

“Each of us is here now because in one way or another we share a commitment to language and to the power of language, and to the reclaiming of that language which has been made to work against us. In the transformation of silence into language and action, it is vitally necessary for each one of us to establish or examine her function in that transformation and to recognize her role as vital within that transformation.”

- Audre Lorde (43)

Deadly Wounds in the US-Mexico Borderlands:
A Rhetorical Analysis of the Anti-Illegal-Immigration News Media Coverage of the El
Paso Shooting and the Viral Video of the United Constitutional Patriots

Elvia U. Lopez Nava

Social Justice and Equity Studies
Brock University

A thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Faculty of Social Sciences,
Brock University
St. Catharines, Ontario

©Lopez Nava 2022

Dedicación

Para mi papi, me llevaste en tu brazos y ahora me llevas con tu apoyo, si no fuera por tus sacrificios no hubiera hecho esta tesis.

Abstract

This thesis focuses on two key events that took place at the US/Mexican border in 2019 and the anti-illegal-immigration media coverage of those two events: 1) The El Paso Walmart Shooting and 2) the viral video of the United Constitutional Patriots detaining migrants at the US-Mexico border. I explore the discursive practices used to discuss the El Paso shooting and the UCP's actions and connect these practices to anti-immigrant rhetoric that has been ingrained in the public discourse of the U.S. I argue the anti-illegal-immigration news media coverage of the El Paso shooting and the UCP reflect, produce, and embody anti-immigrant rhetoric as well as portray white nationalist behavior under the guise of patriotism. I found 5 figures that emerged from my data used by the anti-illegal-immigration media outlets: the "Illegal alien", the Immigrant Child, the Spectator, the Patriot or the White Nationalist, and the "Monster".

Key Words: "Illegal Alien", Patriotism, White nationalism, El Paso Shooting, and United Constitutional Patriots

Acknowledgements

Words cannot express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Gale Coskan-Johnson for guiding me through my thesis and for her invaluable patience. Not only did she provide me with academic support, but she was also a great source of emotional support. I also could not have undertaken this journey without my committee, Dr. Robyn Bourgeois and Dr. Andrew Pendakis, who have generously provided their knowledge and expertise. Additionally, this endeavor would not have been possible without the substantial support from the chair of SJES program, Dr. Trent Newmeyer. I am truly blessed to have met such kind, generous, and patient people who provided a wide variety of support throughout my thesis process.

Special thanks to my cohort members, Zabrina, Nicky, and Phoebe, for their invaluable feedback, advice, and moral support. Strong friendships are what helped me endure the emotional process of writing this thesis. I am also grateful for my partner, Hayyan, who stood by and helped me endure my thesis and for the late-night feedback sessions. Lastly, I would be remiss in not mentioning my papi, whose sacrifices allowed me to have the privilege to attend a MA program. Additionally, many thanks to my family and my friends, their belief in me has kept my spirits and motivation high during this process. Lastly, I would like to mention my mentors from Fresno State, Dr. Loretta Kensinger, Dr. Katherine Fobear, and Dr. Leece Lee-Oliver, it is because of their push and support during my undergraduate years I was able to advance to a MA program. It is truly because of their encouragement and advice I was able to do this thesis.

Table of Contents

Dedicación	iii
Abstract	iv
Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables:	viii
List of Abbreviations:	viii
Chapter 1: The El Paso Shooting and The United Constitutional Patriots	1
Why El Paso and the UCP?	4
Research Question	5
Chapter 2: Literature review	7
Part 1 – Terminology	7
Border[s]/Borderland	7
La Mestiza y Mestiza Consciousness.....	10
La Facultad.....	11
Colonialism and Epistemic Injustice	12
5 Faces of Oppression	14
Hegemonic Imperialism.....	15
Space and Place.....	16
Latinx	16
Part 2 – Themes	17
Nationalism via US-Mexico Border	17
A History of Militarization	18
Fear and Violence	24
Terrorism.....	28
Nationalism and Patriotism.....	30
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework – A Broken Home.....	33
Chapter 4: Methodology	40
Situating the Personal in the Research.....	45
Methods.....	48
Chapter 5: Results	55
Video 5.....	59
Video 1	59
Video 2.....	61

Video 3.....	62
Video 4.....	64
Video 6.....	66
Video 7.....	67
Video 8.....	68
Video 9.....	69
Video 10.....	71
Video 11.....	73
Video 12.....	74
Video 13.....	75
Video 14.....	76
Video 15.....	76
Video 16.....	79
Video 17.....	81
Crusius Manifesto: The Inconvenient Truth.....	82
Chapter 6: Discussion – The Emergence of the 5 Figures.....	85
The “Illegal Alien”.....	85
The Immigrant Child.....	97
The Spectator.....	101
The Patriot or the White Nationalist?.....	105
The “Monster”.....	117
Contradictions.....	121
At Home in the Borderlands.....	123
Chapter 7: Conclusion – Moving Forward.....	126
Works Cited.....	128
Appendix A: List of Videos.....	138
Appendix B: Coding Sheet.....	141
Appendix C: Visual Aid of Theoretical Framework.....	142

List of Tables:

Table 1: My Video Citations..... 48

Table 2: Key Word Total 55

List of Abbreviations:

JLP: Jesse Lee Peterson

UCP: United Constitutional Patriots

DOJ: Department of Justice

POC: Patriots of the Constitution

ACLU: American Civil Liberties Union

INS: Immigration and Naturalization Service

NSFJ: Niagara Social Justice Forum

Chapter 1: The El Paso Shooting and The United Constitutional Patriots

This project focuses on two key events that took place at the US/Mexican border in 2019 and the anti-illegal-immigration media coverage of those two events: 1) The El Paso Walmart Shooting and 2) the viral video of the United Constitutional Patriots detaining migrants at the US-Mexico border. First, on August 3rd, 2019, in El Paso, Texas, Patrick Crusius drove for about 11 hours from his home in Allen, Texas to El Paso, Texas (Romo). Crusius then went to a Walmart and fired a WASR AK-47 on customers at a Walmart. The attack is alleged to be premeditated; this was evident by Crusius' manifesto called the "Inconvenient Truth" that was posted on an online messaging board called 8chan approximately 20 minutes before the shooting (Lavandera and Hanna). As a result of Crusius' premeditated actions, a total of 23 people died and 26 people were injured. Of those killed, 8 were Mexican citizens, and the rest were of Mexican descendant (Danner; Romo). After about 20 minutes of shooting victims at Walmart, Crusius drove north of the store and stopped at an intersection where a motorcycle police officer was setting up a perimeter. Crusius immediately got out of the car, and surrendered himself to the police officer. No use of force was necessary in arresting Crusius (Maxouris and McLaughlin). The main motivation for the attack is stated in Crusius's manifesto in which he states that the "attack is a response to the Hispanic Invasion of Texas." (1).

According to a U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) press release, Crusius has been charged with "22 counts of hate crimes resulting in death, 23 hate crimes involving an attempt to kill, and 45 counts of discharging a firearm in relation to hate crimes."; in total, Crusius faces 90 counts of indictment charges ("Texas Man Charged"). Crusius has

pleaded not guilty to these charges and awaits his trial on the federal level. The El Paso district attorney's office has stated they are seeking the death penalty for this case (Danner). The DOJ is considering Crusius's actions as an act of domestic terrorism. Although the law on domestic terrorism is defined in US criminal law, there are no penalties subject to it (Allen). Thus, the DOJ will not be charging Crusius with domestic terrorism. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the trial has been delayed twice already (Parker). As of September 13, 2022, the closest possible date for a trial is June 2023 which is at the request of prosecution; however, the defense attorneys are asking for the trial to begin in March 2025 (Villagran). As of this writing, a specific court date for the start of the trial is yet to be set.

The second key event of this project occurred in April of 2019. At this time, a video of the United Constitutional Patriots (UCP) detaining migrants at gunpoint at the New Mexico-Mexico border "went viral." In this viral video, the heavily armed UCP is shown illegally detaining migrants, including many young children and families. The original viral video is almost an hour long and I give a detailed description of this video in the chapter 5. The viral video caused outrage among the public, the left wing organizations, and news media outlets. Meanwhile, the viral video attracted attention from anti-illegal-immigration news media sites which led to more support for the UCP. Due the video going viral, the UCP became well known among news media outlets and organizations like the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). The ACLU wrote a letter addressed to the governor of New Mexico to encourage the state to put a stop to the UCP's illegal detainment of migrants. The viral video by the UCP is only one of the many live streamed videos posted on the group's Facebook page (Simonson). The focus

of my research juxtaposes this event, the viral video, to an exploration of the UCP as an organization as well as exploring what occurred around the time of their video going viral.

According to the Southern Poverty Law Center, the UCP is a “border militia group founded by felon, Larry Hopkins...The group uses conspiracy theories and [former] President Donald Trump’s assertion that immigrants are invading the United States to justify their actions, some of which are illegal, such as detaining migrants at gunpoint.” (“United Constitutional Patriots”). The UCP has claimed they are working alongside border patrol; however, the border patrol has rejected any assertion made about working with the UCP. At the same time, they do not condemn the actions of the UCP (“United Constitutional Patriots”).

The ACLU claims that the UCP is a fascist para-militia organization, and their actions of detaining migrants are illegal (Simonson). The UCP is a militia group composed of civilians who have taken it upon themselves to patrol the New Mexico-Mexico border region. They had a permanent camp in Sunland Park, New Mexico (Shoichet and Paul); however, in 2019, the UCP was kicked out of their encampment in Sunland Park, because they were infringing on the property of the Union Pacific (Borunda). As to where the UCP is currently stationed, it is not precisely known but they may be located somewhere along the southern border of New Mexico (“United Constitutional Patriots”).

The UCP has been known of since 2018, because they collaborated with two other border militia groups: Patriots of the Constitution (POC) and Mountain Minutemen. The UCP and the POC issued a joint press release in which they stated, “The Invaders are

now being trucked to the border. Several thousand [are] expected. We do understand that Trump is deploying troops but, in the meantime, it is imperative that we have boots on the ground” (“United Constitutional Patriots”). This statement speaks to the reasoning behind this group’s motivations for illegally detaining migrants, and makes it clear that the immigrants are considered “invaders” to the UCP, and that they support former President Trump’s views on immigration. Most importantly the statement suggests the UCP feels they must act themselves to do something about the “invaders”. The UCP states their overall motivation for their actions is to “support the Border Patrol and show the public the reality of the border” (qtd. in Shoichet and Paul). The UCP plan on continuing to patrol the border until former US President Donald J. Trump’s wall is built (Shoichet and Paul).

