michael

2013 *Angry White Men: American Masculinity at the End of an Era*. New York: Nation Books.

Knights of the Ku Klux Klan

“Eastern-Shore White-Patriots” informational flyer, obtained from Maryland State Police.

The Knights Party

2010 *Aids is a Racial Disease*. The Knights Party website. Last modified in 2010. http://www.kkk.bz/main/?page_id=744, accessed on August 5, 2014.

2010 *Alien Invasion*. The Knights Party Website. Last modified in 2010. http://www.kkk.bz/main/?page_id=695, accessed on August 5, 2014.

2010 *Anti-Abortion quotes from early Suffragists*. The Knights Party website. <http://www.kkk.bz/femforlife.htm>, accessed on August 5, 2014.

2010 *The Anti-gun Male*. The Knights Party website. Last modified in 2010. http://www.kkk.bz/?page_id=878, accessed on August 5, 2014.

2010 *Does the Klan Hate Negroes?* The Knights Party website. Last modified in 2010. http://www.kkk.bz/main/?page_id=719, accessed on August 5, 2014.

2010 *FAQ*. The Knights Party website. Last modified in 2010. http://www.kkk.bz/?page_id=2896, accessed on August 5, 2014.

2010 *Our Goal*. The Knights Party website. Last modified in 2010. http://www.kkk.bz/main/?page_id=28, accessed on August 5, 2014.

2010 *We Are Not The Enemies Of The Black Man*. The Knights Party website. Last modified in 2010. http://www.kkk.bz/main/?page_id=675, accessed on August 5, 2014.

2010 *Woman to Woman*. The Knights Party website. http://www.kkk.bz/?page_id=818, accessed on August 5, 2014.

- Kokot, Waltraud
 2006 Culture and Space – Anthropological Approaches. Paper presented at the Swiss Graduate Programme in Ethnology/Anthropology, Basel, October 2006.
- Kolhatkar, Sonali
 2014 Studies Confirm the Dehumanization of Black Children and the ‘Preschool-to-Prison Pipeline.’ Common Dreams.
<http://www.commondreams.org/views/2014/04/04/studies-confirm-dehumanization-of-black-children-and-preschool-prison-pipeline>, accessed on January 2, 2015.
- Laban Hinton, Alexander
 2002 The Dark Side of Modernity: Toward an Anthropology of Genocide. *In* Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide. Alexander Laban Hinton, ed. Pp. 1-40. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lancaster, Roger N.
 2003 The Trouble with Nature: Sex and Science in Popular Culture. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Langer, Elinor
 2003 A Hundred Little Hitlers: The Death of a Black Man, the Trial of a White Racist, and the Rise of the Neo-Nazi Movement in America. New York: Picador.
- Leyden, T.J., with M. Bridget Cook
 2008 Skinhead Confessions: From Hate to Hope. Springville: Sweetwater Books.
- Lindisfarne, Nancy
 1994 Variant Masculinities, Variant Virginites: Rethinking ‘Honour and Shame’. *In* Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies. Andrea Cornwall and Nancy Lindisfarne, eds. Pp. 82-96. London: Routledge.
- Linke, Uli
 1999 German Bodies: Race and Representation After Hitler. New York: Routledge.
- Low, Setha M.
 2010 A Nation of Gated Communities. *In* The Insecure American: How We Got Here & What We Should Do About It. Hugh Gusterson and Catherine Besteman, eds. Pp. 27-44. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Lowery, Wesley
2014 *Boehner: Obama, Not GOP House, to Blame for Stalled Immigration Reform Talks*. Washington Post. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2014/04/29/boehner-obama-not-gop-house-to-blame-for-stalled-immigration-reform-talks/>, accessed on February 8, 2015.
- MacEachern, Scott
2011 The Concept of Race in Contemporary Anthropology. *In Race and Ethnicity: The United States and the World*. Raymond Scupin, ed. Pp. 34-57. New York: Prentice Hall.
- MacLean, Nancy
1994 *Behind the Mask of Chivalry: The Making of the Second Ku Klux Klan*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Magary, Drew
2014 *What the Duck?* GQ Magazine, online edition. <http://www.gq.com/entertainment/television/201401/duck-dynasty-phil-robertson?currentPage=1>, accessed on February 8, 2015.
- McCall, Leslie
2005 The Complexity of Intersectionality. *Signs* 30(3): 1771-1800.
- McIntosh, Peggy
1988 White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack. *In White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences Through Work in Women's Studies*.
- Meeink, Frank, with Jody M. Roy
2009 *Autobiography of a Recovering Skinhead: The Frank Meeink Story*. Portland: Hawthorne Books & Literary Arts.
- Messer, Lesley
2013 Paula Deen Used a Slur Because 'She Was Born 60 Years Ago.' *Good Morning America*. <https://gma.yahoo.com/blogs/abc-blogs/paula-deen-used-slur-because-she-born-60-222654280.html>, accessed on November 10, 2014.
- Mustian, Jim, with Ben Wallace
2013 *Gays in Baton Rouge Arrested Under Invalid Sodomy Law*. *The Advocate*. <http://theadvocate.com/news/police/6580728-123/gays-in-baton-rouge-arrested>, accessed on January 15, 2015.

- Nagengast, Carole
2002 Inoculations of Evil in the U.S.-Mexican Border Region: Reflections on the Genocidal Potential of Symbolic Violence. *In Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*. Alexander Laban Hinton, ed. Pp. 325-347. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nash, Jennifer
2008 Re-Thinking Intersectionality. *Feminist Review* 89: 1-15.
- Ortner, Sherry B.
1996 *Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Orum, Anthony M.
1972 *Black Students in Protest: A Study of the Origins of the Black Student Movement*. Urbana: American Sociological Association.
- Pfeil, Fred
1996 *White Guys: Studies in Postmodern Domination & Difference*. London: Verso.
- Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network
2015 Marital Rape. <https://www.rainn.org/public-policy/sexual-assault-issues/marital-rape>, accessed on April 2, 2015.
- Religious Tolerance
2006 Christian Identity Movement. Ontario Consultants on Religious Tolerance. http://www.religioustolerance.org/cr_indent.htm, accessed on August 21, 2014.
- Said, Edward
1977 Orientalism. *The Georgia Review* 31(1): 162-206.
- Scott, James
1990 *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Simi, Pete, with Robert Futrell
2010 *American Swastika: Inside the White Power Movement's Hidden Spaces of Hate*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

- Smith, Geoffrey S.
1992 National Security and Personal Isolation: Sex, Gender, and Disease in the Cold-War United States. *The International History Review* 14(2): 307-337.
- Solaro, Erin
2006 *Women in the Line of Fire: What You Should Know About Women in the Military*. Emeryville: Seal Press.
- Stampler, Laura
2014 *This Is How Many People Watched The Super Bowl*. TIME.
<http://www.time.com/3669/super-bowl-48-ratings/>, accessed on March 18, 2015.
- Stormfront
An Introduction to Stormfront and the Pro-White Movement. Last modified on February 12, 2015. <https://www.stormfront.org/forum/t968576/>, accessed on February 20, 2015.
- Know any Jewish Owned or Supporting Firearm Companies? Last modified on February 13, 2015. <https://www.stormfront.org/forum/t661738/>, accessed on February 20, 2015.
- Questions about Being a “Homemaker”? Last modified on February 2, 2015. <https://www.stormfront.org/forum/t1085019/>, accessed on February 21, 2015.
- Part III: Money, Race, Immigration and Morality. Last modified on May 23, 2013. <https://www.stormfront.org/forum/t968594/>, accessed on February 20, 2015.
- Self Defense, Martial Arts & Preparedness. Last modified on February 18, 2015. <https://www.stormfront.org/forum/f35/>, accessed on February 20, 2015.
- Talk. Last modified on February 18, 2015.
<https://www.stormfront.org/forum/f46/>, accessed on February 21, 2015.
- White Nationalism FAQ. Last modified on November 21, 2014.
<https://www.stormfront.org/forum/t1001939/>, accessed on February 17, 2015.
- Theweleit, Klaus
1987 *Male Fantasies Volume 1: Women, Floods, Bodies, History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Turner, Victor
1975 Symbolic Studies. *In Annual Review of Anthropology* 4: 145-161.

U By Kotex

2010 Buy Me Tampons – Social Experiment. YouTube.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HXz9OcnRBYY>, accessed on April 5, 2015.

Wagner, Margaret E., Gary W. Gallagher, and Paul Finkelman, eds.

2002 The Library of Congress Civil War Desk Reference. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.

Weinberg, Gerhard L.

1994 A World at Arms: A Global History of World War II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wray, Matt

2006 Not Quite White: White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness. Durham: Duke University Press.

Yahr, Emily

2014 *How Many People Watched the 2014 Oscars? 43 Million, the Most in 10 Years*. The Washington Post. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/style-blog/wp/2014/03/03/how-many-people-watched-the-2014-oscars-43-million-the-most-in-10-years/>, accessed on March 18, 2015.

Biography

Caitlyn L. Carr received her Bachelor of Science in Behavioral Science from York College of Pennsylvania in 2010. After finishing her Master of Arts in Anthropology at George Mason University, she went on to accept a position as a teacher with the Institute of Reading Development.