Why El Paso and the UCP?

I chose to examine the El Paso shooting and the UCP, because these two actions are separate acts of violence, yet seem to be instigated by the same anti-immigrant rhetoric. In this project, I am less interested in Crusius’ as an individual and more interested in the ways his actions emerge as a symptom of the anti-illegal-immigrant work of a larger movement. I would argue that the UCP, too, is part of this larger movement, except they have organized themselves differently than Crusius. On a broader level, this research project explores the extent to which Crusius and the UCP’s actions are a result of white nationalist and the anti-illegal-immigration rhetoric that has been ingrained in the public discourse of the U.S.

In a more specific manner, I examine Crusius and the UCP’s actions in juxtaposition with one another, because, as I argue, these two violent actions work

together to promote anti-illegal-immigration rhetoric amongst mainstream and alternative conservative news media video outlets. I choose to examine anti-illegal-immigration news media outlets, because it is through these channels that I find the anti-immigrant rhetoric is fluid in its production and its embodiment. I explore the rhetorical elements in the videos that shape the ideologies that produce this rhetoric. My focus for this thesis is on the material that enters the public sphere not the private communications of the UCP and Crusius. The steps I take to achieve my examination of these two events is discussed in depth in the methods section of this thesis.

Research Question

What discursive practices emerge from the anti-illegal-immigration media outlets to portray the El Paso shootings and the actions of the UCP? In my research, the emergence of the 5 figures used by the anti-illegal-immigration media outlets: the “illegal alien”, the immigrant child, the spectator, the patriot or the white nationalist, and the “monster”. In the discussion section of this thesis, I explore how these discursive practices come to reflect, produce, and embody current anti-immigrant and white nationalist rhetoric in the US.

In the following section, I present a literature review which has been broken up into two parts. The first part discusses the terminology that will be used throughout the thesis and the second part discusses themes found in current scholarly literature. After the literature review, the theoretical framework section follows and it outlines the various key concepts (e.g., borderland theory, mestiza consciousness, relations of ruling, and colonialism) that will be utilized in framing this thesis. Second, the methodology section reviews the three methods that will be implemented (e.g., rhetorical analysis, growing

routes, and methodological homeplace). The third chapter is the results. I cover key words found in the 17 videos used and in Crusius's manifesto. I also include a short synopsis of each video used for data to provide context for the readers. The next chapter is a discussion in which I present the 5 figures that emerged from the data: the "Illegal alien", the Immigrant Child, the Spectator, the Patriot or the White Nationalist, and the "Monster". Lastly, I conclude the thesis with thoughts on how to move forward and the importance of this research.

Chapter 2: Literature review

Part 1 – Terminology

The following literature review is broken up into two parts: 1) terminology and 2) themes found in current research surrounding my topic. In this section, I list and define key concepts/terms used throughout this thesis. I provide these definitions to offer clarity on how these terms are used. First, I borrow from Anzaldúa to frame my research, specifically, with these key terms including border[s]/borderlands, la mestiza y mestiza consciousness, and la facultad. Second, I define various forms of colonialism and by products of colonialism such as colonization (Mohanty), internal/external colonialism (Tuck and Yang), and epistemic injustice (Bhargava). Third, I define the 5 faces of oppression: exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence (Young). Fourth, I define and frame hegemonic imperialism and discuss the importance of this term (Mohanty; Baca). Fifth, I turn to Crawford to differentiate and highlight the importance of space and place. Lastly, I define and highlight the importance of Latinx (Gonzalez).

Border[s]/Borderland

Borders are set up to define the places that are safe and unsafe, to distinguish *us* from *them*. A border is a dividing line, a narrow strip along a steep edge. A borderland is vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residue of an unnatural boundary. (Anzaldúa, 25)

The concept of border[s]/borderlands is foundational to this research because I examine two forms of violence that have been committed along or near the US-Mexico border. Anzaldúa states that the US-Mexico border is not a natural formation, but rather

is a man-made construct. A borderland is created from the “unnatural boundary” and is a “vague” place (Anzaldúa, 25). Borderlands represents a space and place where opposing “elements” mix. These elements can be the emotional residue Anzaldúa refers to in the quote above. It is important to note neither “element” can destroy the other nor take over the other to create “unique and unexpected ways”. I interpret this to be the unique experiences borderlanders come to have (6). Anzaldúa outlines 2 types of inhabitants of the borderlands: 1) “legitimate” inhabitants and 2) transgressors inhabitants. The “legitimate” inhabitants are “those in power, the whites and those who align themselves with whites” and the transgressors are the “aliens—whether they possess documents or not, whether they’re Chicanos, Indians, or Blacks.” (Anzaldúa, 25).

The border is a contested place with a long history of violence. The Spaniards and the Anglos led a movement of genocide and displacement of the Indigenous peoples and, later, Mexican inhabitants of that area (Anzaldúa 25-35). Currently, the border promotes separation and discrimination between “the whites and those that align themselves with whites” and those who are not white and do not align with them (26). The history of conquest that transpired on what is now the US-Mexico border lay the base for Anzaldúa’s borderlands theory.

Anzaldúa’s conceptualization of borders/borderlands began with her geographical position of growing up on the Texas-U.S. Southwest/Mexican border (7). Anzaldúa uses her position as a physical and imagined borderlands person and extends it to theorizing around her multiplicity as a mestiza. Anzaldúa states

In fact, the Borderlands are physically present wherever two or more cultures edge each other, where people of different races occupy the same territory...I have been

straddling that *tejas*-Mexican border, and others, all my life. It's not a comfortable territory to live in, this place of contradictions. Hatred, anger, and exploitation are the prominent features of this landscape. (Anzaldúa, 19).

It is there, Anzaldúa suggests, a third place is formed. The formation of this place is through *la mezcla* and the clashing of two social and political systems (7). Through these mixing and contradictories societies, the residents of this area gain a new type of perspective (Anzaldúa, 7). Anzaldúa argues this perspective provides the residents with an "outside within" status, meaning those who live within a system gain knowledge from it but also maintain knowledge from the perspective of being outside of the system (7). Overall, the borderlands theory allows those that live within the borderlands to examine and theorize around their experiences of being exposed to these contradictory experiences.

Lastly, Anzaldúa contends that the US-Mexico border is "*una herida abierta*," in other words, an "open wound" caused by the two contradictory social systems in place (25). Anzaldúa's use of the word "wound" here is clever because it signifies the borderlands is a location of injury, it is a site of ongoing trauma. The trauma is a result of two conflicting political and cultural systems. Anzaldúa personifies the borderlands by using an "open wound" metaphor which shows the borderlands is a living entity - an entity created out of the "emotional residue" of political and cultural warfare (25). In this way, Anzaldúa reminds us to humanize those that live within the borderlands and their experiences. The "open wound" metaphorizes the continuing acts of violence that occur in the borderlands by the hands of the U.S. and its empowered white citizens; the

“wound” never heals, never closes, thus those in that place are living in a constant state of pain.

For this research, I both examine the rhetoric being used to discuss El Paso and the UCP and consider the effects of this rhetoric on the borderlands and the borderland people. The emergence of the 5 figures, in this research, begin to construct the borderlands in its physical landscape but also in its imagined landscape. For example, the narrative of the 5 figures begin to construct what the borderlands look like and feels like. The physical and imagined landscape of the borderlands blends and shapes to the creation of the 5 figures. The portrait of the imagined borderlands is created by the various people’s rhetoric I examine as well as my own idea of what the borderlands look like. I delve into this portrait deeper in chapter 6.

La Mestiza y Mestiza Consciousness

Anzaldua’s mestiza is a hybrid woman. A woman who is from a bi or tri (or more) cultural background. Through the inevitable mixing of two or more cultures - la mestiza is born. She learns to deal with ambiguity daily because the multiple collectives she belongs to are in a constant state of struggle. Since la mestiza is constantly stepping from one reality and into another, she is torn between multiple realities. The mestiza consciousness is developed because we are in a constant state of contradictions (Anzaldúa,101). Anzaldúa asserts la mestiza can adapt to tolerate ambiguity. She can learn “to be Indian in Mexican culture, to be Mexican from an Anglo point of view.” (Anzaldúa, 101). La mestiza has a pluralistic mode of thinking. She can view things from multiple perspectives. Anzaldúa argues la mestiza has developed ambivalence as a coping

mechanism due to living in multiple realities, thus when a painful event jolts her out of this ambiguity she will face her ambivalence and resolve it (101-102).

Anzaldúa asserts that while living at the border, it becomes clear that social categories are constructed, because there, mestizas hold multiple identities— Mexican, American, Indigenous, Queer etc.— that contradict one another. Essentially, the mestiza consciousness is a collective consciousness created out of a need to hold complex and layered social perspectives, while resisting institutional and material forms of oppression. Mestiza consciousness is a navigation tool that allows la mestiza to navigate multiple identities/beliefs/values that may cause her to face intersecting forms of oppression (Anzaldúa, 102).

La mestiza and mestiza consciousness are important concepts because of its application onto the self—in other words— to myself as the researcher. Mestiza consciousness is a navigational tool that I use to conduct my research and it is a tool that allows me to create a complex analysis of the rhetoric. It is a tool that is not overtly apparent in how I use it, but it is a concept that creates a place for me to understand the multifaceted rhetoric I examine meanwhile still accounting of the self in the analysis.

La Facultad

La facultad is the capacity to see in the surface phenomena the meaning of deeper realities, to see the deep structure below the surface. It is an instant “sensing”, a quick perception arrived at without conscious reasoning. (Anzaldúa, 60)

La facultad is a survival tool likely to develop amongst marginalized people, for example, women, LGBTQ+ folks, people of color, immigrants, and other “outcasts”. It is a survival tool that is born from a painful event[s] that results in the loss of

innocence/safety/easy ignorance. It is a tool we use to keep us out of harm's way. It is a 'sense' that makes a person perceptive to danger in a proximity sense. In other words, a person knows when something or someone dangerous is nearby. Anzaldúa explains that to develop *la facultad* we must lose something, such as our innocence. *La facultad* also works as a 'sense' in the ability to perceive/analyze people, objects, and structures on a deeper level—to see beyond the surface level (Anzaldúa, 60). *La facultad* is another tool I use that further allows me to deepen my understanding of the data along with my own experiences. This concept helps me paint the portrait of the physical and imagined landscape of the borderlands.

Colonialism and Epistemic Injustice

Mohanty applies a discursive definition of colonization, she focuses “on a certain mode of appropriation and codification of scholarship and knowledge about women in the Third World...” (17). In other words, Mohanty's work here is highlighting the colonialist moves made in feminist scholarly work about “third world woman” (17). Mohanty explains one way this was done was by categorizing the “third world women” in “particular analytical categories” that essentially homogenized these women into a singular group, which reinforces a binary structure of power, and strips the women of their “historical and political agency” (39). Mohanty makes note of the varied definitions of colonization from other scholars in doing so recognizes colonization has come to almost consistently mean “a relation of structural domination and a suppression—often violent” of diverse beings (18). Furthermore, Mohanty states colonialism is rooted in institutions and is embedded in the very structure of a society. Mohanty's definition of

colonization is discursive, this approach to colonization is useful in my analysis of the 5 figures and how each plays a different role as an agent and/or product of colonization.

Tuck and Yang define external colonialism as the forced removal/displacement of Indigenous peoples, sovereignty, and commodification of the stolen land/resources/people. The strategies to achieve external colonialism are carried out through military force, creation of borders/ frontiers, and use of the forced removal of land, resources, and people for militaristic purposes (4). Internal colonialism is the “the biopolitical and geopolitical management of people, land, flora, and fauna within the “domestic” borders of the imperial nation” (Tuck and Yang, 4). There are several “modes of control” that reinforce internal colonialism such as “prisons, ghettos, minoritizing, schooling, policing” and strategies that support these forms of control are described as “segregation, divestment, surveillance, and criminalization” (Tuck and Yang, 5).

The application of Tuck and Yang’s definition of internal colonialism reveals certain modes of control and strategies used at the U.S- Mexico border. For example, policing the borders, detention centers as prisons, the minoritizing of migrants, the segregation of people (at the border itself and through detention centers), and the criminalization of undocumented migrants. Tuck and Yang emphasize that external and internal colonialism do not sufficiently describe all forms of colonialism that takes place inside the U.S. borders. This thesis takes up Tuck and Yang’s definition to examine and make sense of the ways colonialism takes different forms and is still in practice at the US-Mexico border.

To further my understanding of colonialism and its effects, I turn to Rajeev Bhargava definition of epistemic injustice. Bhargava states “epistemic injustice is a form

of cultural injustice” that occurs due to colonization (413). To explain further, epistemic injustice is the replacement of a system of cultural beliefs/values with the colonizers set of cultural beliefs/values that ultimately affect the collective and individual’s way of understanding themselves and the world. This terminology is helpful in furthering the understanding of colonization because it provides a detailed insight into one way the process of colonization occurs. Epistemic injustice plays an important role in the colonization process because it replaces one way of thinking with another. In this thesis, I investigate the extent to which the rhetoric being used in anti-illegal-immigration news media outlets contribute to this specific process of colonization.

5 Faces of Oppression

Iris Marion Young defines the five forms of oppression as exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence. According to Young, exploitation is the process of taking a product/outcome of one group’s labor for the benefit of the other group. The group that produces the products gains nothing or very little from performing the labor. The labor is for the sole benefit of another group. Second, marginalization occurs through the deprivation of resources and structural disenfranchisement of certain socially marked groups. The social marking of groups can be based on race, gender, age, ability, sexual, gender orientation, and citizenship status etc. Young associate’s powerlessness with the inability to exercise control over one’s work decisions, the “inhibition in the development of one’s capacities” and being vulnerable to experiencing disrespectful behavior because of one’s social status (Young, 56).

Young's cultural imperialism occurs when a dominant culture imposes their beliefs and ideologies on another culture, thus leaving no room for the other cultures' sets of values/ beliefs.¹ The process of cultural imperialism creates a paradox of invisibilizing a group while also marking them as the "other" (Young, 60). This process occurs by generalizing a culture, whether it be their people and/or their beliefs and reducing them to a stereotype. This is an occurrence that Mohanty has noted in her work as well. Mohanty argues that the feminist scholarly work, has generalized and homogenized "third world" women and their experiences (333-335). Thus, through this act of generalizing, they are invisibilizing "third world" women's diverse experiences and contributing to cultural imperialism. Although violence is an obvious form of oppression, it is necessary to recognize that "violence is a social practice" (Young, 62). It is systematic because it creates social and structural conditions that allow the continuation of violence towards a socially marked group (Young, 62).

Hegemonic Imperialism

In the context of the modern-day U.S., "Contemporary imperialism is... hegemonic imperialism" (Abdel-Malek qtd in Mohanty, 335). Abdel-Malek states that hegemonic imperialism is justified violence that has been taken to the next level, meaning it includes physical violence but also psychological violence in that it "attempts to control hearts and minds." (335). There are various modes of control contemporary imperialism uses; for example, it includes the military, the dominant culture, the economy, the

¹ Of course, whether Young's cultural imperialism is accurate is debatable especially since cultural imperialism does not look the same for every group that experiences imperialism or colonialism. For example, in Canada and the U.S., there are many Indigenous nations/tribes/cultures that have resisted complete eradication and their people/cultures continue to live on (e.g., First Nations, Inuit, Metis, Blackfeet, Ojibwe etc.).

laws/policies, and the benefits of scientific/ technological development. Overall, hegemonic imperialism is a necessary process to understand, in the context of examining how the 5 figures come to play into this form of hegemonic imperialism.

Space and Place

Space and place are important terms to consider for this research because I examine a physical space (i.e., El Paso and New Mexico border) and an “imagined” place (i.e., the US-Mexico border region). I define space and place utilizing Gupta and Ferguson’s definition: “‘space’ refers to a “physical” and “material” location while place refers to “remembered and/or imagined locations” (as cited in Crawford, 75). This is useful to note because throughout the thesis I make these distinctions between space and place, specifically regarding borderlands in the physical sense but also in the remembered or imagined sense.

Latinx

In my attempts to be gender inclusive, I use Latinx when referring to a large group of people of Latin American descent. The ‘x’ in Latinx is used as a gender inclusive version as opposed to Latino/a which indicates man or woman. The ‘x’ is used as a form of resistance to the automatic default usage of the masculine in Spanish. The history behind the ‘x’ began during the 90’s and possibly even as far back as the 70’s (Gonzalez, “Most People”). According to David Bowles, "Radical feminists in the 90s (and perhaps as early as the 70s) would sometimes on posters and in graffiti would literally "x" out the "o" at the end of words that were meant to include men, women, and non-binary folk all together." (as qtd in Gonzalez, “Most People”).

Part 2 – Themes

My preliminary research has identified four main themes in the literature related to the US-Mexico border. I divided these themes into four related and sometimes overlapping categories: nationalism via U.S.-Mexico border (Nevins, 13-77; Anzaldúa, 6-113); militarization (Nevins, 13-77; Ewing, 198-222; Correa-Cabrera and Garrett, 243-255); fear and violence (Nevins, 13-77; Ewing, 198-222; Sabo et al. 66-74; Correa-Cabrera and Garret, 243-255); and terrorism (Blackbourn et. al, 183-190; Cabrera and Glavac, 673-695). Note that some scholars will appear across categories because many of the themes overlap.

Nationalism via US-Mexico Border

In this sub-section, I go over a brief history of the construction of the US-Mexico border and how nationalism was established through the border. Nevins explains that before the border was established, the U.S. government used despotic power to gain authority in the border region (16). As Nevins quotes Mann, despotic power is defined as “the range of actions which the elite is empowered to undertake without routine, institutionalized negotiation with civil society groups.” (16). Nevins explains that through this process the elite established their own policies in that region. This action is labelled as infrastructural power. Nevins explains the U.S. uses despotic power to establish infrastructural power to forcibly pacify the territory (that Mexico once claimed) that is now the U.S.-Mexico border (16).

An example of Nevins’ description of the process of despotic power and institutionalized power is shown in Anzaldúa’s work. Anzaldúa observes the actions of the Anglos that illegally migrated into Texas (when it was a part of Mexico) and took

violent measures to drive away the Mexicans that resided in Texas (28). These actions ultimately led to warfare between the U.S. and Mexico, eventually resulting in the U.S. annexing Texas and other Mexican territories (Anzaldúa, 28-29). This is one piece of the long history that leads to the pacification of the border. The process of pacification has occurred through multiple venues such as the militarization of the border. These processes are discussed in later sections. Nevins notes that pacification of the border was overall a success, however, it failed in its ability to control the flow of unauthorized people and goods from crossing (30). Despite this, the establishment of the border launched U.S. nationalism.

A History of Militarization

A reoccurring theme found in scholarship that examines U.S.-Mexico border history is the U.S. states' various attempts at pacifying the region (Ewing, 198; Nevins 13-30). In its attempts to pacify the border in conjunction with rising anti-immigrant sentiment after WWI, the Eisenhower administration created Operation Wetback in 1954 (Nevins, 51). The circumstances that led to the implementation of Operation Wetback was the perception of an image that there was "crisis" of unauthorized immigration occurring. Nevins explains there was multiple events that led to this perception. One important contributing event to this perception was the economic recession that assisted immigration restrictionist sentiment. Nevins asserts "A variety of federal government officials and national politicians, along with a complaint media, helped construct the perception of a crisis and to stoke public fears." (51).

After Operation Wetback was implemented a rise in apprehensions and deportations of migrants were made, INS reported, one million migrants were

apprehended in 1954 (28). To combat the rise in deportations of unauthorized immigrants, the US developed the Bracero program, “a contract labor program”, in doing so they kept agriculture interests in mind (Nevins, 27). However, it was found that the program did not reduce unauthorized immigration rather it led a greater control over migrant labor. One reason unauthorized immigration was not reduced was due to the farmer’s preference for hiring “illegal” immigrants over those in the Bracero program because it was less expensive and it created a successful agricultural economy (Nevins, 29; Mitchell, 564). Mitchell states the Bracero program was both the creator and regulator of “a constant oversupply of labor”; this means that contracted labor and undocumented labor were both necessary components to create this pool of labor (569).

Since the growing numbers remained unaffected, conservative politicians and state officials began to argue that “illegal” immigrants lead to unstable economies, specifically in the agriculture sector. Ironically, Mitchell argues the “illegality” of the migrants is exactly what made it possible for the California agricultural economy to be successful (570). The over surplus of labor by migrants who are undocumented are necessary for the agriculture economy because it keeps the migrants powerless and the agriculture economy booming (Mitchell, 570). However, this was not relevant at the time and in 1951 report of the President’s Commission on Migratory Labor confirmed the belief that “illegal” immigrants were bad for the economy. The report linked unauthorized immigration with low wages, threats to public health, social services, crime, and other social issues. As conservative officials used the report to argue for stricter immigration enforcement, the pressure on the Eisenhower administration grew. Thus, President Eisenhower announced the commencement of the operation (Nevins, 28-30).

Again ironically, Mitchell, argues that migrants posed minimal burden on social services and other resources in California (i.e., hospitals, healthcare, education, shelter etc.) because most of “labor power is reproduced elsewhere” such as in the migrant’s homelands (569).

The operation was led by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) in 1954. It was a massive capture of “Wetbacks”². These apprehensions took place in the border states, and as a result over one million migrants were apprehended by the INS (Nevins, 28). This operation is of significance because as Nevins states, it “increase[d] state and grower [i.e., farmers] control over migrant labor.” (28).

Operation Blockade, later renamed Hold-the-Line, was implemented in 1993 in El Paso (Nevins, 74). This operation was later used as the inspiration for Operation Gatekeeper. Operation Blockade’s main purpose was the establishment of “prevention through deterrence”, which was a set of policies implemented to prevent unauthorized crossings at the border (Ewing, 200). The strategy of “prevention through deterrence” evolved into various other prevention strategies, but the main goal of the strategies was always to deter unauthorized immigration (Ewing, 200). One manner by which the INS implemented this strategy was through the construction of a physical divide, the border fence. Ewing argues the border fence is one method used to achieve the strategy of “prevention through deterrence” (200). Other methods were also used to implement the strategy: the number of border patrol officers increased as well as the technologies used such as cameras, radars, helicopters, etc. The fence itself did present as imposing, but it

² “Wetback” is a slur used for Mexicans who crossed the border by swimming across the Rio Grande. When the migrants arrived on the other side of the river, they were wet or *mojado/a*; thus, people began referring to them as “wetbacks” (Gerber).

was not an effective deterrent as people found ways to bypass the fence or simply go through it. Instead, this strategy led to more deaths of migrants in the deserts and mountains as they were forced to cross through dangerous paths (Ewing, 205).

This increase in death is not only a result of “prevention through deterrence” but is part of dead labor that is an essential part of the agricultural economy. It is connected to an energy flow that operates through and at the Holtville cemetery in California (Mitchell, 561). The death and injury of migrants are necessary because “farmers rely on a constant over supply of labor” and dead labor, a horrific type of regulation of labor, is necessary for labor to be reproduced and replaced (Mitchell, 568). This system keeps migrants powerless and continues a successful reproduction of agriculture (Mitchell, 569).

Nevins notes that Operation Blockade was a drastic change from the border patrol’s previous strategies of apprehending unauthorized immigrants that had already entered the U.S. (74). Operation Blockade, as a new strategy, was about showing force through manpower and use of new technologies that come off as imposing to deter unauthorized crossings. Regardless of the reasons for emplacing a new operation, Ewing argues the strategy used in this operation was not successful because the “unauthorized immigration population doubled in size”, it went from “3.5 million in 1990 to 11.7 million in 2012” (198, 212).

Contrary to Ewing, Nevins states “prevention through deterrence” strategy had a “significant effect” in deterring unauthorized crossings at the El Paso border, and this was found through the drop in numbers of apprehensions made by the border patrol (74). Ewing observes the border patrol is quick to take credit for this drop in numbers,

however, he considers that “the greatest drop in apprehensions” at the border took place during an “economic downturn” in late 2007 (212). Regardless of the strategy being effective or not, the “annual budget of the Border Patrol has increased ten-fold, from \$363 million in FY 1993 to \$3.5 billion in FY 2013” (200). Ewing argues that despite the federal government pouring billions of dollars into the border patrol budget, they have not been successful through their use of “enforcement-only policies” (212). The US-Mexico border remains to be porous despite the heavy militarization and enforcement type of policies at the border (Mitchell, 569; Ewing, 212)

The political context in which Operation Gatekeeper emerged played a decisive role in its implementation. Operation Blockade laid the intellectual groundwork and “political inspiration” for Operation Gatekeeper (Nevins, 50). In the political arena, Operation Blockade was used to fuel conservative arguments supporting immigration enforcement. During the Clinton administration, the stance on immigration was to fight unauthorized immigration with state sanctioned immigration. In other words, the solution was to combat unauthorized immigration with legal immigration (Nevins, 75). Despite the Clinton’s administration efforts on immigration enforcement, the Republicans attacked their policies. In California, during this time, the state proposed a ballot called Proposition 187, which denied “public education (from elementary to postsecondary levels), social services, and health care services (with the exception of emergencies) to unauthorized immigrants.” (Nevins, 75-76). For the Clinton administration to demonstrate their seriousness on immigration enforcement, they implemented Operation Gatekeeper.

Nevins asserts that Operation Gatekeeper was a border enforcement strategy but also a representation of the political and social views during that time (50). In 1994, Operation Gatekeeper was implemented by the INS. In their employment of the operation, they demonstrated political power that endorses a boundary at the border and an increase in immigration enforcement (Nevins, 50). Nevins states that Operation Gatekeeper symbolizes the US expansion of powers and an attempt at pacifying the border (51).

The militarization of the border is an occurrence that has progressed over the years primarily through the state. The border patrol and law enforcement in the local communities have been affected by the militarization of the border. In its attempts to pacify the US-Mexico border, the border patrol implemented tactics such as imposing permanent and random checkpoints (Casteñeda and Melo, 84-85), ethno-racial profiling, and implementing several forms of militarization at the border beginning with the establishment of nationalism by defining the US-Mexico border (Ewing, 198; Nevins, 13-30). Over the years, the state has implemented operations such as Operation Wetback, Operation Blockade, and then Operation Gatekeeper to establish control over the region. In the next paragraph, I briefly outline the discussion that occurs in the following two sections.

Borderland scholars have demonstrated that there are two types of fear occurring in the U.S. First, there is the white fear of the “other” and the fear experienced by the Latinx population and immigrants (Nevins, 13-77; Cabrera and Glavac, 673-695; Correa-Cabrera & Garrett, 243-255; Ewing, 198-222; Larsen, 14-16). The fear experienced by immigrants and Latinx communities is at the hands of the American state, its law

enforcement, and empowered citizens (i.e., border militias or similar groups/people). Although both sides are experiencing different forms of fear, only one of these groups experience systematic violence: the immigrants and Latinx communities (Sabo et al., 2014). Furthering this narrative of violence, domestic terrorism committed by US far-right extremist groups is found to be linked to the anti-immigrant rhetoric that has been legitimized and promoted by political actors (Taylor, 227; Cabrera and Glavac, 674; Larsen, 14).

Fear and Violence

In the current literature, scholars break down the connection between fear and violence in relation to the fear experienced by white citizens and the fear experienced by immigrants and Latinx folks (Correa-Cabrera and Garrett, 245-249; Nevins, 79; Sabo et al., 69). Correa-Cabrera and Garrett contend that conservative state officials exaggerate the number of dangerous criminals entering the U.S. through unauthorized crossings. Moreover, the conservative officials use the media to promote and create fear around immigration (245). Correa-Cabrera and Garrett argue that “dark times” rhetoric is being used to promote fear and construct a misperception of national security causing there to be rampant violence at the border. Importantly, the “dark times” rhetoric they refer to juxtaposes the perception of fear surrounding terrorist attacks by extremist Muslim groups and the drug war in Mexico (245).

Correa-Cabrera and Garrett finds numerous media reports and state officials’ rhetoric to be either exaggerated or inaccurate when discussing Mexico’s drug violence. Thusly, they promote the “rhetoric of fear” (245-246). U.S. politicians have been using this rhetoric to promote stricter immigration policies and a more militarized border.

According to these U.S. politicians, the drug violence is out of control and is a threat to U.S. national security. Correa-Cabrera and Garrett assert that due to this ‘fear’ the U.S. has implemented security measures to secure the border (245-256). The first measure was an increase in border patrol agents, the second measure was the creation of the border fence, and the third measure is reinforcing the current laws around unauthorized immigration (Correa-Cabrera and Garrett 248; Ewing 203-208; Nevins, 248). In recent years, the U.S. government has added more money in the border security budget; in the year 2013, the budget was set at 11.9 billion (Nevins, 248; Ewing 209).

The fear of the “alien” is not a recent phenomenon and has roots in the establishment of the country. Just as there are current conservative politicians pushing fear rhetoric, similar tactics have been used in the past. For example, as stated previously, the 1951 report of the Presidents Commission on Migratory Labor linked unauthorized immigration with low wages, threats to public health and social services, and to crime and other social issues (Nevins, 28). Furthermore, during the Ford administration in 1976, President Ford blamed the economic recession on unauthorized immigrants, stating they are interfering with the economic prosperity of America (Nevins, 52).

Another example is William Saxbe, the U.S. attorney general under the Ford administration, who claimed that unauthorized immigrants were bringing crime, taking jobs, and taking advantage of welfare services. Saxbe argued for the deportation of “illegal aliens”, the majority of which, according to him, were Mexicans. The INS Commissioner, Chapman, added fuel to the flames by falsely reporting that “unauthorized migrants were producers of poverty, crime, and joblessness (among U.S. citizens)” (Nevins, 52). Commissioner Chapman claimed that if they were to deport the “illegals”

than one million jobs would open for U.S. citizens. This is a false statement. A report by the Bush administration tackles the myth of immigrants taking American jobs. The report debunked this myth by explaining that the jobs immigrants and American citizens take typically complement one another. American citizens typically do not work the same type a job an immigrant would (Denhart, 119). Nevertheless, the media promoted anti-immigrant rhetoric while the politicians mobilized ‘dark days’ rhetoric and further spurred support for conservative policies for immigration (Correa-Cabrera and Garrett, 247).

In fact, the fears the Latinx population experiences is not by the “other”, but by government sanctioned anti-immigration organizations and/or practices. According to Sabo et al., those that live in the border communities experience highly militarized environments wherein they are subjected to ethno-racial profiling and mistreatment from immigration law enforcement (69). Sabo et al. assert that “approximately 25% of respondents described an immigration-related mistreatment episode, of which 62% were personally victimized. Nearly 75% of episodes occurred in a community location rather than at a US port of entry.” (69). The study conducted aimed to uncover the pervasiveness of the militarization of the border region as well as the enforcement immigration policy experienced by the Mexican residents of the Arizona border area (Sabo et al., 66). The argument made is that everyday violence experienced by the Mexican residents is a direct result of structural racism (Sabo et al., 66). Furthermore, the border region is an area where the state can openly use violence against oppressed groups, in this case, Mexican immigrants and people of Mexican descendant. The everyday violence experienced by Latinx immigrants varies from physical, verbal, and

emotional violence from immigration officials. Sabo et al. found about 90% of their participants report daily sightings of immigration officials in neighborhoods, worksites, and stores. The violence occurred at the border's port of entry and in the community (69). It was concluded that the militarization experienced by the Latinx border communities is a form of power in place that is meant to oppress and pacify the region with military like tactics (Sabo et al., 72-73).

Correa-Cabrera and Garrett examine the connection between fear and the promotion of conservative policies on immigration, and they argue that this information shows a connection between the exploitation of fear and violent acts of terrorism (250). Various advocates (i.e., elected politicians, elements of the news media, security-industry) the tool of fear to support their actions of violence and abuses committed against border crossers and people who appear Latinx (Correa-Cabrera and Garrett, 250). In their national rhetoric of anti-immigration, the United States exaggerates stories of violence at the border to create fear among the citizens of the US. However, violence at the border is less likely to be committed by immigrants than by the state itself. In this thesis, I align myself with scholarship that argues that political rhetoric perpetuates this fear which instigates violence by the citizens thus allowing for citizens to come in arms to protect their beloved USA, examples of this include the El Paso shootings and the UCP. Violence has been used by the state to promote fear among immigrants for many years. Sabo et al. argue persuasively that border officials and police promote fear and violence through their tactics in the borderland communities of Arizona (66). Nevins reaffirms this by entailing the long U.S. history of violence to pacify the region and promote nationalism and anti-immigrant rhetoric (51).

Terrorism

As the previous section has discussed, fear and violence have been mobilized by the US state to gain pacification, and this section discusses right wing terrorism by U.S. citizens. Blackbourn et al., provides a preliminary definition of far-right terrorism as people who hold “apocalyptic world views in which grievances are focused on outgroups and scapegoats (often racial or religious minorities and migrants). This world view is accompanied by a sense that such groups must be violently attacked or eliminated if the in-group is to survive” (184-185). Blackbourn et al. asserts far-right extremism has a focus on both domestic and international issues contrary to beliefs that it is domestic in nature (185). An example of this is the El Paso shooter, who was shown to have supported the Christchurch Mosque shootings that were perpetrated in New Zealand by a White Supremacist (Crusius, 1).

Crusius fits into the definition of far-right terrorism, because in his manifesto, he fears the end of the white race and connects it to “the great replacement”, a conspiracy theory by a French writer, Renaud Camus. To put it briefly, the great replacement theory is a warning about the white Europeans being replaced with people of color. It is a theory that stresses the act of replacing whites with something that is not purely white (Charlton; “Great Replacement Theory”). A solution for this “replacement” as well as Crusius’ environmentalism (he claims people and companies in the US are depleting the Earth of its resources), is to kill as many people as possible. Crusius states that he chose Latinx people because he read the *Great Replacement*. In addition to Crusius fitting into the far-right terrorism definition provided by Blackbourn et al., Crusius fits the domestic terrorism definition as well. As I previously state in the introduction of this proposal, the

DOJ considers the Crusius' case as domestic terrorism, but they are not charging him with domestic terrorism, because the domestic terrorism law does not have penalties subject to it (Allen).

Taylor claims that the application of domestic terrorism is ambiguous in the court system which causes a double standard to occur, ultimately affecting the portrayal of domestic terrorists in the media (237-238). Taylor found that in the legal realm, terrorists that held Islamic views were far more likely than white terrorists to be deemed dangerous (238). White domestic terrorists were not charged with domestic terrorism, rather their acts were charged as hate crimes or other charges that warranted fewer years in prison. The terrorists that held Islamic views were automatically charged with domestic terrorism. The double standard found within the court system can be seen translated to the media in terms of its portrayal of terrorism (Taylor, 238-239). Taylor's findings provide insight into both the court system and the media's ambiguous usage of far-right extremism as terrorism (239).

Larsen examines the links between the U.S. anti-immigrant movement and organized extremists (14). Larsen argues that anti-immigrant sentiment is supported by anti-immigrant organizations, such as the Federation for American Immigration Reform and Center for Immigration Studies (14). These organizations are increasingly growing because they are receiving millions in funds and validation by conservative politicians. Larsen notes these organizations have connections to hate groups and argues that anti-immigrant organizations are largely accepted, because they are not seen as extremists (15). The organizations are run by people wearing suits, portraying themselves in a legitimate manner rather than with guns and paramilitary clothing. Thus, the words and

actions by the anti-immigrant organizations are legitimized and normalized, conveniently aligning with the views of white nationalists.

Cabrera and Glavac assert the urgency to examine the beliefs of paramilitary groups such as the Minutemen, and their influence on the public views on immigration policy (675). Cabrera and Glavac surveyed the Minutemen, a voluntary border patrol group, immigrant right activist groups, and the general public that reside at the Arizona border (677). Their survey results highlight a large difference in views about immigration policy between the two groups and the similarities found with the public. The public showed a tendency to have views that aligned with the immigration rights activist rather than the Minutemen group (Cabrera and Glavac, 680-681).

Nationalism and Patriotism

Nationalism is inherently geographical as it employs a geographic basis to argue for the unity of the nation and to distinguish the members of the nation and from nonmembers. As such, nationalism is fundamentally about identity and the relation of a particular “people” or “nation” to a defined territory. (Nevins, 157).

Nationalism is a concept akin to other forms of ideas (i.e., kinship, religion, liberalism, and fascism) that promotes unity among a people using a geographical location as its basis, in other words, nationalism is “imagined” or created and emplaced on a land where a nation does not exist (Anderson, 5-7; Nevins, 155). Nevins states nationalism is a concept based on geographical ties to a bounded territory that promotes exclusionary practices of who is a part of that territory and who is not. Furthermore, a key component to nationalism is the relationship between people’s identities to the bounded territory (157).

Anderson states the nation “is an imagined political community and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (6). According to Nevins, “Nationalism is a struggle over the definition of spatial boundaries, that is, over the control of a particular land or soil.” (157); furthermore, nationalism both creates and draws on social/spatial boundaries. These boundaries define who is in and who is not. Nationalism builds from this exclusivity and inequities. Nevins explain these social boundaries are a “inevitable part of the process of establishing and giving identity to a social phenomenon. Social actors employ symbolism and boundary production to define membership.” (157). This is once again working to define the members from non-members, the national and the foreigner or alien. Nevins argues that nationalism is a kind of “political religion” that creates an inextricable link between members of the nation and those outside of it (i.e., the national and the alien). In other words, you cannot have one without the other and because of this nationalism both creates and needs boundaries (157). Nevins states nationalism promotes unity (the nationals) and difference (the alien) at the same time. Nevins argues that Operation Gatekeeper is an example of the US creating difference and strengthening the US-Mexico boundary by emphasizing the legal status of immigrants (158).

Anderson adds that the nation is sovereign because this concept emerged from the age of Enlightenment and revolution which shattered the notion that the “divinely ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm” is inherent (7). Nevins echo’s Anderson and adds that sovereignty soon became associated with the nation and not the ruler. Furthermore, “the nation is imagined as limited” because it is finite in nature because beyond the boundaries of one nation is another nation (Anderson, 7). Anderson notes nationalists do

not typically wish all other races join their nation, so the world becomes one large nation (7). Nevins continues this thought process by adding that nationalists in fact require their nation to have boundaries to rule that territory (155). Anderson imagines the nation as a community because it is the comradeship that is felt deeply and horizontally across the community (7). Anderson states the nation is “imagined as a community” and there is a strong sense of “horizontal comradeship...it is this fraternity that makes it possible...for millions of people, not so much to kill, as willing to die for such limited imaginings” (7). The notion of “willing to die” can be understood in terms of people joining the military and taking up arms for their “imagined community”, essentially it is built in their sense of national pride (7). I explore this comradeship in this section not in the sense of US citizens are willing to *die* for their country but rather are willing to *act* for their country (e.g., UCP detaining migrants and Crusius shooting Hispanics at Walmart).

Anderson states nationality, nation-ness, and nationalism are “cultural artefacts of a particular kind”. These cultural artefacts are produced through historical struggles and have become a normalized idea to the point people have emotional attachments to it, hence patriotism (4). Nevins adds to Anderson’s point on boundaries that boundaries are sites of violence meaning the boundaries created have not been done through a “consensual processes (154).

The boundaries of a modern nation state are where the state’s ability to exert power ends (of course this understanding does not include neo imperialism the US and other colonial powers enact on). Thus, the state’s power and citizen’s rights are theoretically limited to the geographical boundaries they are in (Nevins, 154). In the following chapter, I outline my theoretical framework.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework – A Broken Home

When I began conceptualizing the theoretical framework for this MA thesis, the image of a home appeared in my mind. I am not sure why the image or the construction of a home came to mind, but as Davies says, “The concept of a home is pervasive” (Davies, 154-155). When the image of the home came to my mind, it appeared crystal clear.

I view this theoretical framework similarly to the way an architect would view an existing home. The architect would obtain the blueprints of the home to understand its structure. In this case, I am the architect that examines the build of the home to understand what systems are in place that create an environment for the UCP and the El Paso shooting to occur. Additionally, I move beyond the role of an architect into the role of an observer. I examine who are the residents of the ‘broken home’ (i.e., the five figures: the “illegal alien”, the immigrant child, the spectator, the “patriot or the white nationalist”, and the “monster”) and the conditions of the home that create a thriving environment for the 5 figures to exist. To borrow from Anzaldúa, I refer to the 5 figures in this chapter as *los atravesados*, Anzaldúa defines *los atravesados* as the “prohibited and forbidden” inhabitants of the borderlands, they are the “squint-eyed, the perverse, the queer, the troublesome, the mongrel, the mulato, the half-breed, the half dead” (25). The 5 figures fit in well with Anzaldúa definition of *los atravesados*; the figures themselves are a rag tag group who get along with one another and support one another in their own ways. As the architect and the observer, the concepts I use to examine the house and *los atravesados* are the following: borderland theory, mestiza consciousness, and relations of ruling. In this chapter, I first explain and argue for viewing the theoretical framework as a

“broken” home and what the “home” symbolizes. Second, I discuss the theoretical tools I use and how they are useful for this research.

Why the metaphor of the home?

The “home” as a metaphor is useful for creating an understanding of how several systems in place are complicit in, add to, and support the violence at the border. For example, the 5 figures that emerged from the data appear to find themselves “at home” in this broken space. It is useful to examine it as a “home” because those residing in the metaphorical home are the rhetorical 5 figures. The home creates a place in which the 5 figures can thrive. The house is situated in the metaphorical and physical space of the borderlands and the US-Mexico border. First, the base of the house represents the borderlands and the US-Mexico border, it being the site at which violence occurs in an environment propagated by the US. The roof of the house is the El Paso shooting and the existence/actions of the UCP. This is the roof of the house because it is the unifying structure that houses and provides safety for the 5 figures. The systems in place that create the underlying structures of the house allows for the existence of the 5 figures. The structures upholding the roof and the home are: nationalism, terrorism, colonialism, fear/violence, and militarism.⁵

The metaphor of a house is particularly interesting because not only it is a form of political imagery, in the way I use it, but it also creates a place for me to enter as the self, the self being one who has emerged from this material space but who finds herself feeling not at home in the metaphorical place. Davies states the “Home is an evocative and fluid concept” (154). Due to the fluidity of home as a concept, I use the idea of a “broken

⁵ See Appendix C for visual aid of house.

home” to examine the *los atravesados* who thrive in a home whose structures are colonialism, US nationalism, white supremacy, white domestic terrorism, and fear/violence. The pervasiveness of the nation as the home was echoed in the rhetoric by the UCP, Fox News, and JLP. The political context of how home is used in this research switches depending on the one using it. The home is a place where negotiations are made, and dialogues occur (Davies, 160). Davies continues describing the home as:

A home can be ‘provisional or in flux’ and ‘permeable and unstable’. Understood in this light, the home is a process constitutive of an attachment to place and people, but not simply a defined or stable dwelling or location. For this reason, Alison Weir has argued that we can productively use the value of home in a public or political context if we maintain an awareness of what others have called the dialogic or agonistic nature or political connections. (160)

In constructing a metaphor for the “broken home”, I do not idealize the home as a space of security. Instead, I view it as a “broken home” in which violence occurs because it is a space where there is no real sense of safety. It is a home that has been historically constructed through the centuries by Spanish, British, and American exploits. In doing this, I do recognize it is not possible to neatly categorize the institutional powers or the centuries of violence used to maintain and create these systems of violence at play here nor do I try to. Davies examines the concept of the home and its complexity as a normative and psychological metaphor in political spheres and portray its multidimensionality (154). Instead, I grapple with the complexity of how various forms of violence converge with the 5 figures found in the data. I use the “broken home”

concept to unpack this convergence and understand the discursive practices used in the portrayal of the El Paso shooting and the actions of the UCP.

Theoretical Tools

I borrow from Anzaldúa's understanding of borders in that they are constructed/human made, much like a house (19). The US-Mexico border was constructed with economic and political motivations in mind. This human-made construction of the border is important to note because at the border, the U.S. participates in nationalism as a nation-building project (Nevins, 30). The borderlands is the place and the position from which I enter this research; therefore, Anzaldúa's understanding of borders is a vital component in the way I approached my data. Borderlands theory is a crucial aspect of my theoretical framework because it allows me to, first, understand how violence can erupt in these spaces and why it continues to occur. Anzaldúa sees the border as an "open wound" (25). If the border is an "open wound" and it is a site of conflict because it is a location in which two or more cultures clash (Anzaldúa, 19), then it makes sense that the same site would produce eruptions of hatred and fear/violence. The El Paso shooting and the actions of the UCP appear to be products of the clash of cultures and ideologies and so participate in the long-established legacy of violence at the border. The borderlands are hurting due to the continual violence in that place. Anzaldúa's "open wound" essentially has never healed thus it is always experiencing pain. It is through this "open wound" that the 5 figures come to exist.

Mestiza ⁶consciousness is the second theoretical concept that I use to help frame this research. Mestiza consciousness provides me with a navigational tool to use complex and layered perspectives while examining and resisting structural forms of oppression, some of which I have already listed above (Anzaldúa, 102). This theoretical tool helps me unpack the complex and layered perspectives found in the anti-immigrant rhetoric produced by the anti-illegal-immigration news media outlets while still managing my own perspectives. In addition, this tool provides room for me to discuss the self as the observer. As I said above, mestiza conscious allows for the holding of multiple perspectives at once, and this also includes using the self and bringing in my personal experiences into the thesis. I use my personal experiences of living in the borderlands and directly dealing with the US immigration system as well as white nationalists, in conjunction with the research, in order to provide a unique perspective of borderland violence. Including self referential work into the thesis, I provide a transparency that allows for the reader to grasp an understanding of why I do this research and the value it adds to it. It makes clear to the reader my personal investment in the research.

I turn to Mohanty's use of Smith's concept of 'relations of ruling' as a framework to help understand the intersecting themes and structures found in the data collection and in the build of the "broken home". Mohanty's concept of relations of ruling "foregrounds forms of knowledge and organized practices and institutions, as well as questions of consciousness and agency." (56). This conceptualization allows for an examination of

⁶ There is an important debate over the word Mestiza/o because it has been used historically in Mexico to erase the racial identity of Indigenous and Black people that reside in Mexico (Lua). I take this debate into consideration personally, but it is not something I have space for to discuss in this thesis unfortunately. I am aware of this word has been used in problematic ways in Mexico, but I find that Anzaldúa's use of the term is separate from the use debated in this conversation.

both the intersecting power structures and the various forms of ruling (i.e., government, law, business, financial management, educational institutes). Through Mohanty's understanding of Smith's "relations of ruling", this conceptualization allows me to identify the relations between the historical and contemporary forms of border violence, immigration policies, border policies, racism, xenophobia, white supremacy, capitalism, and imperialism. This frame is useful in furthering my understanding of how various structures of power integrate with each other and create an environment for the existence of the 5 figures that reside in this broken home.

As I have established above, I view the El Paso shootings and the UCP as the roof of the house. I have identified key structures (e.g., nationalism, militarism, colonialism, terrorism, and fear/violence) that uphold the xenophobia-driven violence at the border. Relations of ruling allows me to view how these structures intersect. Militarism is tied to colonialism, because to have colonialism you need some sort of militaristic action to have "successful" colonization (Tuck and Yang, 4). Second, domestic terrorism has been perpetuated by both the U.S. state and by white supremacists. White domestic terrorism stems from far-right extremism such as white supremacy which produces fear and violence, specifically amongst Black folks, Latinx folks, and immigrants (Blackbourn et al., 184; Correa-Cabrera and Garrett, 245; Sabo et al., 51). Fear and violence are both powerful themes underlying this project; thus, relations of ruling allow me to break down those connections and discover the ways in which they are utilized.

Colonialism is the last key concept to this project, and to understand how colonialism constructs and reinforces the border is important for the basis of this research. For the theoretical concept of colonialism, I use both Mohanty's and Tuck and

Yang's definition. Mohanty's application of colonialism uses a discursive definition; Mohanty states colonialism is rooted in institutions and is embedded in the very structure of society. Mohanty writes colonization is a "relation of structural domination" (18). Meanwhile Tuck and Yang's definition of external and internal colonialism contributes to a more detailed understanding of how colonialism operates at the US-Mexico border. My literature review has established the ways in which colonialism has contributed to supporting white supremacist/nationalist rhetoric. The application of the concept of colonialism applies to my research through the militaristic patrolling of the southern border by the UCP and Crusius shooting at the Walmart in El Paso. Furthermore, the narrative of "securing the border" through a border wall and more border agents/other forms of border security is to put it simply white claims to land and the perceived right to control access to the land.

In this thesis, I examine the El Paso shooting and the actions of the UCP by recognizing that they are both results of the long ingrained anti-immigrant sentiment and the white supremacist ideologies on which the U.S. state is founded. Each of the key concepts used in my literature review have presented the various ways in which this is so. The key theoretical concepts I utilize in this theoretical framework help contribute and further my understanding of the 5 figures that arose from the data. It has been clearly established in the literature that sites of borderlands violence are the results of anti-immigrant and white supremacist rhetoric (Anzaldúa, 28-29; Nevins, 13-23; Ewing, 198-222; Larsen, 14-16), thus this thesis examines how, specifically, anti-immigrant and white supremacist rhetoric is used as a tool of imaginative community building amongst anti-illegal-immigrant visual news media outlets.

Chapter 4: Methodology

For this project, I employ a mixed-methods approach that mobilizes to both structurally academic and creative methods. I first define rhetorical analysis and my reasoning for choosing this to be the main method. Additionally, I discuss my plan to include a reflexive statement in the methodology in my thesis. After my explanation of how I use my reflexive statement, I discuss the differing forms of rhetorical analysis that is used which include “growing routes” (Crawford, 76) and “methodological homeplace” (Calafell, 105). Lastly, I conclude by explaining how all three methods work together and are necessary for this research.

My methodology employs rhetorical analysis, growing routes, and methodological homeplace. First, the question of what rhetorical analysis is, in the context of this project, must be answered.

[Rhetoric is] that disciplinary art that imprecisely tracks the making of social imaginaries, including their histories, possible futures, and connections to material conditions; it assumes that individual thoughts and feelings, no matter how idiosyncratic, precipitate out of a social imaginary linked to specific material conditions. It would seem, then, that rhetoric is concerned with collective consciousness, its constituent parts and how they change over time. (Cintron, 51)

In short, Cintron states the field of rhetoric is about the tracking of “social imaginaries” and how they arise out of “material conditions”, no matter how odd or eccentric individual thoughts are. In the context of my research, for example, I track and string together what has been said about the El Paso shooting and the UCP. Jesse Lee Peterson (JLP) promotes the UCP as doing good work with detaining migrants because his opinion

is that the US is being “invaded” and overrun with Latinx migrants; in this sense these are JLP’s individual thoughts. Therefore, JLP’s idea of an invasion occurring at the border is connected to the “social imaginary”, the imagery JLP engages in is of the “illegal alien”. This is an example of how I use rhetoric to track the “social imaginaries” created from the rhetoric of the videos I examine. The connection to the “material conditions” in this case are the El Paso Shooting and the UCP. The “social imaginaries” that I investigate, and piece together are constituted by the 5 figures.

Joan Leach states that rhetoric is an investigative process between the representation of the text and the audience. The purpose of rhetorical analysis is to unpack discourse and inquire about its persuasiveness (3). Leach states one important rhetorical perspective to consider is “the power of language and discourse to fundamentally structure our thinking, our systems of representation, and even our perception of the natural world.” (3). I have chosen rhetorical analysis because this method is most effective for examining conservative language on xenophobia and the “social imaginaries” created. Rhetorical analysis understands that language and discourse influence the way we view the world and others in it. It allows for the examination of how discourse is constructed and is sensitive to the histories underlying this construction. I examine anti-illegal-immigration news media rhetoric on the El Paso shootings and the actions of the UCP; therefore, the media’s construction of these two events allows me to examine the ways in which xenophobic discourse is spread and comes to be known as true.

I include a reflexive statement in my methodology because self-reflexivity is a constant throughout this thesis and is inherent in the methodology I employ. I incorporate

creative modes of writing in my reflexive statement, because, as a form of transparency, it allows the reader further insight into me as the researcher and as a person affected by xenophobic actions. Additionally, it provides a visible shift between the academic and the personal. I include the reflexive statement here because it is a crucial aspect of my research. This is so because many of the theoretical concepts and methods I use acknowledge that knowledge production is not solely based on scholarship, but also rises from personal life experiences (Calafell, 105; Crawford, 76). The usage of Crawford's "growing routes" and Calafell's methodological homeplace provides a place where I can use my own life experiences with white nationalism and the US government to help shape my analysis. The knowledge I have gathered due to my life experiences was my main motivation for conducting this research, thus the knowledge I gained is vital to my thesis.

In addition to using rhetorical analysis as a method, I mobilize two innovative conceptualizations of rhetoric. First, Ilene Whitney Crawford's use of rhetoric is "the study and practice of movement, rather than the study of how language achieves its effects i.e. persuasion." (76). Crawford creates a concept called growing routes:

"Growing Routes" describes a mode of feminist rhetorical practice and constructs and accounts for our root in the world and our routes through the world over time. "Root" and "Routes" are homonyms where I grew up: "growing routes" invokes both, treating both roots and routes as complex compositions of physical, emotional, and intellectual movement. (Crawford, 76)

'Growing routes' is a method that allows for self-reflexivity through movement which is crucial for this research because I examine my movement geographically and

spiritually. In this research, I physically and metaphorically enter the borderlands. My research is constructed in this landscape. My research is situated in the borderlands because of my examination of the physical violence that took place there and it is a metaphorically contested site in terms of political and cultural values clashing.

Bernadette Calafell creates a methodology called methodological homeplace, in which she connects ‘theory of the flesh’ while engaging in rhetorical criticism, critical ethnography, and autobiographical performance. Theory of the flesh, a theory created by Moraga and Anzaldúa, refers to a place where one’s own identities (e.g., homelands, skin color, sexuality) can be examined. It helps make sense of and connect all our contradicting identities. Theories of the flesh is a tool for survival. It allows us to understand that knowledge production is not necessarily delegated to academics, but knowledge production can also come from our flesh and the experiences one has been through (Calafell, 105). Calafell, Alcoff and Mohanty explain that “Identities are markers for history, social location, and positionalities. They are always subject to an individual’s interpretation of their meaningfulness and salience in her or his own life, and thus, their political implications are not transparent or fixed (6).” (105). I use Calafell’s creation of a methodological homeplace by including theories of the flesh into my own methodology. Calafell uses the theory of the flesh because she recognizes that her work and identity are connected. Through her methodological homeplace, she creates a place that allows her to theorize around her personal experiences while engaging in rhetorical criticism, critical ethnography, and autobiographical performance. This is useful for me, because I include personal experiences and discussing my identity in relation to the

research I am conducting. This is the primary reason I have included Calafell's use of methodological homeplace.

Rhetorical analysis, growing routes, and methodological homeplace are methods that compliment and support one another by filling in the gaps each one has. Rhetorical analysis is the main method for this research; it provides me with the understanding that rhetoric constructs our perception of reality and is involved with the tracking of "social imaginaries". Meanwhile, growing routes play into the idea that our realities are constructed and that our movement, whether it be geographically or spiritually plays into this construction of our reality. Lastly, methodological homeplace provides the understanding that our experiences and identities produce valid knowledge that is necessary for this scholarly work. Both, growing routes and methodological homeplace also allow space for self-reflexivity which as I mentioned before is a crucial aspect to this research project. All three methods create circular understanding that rhetoric and knowledge production is constant and circular.

Lastly, through this research, I challenge the notion that complete objectivity results in 'reliable' research. I argue that the inclusion of my personal experiences is a strength to this research. The methodology section includes ways I can include my personal experience as a form of knowledge making that I believe can lead to a unique perspective. The tone I use throughout thesis is mostly angry and sarcastic. I chose anger and sarcasm as a form of self preservation. I use it as a performance and the tone I use exemplifies the effect the text has on me. In this way, I am performing defiance against the harmful and heavy rhetoric found in the data at the same time I validate my anger and the effects of listening to hurtful rhetoric. As a scholar, I am not allowing my personal

experiences to overwhelm my research, but I am both stepping in and out of my personal experiences to provide a holistic analysis. To keep myself accountable, I practice self-reflexivity throughout the research process. I attempt transparency throughout for readers to understand my perspective.

Situating the Personal in the Research

Ay, qué dolor

Qué dolor que le da

En el alma

Ay, qué dolor

Porque no la miran

Me llaman la malquerida

Algunos me han maltratado

Otros sin mirar mis ojos

Mis palabras silenciaron

— *Natalia Lafourcade “La Malquerida”*⁷

⁷ Natalia Lafourcade is a Mexican singer.

English translation of the song La Malquerida by Natalia Lafourcade:

Oh, the pain

The pain it brings you

In your soul, oh, the pain

Because they don't look at her

They call me the unloved

Some have mistreated me

Others without looking me in the eyes

Silenced my words

This research project came about because of my personal experiences and my need to understand why these violent events like those described in this research continue at the US-Mexico border. My encounter with white nationalists in Canada has forced me to revisit my relationship with white supremacy in the United States. White supremacy has never been a topic or issue I handled directly, nevertheless, the actions of white supremacists have always left an impact on me and on racialized people/immigrants. For this reason, my own positionality in relation to my topic is crucial to my methodology, because it compels me to include an autoethnographic component to this research.

During my first year of my MA program, I was jarred out of my ambivalence. It happened on several occasions throughout multiple times similar to Anzaldúa's description of the *mestiza*. I went from living in ambiguity to abruptly facing the subconscious pain that laid within me. My ignorance had blinded me to the impact that the anti-immigrant and anti-Mexican sentiment in the U.S. had on me.

The events that jolted me to the pain, began during the preparations for my workshop for the NSJF. During this process, I came across immigration trauma as a topic of study. Initially, I had assumed it had to do with some sort of violent transgression that had been committed against a migrant, however, I did not realize until further reading that it was not just about a violent transgression, but it also included a systematic and institutionalized act committed. In that moment in time, I realized I had experienced this trauma.

The February 1st, the day of the NSJF arrived, and little did my colleague and I know that we were in for quite a surprise. I was made aware after my workshop that two white nationalists attended the workshop and secretly live-streamed it, without consent, to

a white nationalist website. The incident left me feeling violated, forcing me to re-evaluate my choice of research topic. I find myself profoundly moved and deeply connected with my current research topic. But my story begins before my encounter with the white nationalists:

I was forced to dislike the mother country that birthed me. For the first two years of my life, I was fed and clothed in the native produce of my motherland. Once brought to my adoptive mother country, I failed to see how the food she fed me left my appetite unsatiated. My new mother taught me to forget the culture that I grew from. She trained me to cut-off the lingering roots from my feet. For 20 years, I was forced to bleed and spill the Mexican blood within me and replace it with the glorious red, white, and blue blood.

I was born in Mexico City and lived there until the age of two. My father then decided to move us to Fresno, California where I was raised. Although the move was a major and life altering decision, I subconsciously reduced it to an inconsequential factor in my life. However, I realize now, as an adult, the decision to move greatly impacted me. The action of immigrating defined who I was under the eyes of the government, and it defined how I grew to perceive myself.

I have chosen the US-Mexico border as my site of geographical analysis because that is where my story in the U.S. begins. Under U.S. law, at a young age, I crossed the border without proper documentations. In effect, I was criminalized because according to Section 1325 (a) of Title 8 in the U.S. Code, passed in 1929, it is a crime for noncitizens to cross the U.S. Border by improper entry of “time or place; avoidance of examination or inspection; misrepresentation and concealment of facts” (8 U.S.C. § 1325 (a), 1996). Of course, in my young age, I was unaware of the impact this had on me; it was not until my adulthood I was able to fully process what effect this form of criminalization had on me. This early experience of criminalization at the border marks my indoctrination into a border regime that finds it acceptable or normal to strip a child of their rights and

innocence. Due to my intimate relationship with the border, I believe I have a perspective that can enhance my analysis of the data and provide a unique perspective.

Methods

To reiterate, I chose to examine mainstream and alternative conservative news media outlets, because it is through these channels that I find the strongest form of anti-immigrant rhetoric. I explore the rhetorical elements in the videos that shape the ideologies that produce this rhetoric. The steps I took to gather and organize my data are detailed below. But first, I explain how I do my intext citations for the videos in my results and discussion chapters. The video intext citations I created do not adhere to the MLA rule on intext citations for videos because it would detract from how I discuss each video and cause possible confusion. Second, when I refer to Crusius's manifesto I do not intext cite Crusius because I do not want to call anymore attention than I already do to his manifesto. I only use his name to signify what he has said in the manifesto.

Table 1: My Video Citations

UCP CS1	Video 1
UCP CS2	Video 2
UCP CS3	Video 3
UCP CS4	Video 4 (a & b)
UCP CS5	Video 5
UCP CS6	Video 6

United Constitutional Patriots = UCP
El Paso = EP
Viral Video = VV
Coding Sheet = CS

EP CS1	Video 7
EP CS2	Video 8
EP CS3	Video 9
EP CS4	Video 10
EP CS5	Video 11
EP CS6	Video 12
EP CS7	Video 13
EP CS8	Video 14

VV CS 1	Video 15
VV CS 2	Video 16
VV CS 3	Video 17

The above charts have been created as a guide for myself and for the readers to understand how I cite the videos I watched for the data. In the short right column, I define the acronyms you find in the long-left hand columns. In the left columns, I numerically ordered all the coding sheets for the purpose of easy citing for the results and discussion portion of the thesis. In the results and discussion section when I refer to a certain video, I refer to them numerically; for example, I might say “In video 2, JLP says ...”. I do this because it saves me from having to repeat the name of the video repeatedly. Furthermore, a few videos are titled the same or similarly so to not cause confusion the intext citations are number based. I have separated my data into three different sets. The first is the UCP videos (1-6), the El Paso videos (7-14) and the viral videos (15-17).

First, I gathered background information on the UCP itself, such as information on the founding members and leaders of the militia group. The purpose of the group and the activities they undertake. I investigated this information, which was discussed in the introduction of this thesis.

For the El Paso shooting, I gathered videos posted from Aug. 3rd, 2019 (the day the shooting took place) to the end of August 2019. The reason is because most of the news videos on the El Paso shooting were posted in August 2019. As for the timeline for the UCP, the videos that I have gathered are from April 2019. I have chosen to focus my attention on the videos posted in April because that is when the UCP gained media attention because of the viral video.

The platforms I use to watch the videos include YouTube, Fox News, and BitChute. I use YouTube because of its wide variety of content posted, and it is where I found a large portion of my videos. The channels from which I view these videos are Fox News, Atomic News, the United Constitutional Patriots Radio, and C-SPAN. I have also used two videos from the Fox News website itself. I chose to examine Fox News videos because it is a well-known main-stream conservative news channel. Fox News, I believe, plays a huge part in the public's perception of events, and it is necessary to know what kind of rhetoric they are using to discuss El Paso and the UCP. I have chosen to use BitChute because it is an alternative far right video hosting platform much like YouTube, but specifically for individuals with far-right views. BitChute was created for the purpose of giving an uncensored platform to people who hold far-right views, because other platforms like YouTube censor them. BitChute is a small platform. It does not have nearly as many views as YouTube, but it is growing in its viewership (Binder).

The channels I examine that are from alternative/independent conservative news platforms are the Jesse Lee Peterson Show (BitChute), Atomic News (YouTube), United Constitutional Patriots Radio (YouTube), and the Next News Network (BitChute). I use the Atomic News channel because they reposted the live streams of the UCP detaining migrants at the border. The original live streams were posted on the UCP Facebook page but were later taken down. I assume it was done after one of their live stream videos went viral.

The United Constitutional Patriots Radio is a live streamed radio where they inform listeners of the activities the UCP are doing at the border. They give updates on how many migrants they are apprehending and the locations of their apprehensions.

Additionally, they ask for monetary support from viewers as well as other kinds of resources such as volunteers. I chose to examine these live radio sessions because it is an alternative form of news video from the subject itself. This radio takes me directly to the core of the militia's ideas, beliefs, motivations, and goals. I explore how other news channels examine the UCP's actions in comparison to how the UCP views themselves in it. It discusses the differences and similarities of how the UCP both takes the role as being the subject discussed and at the same time playing as an active agent in that same conversation.

The JLP Show is a rather interesting YouTube channel. For one, they do radio but also post their live radio sessions as videos on BitChute and YouTube. The title of the channel is named after the host. JLP is hosted by a Black American man in which he covers general world events much like a news channel would. In the show, there is a segment called the Hake Report which is done by a white man named James Hake. The Hake Report covers world/national news events that JLP covers later in the show. JLP takes callers during the live radio session. JLP discusses with the callers on a question that either JLP has posed or just anything the caller wants to discuss. The show at times has religious undertones. This element is discussed more thoroughly in the discussion chapter of this thesis.

The reason I chose JLP show was because he is a Black American man that engages in the anti-illegal-immigrant rhetoric and transphobic/ homophobic/ Islamophobic/ xenophobic rhetoric. JLP seems to cater to audiences that seem to be from the far-right political spectrum. The counterintuitive identity politics at work here are interesting he a Black man engages in anti-immigrant rhetoric and even criticizes Black

on White crimes. JLP appears to contradict himself however he really is just disrupting imaginaries about race and politics that appear to be fixed. The examination of this radio show is challenging my own sense of beliefs on who perpetuates anti-illegal-immigrant rhetoric.

Under appendix A, I list the videos I gathered for examination for the UCP and El Paso. I include information such as the name of video, the website, and the channel I retrieved the videos from as well as hyperlinks to all 17 videos in case any reader wishes to watch the videos themselves. I do warn to readers to take caution before watching any video because some of the content can be difficult to watch--especially the live stream videos by the UCP.

Below the appendix A is appendix B and it displays the coding sheet I created to assist me in the data collection process. The first three sub-sections within the coding sheet are “the link/name of video”, a “descriptive summary of video”, and “number of people in the video as well as the race and gender of the people in the video”. The purpose of these three subsections is to provide me a base understanding of who is engaging in these conversations and to serve as a quick reminder of the information in that video, so I did not have to constantly go back watch the whole video.

Originally the “key phrases used” sub-section purpose was to understand what key words/phrases are used to describe the occurrence (i.e., El Paso and UCP) and the anti-immigrant/white supremacist rhetoric used to discuss the topic at hand. I created a key phrase box with some possible key phrases with letters of the alphabets attached to them; this box is below the coding sheet. I did this with the intention of saving time when gathered my data. In the coding sheet, I included an example of how I would have listed

out the phrases that have attached letters (ex: a-b+e). Using this is kind of word chain system was intended to make it easier to remember the key rhetoric used and what key phrases are being used together. However, this is the one section my coding sheet that did not end up working for me. When I began collecting data, I realized the word chain system was not working for me so instead I just began to quote what was being said because I realized I needed context in conjunction with the key phrases being used. Thus, that sub section ended up becoming a sort of transcription for what was said. I did not transcribe everything said in the videos but rather only the key parts I needed for my data. This new adaption of my coding sheet resulted in not using the key phrase box.

The subsection called “supportive, objective, or anti” is to get a quick understanding of what stance the news video is taking on the UCP and Crusius. This is important to know because as the examiner, I need to understand from where the news video is coming. The sub-section “how are they making logical sense of the occurrence?” is a question that intends to examine how they are making sense of the topic. The next sub-section is congruent with one before it, “reasons to blame (who/what/why)”; this section asks what reasons are being used to assign blame for the occurrence. For example, who are they blaming for the El Paso shooting, what are they blaming it on, and why are they blaming a particular set of reasons. I found this section to be particularly useful, because later when I was reviewing my data I easily able to identify what the UCP and the news media reporters were blaming the certain event on.

The subsection “what side conversations they engage in” asks what conversations besides discussing Crusius or UCP are they engaged in conjunction with it. I found this important to examine as well because much of the conversation and rhetoric they use in

these conversations influence one another. For example, some of the videos discuss the Dayton shooting in conjunction with the El Paso shootings. Lastly, the sub-section “personal thoughts” is included because I think it is important to be aware and transparent of my personal feelings when examining the videos. I found this a useful space to vent my thoughts and form connections when I was collecting the data. Also, this is a step that allows me into enter the borderlands with the information or the imagined landscape.

The methodology chapter showed the various methods I use to tackle the data and why rhetorical analysis takes the forefront for this thesis. The following chapter details the coverage of the UCP’s viral video and actions at the border and coverage of the El Paso shooting in the anti-illegal-immigration news media. I briefly summarize what occurs in each video to give context for the chapter 6.

Chapter 5: Results

In this chapter, I account the ways in which reporters of the anti-illegal-immigration visual news media have discussed the UCP's viral video and actions at the border as well as the El Paso shooting. Additionally, I examine the rhetoric used in Crusius's manifesto "The Inconvenient Truth". The key words I identify in these texts are used to construct the "illegal alien" include the following: "illegal aliens"; "illegal immigration"; "illegals"; "invaders" "invasion"; "invaded"; "capture"; "caught"; "illegally"; "fugitives"; and "freeloaders". The key words listed not only construct the figure of the "illegal alien" but also play a role in constructing other figures such as the immigrant child, the spectator, "the patriot or the white nationalist", and the "monster". The construction of these figures appears in the data through the rhetoric of the news media, the UCP, and Crusius. I delve into the specifics of these figures in the following chapter. Below, I have listed a chart of the total number of each key word used in the data. In the following paragraph, I discuss how the key words function as descriptor words, meaning they are describing a person and/or an action by identifying their grammatical role as a noun, verb, adverb, and adjective. Furthermore, I examine how the key words are used overall in the data.

Table 2: Key Word Total

Illegally:	1
Fugitives:	1
Freeloaders:	1
Capture/Caught:	4
Invaders, invasion, invaded:	7
Illegal immigration:	8
Illegals:	8
Illegal aliens:	16

The key words I identified are used to describe the immigrants in their actions, but also how the spectators view the immigrants themselves also how they treat them.

“Illegally” is used as an adverb meaning “illegally” is used to describe an action. In the context of this research, the action of crossing a border is done not in a “legal” manner.

“Fugitives” and “freeloaders” are both nouns. Since a noun, put simply, is a person, place, or thing, this means a person has become an inextricably criminal for “fugitives”.

“Freeloader” does not assume criminality; however, it does present a person negatively and only negatively because the person becomes one with the label, there is no separation between the two. “Fugitives” and “freeloaders” are nouns used to link the migrants to the label thus the migrant is seen only as a “fugitive” and a “freeloader”.

“Capture” can be both a verb and a noun depending how it is used. I found that “capture” is used in both ways; firstly, as a verb, it is action of taking someone by force and secondly “capture” as a noun is when a person is the “capture”. The UCP specifically spoke of “capturing” their soon to be captures (the migrants) at the border. “Caught” is a verb and is the action word used by the UCP to describe how they detained the migrants.

“Invaders, invasion, and invaded” are similar in concept, however, each word plays a different role. “Invader” is a noun and inextricably links the person to an action. The person becomes nothing more than an “invader”; this is how the migrant is portrayed. “Invasion” is another noun, but it is not a person it is a concept. A concept in which the movement of migrants crossing the US-Mexico border is associated negatively and is provocative. “Invaded” is a verb because it is an action. The action of migrants crossing or “invading” the US-Mexico border.

“Illegal immigration” is an adjective and a noun, the “illegal” is the adjective and “immigration” is the noun. The adjective is describing the noun, a movement, so the migrants moving across a border is deemed “illegal”. “Illegals” is a noun, and this again is inextricably linking a person to their status of an undocumented migrant. “Illegal aliens” is a noun, the role here is that a person becomes an “illegal alien” when living or crossing the US-Mexico border. The category of the “illegal alien” is what the migrant fully encompasses (against the will of the migrant) leaving behind any semblance of a ‘regular’ identity behind and is the most common way unauthorized migrants are referred to in the data.

Overall, I found each key word contributes a different role in producing figures like the “illegal alien”, the immigrant child, the spectator, and “the patriot or the white nationalist”. For example, “illegally”, “fugitives”, “freeloaders”, “invader”, “illegals”, “capture”, and “caught” each are telling of how the speaker views unauthorized immigrants by presenting them in negative manner. “Illegals”, “illegally”, and “fugitives” have etymological links to criminality, these words produce the figure of the “Illegal Alien”. Meanwhile “freeloaders” suggests a negative connotation, but it does not automatically assume a criminal person. “Freeloader” falls more along the line of a parasite or scrounger simply someone that wants to only take and not give back. Despite not assuming any criminality, the freeloader is used to produce the “illegal alien” who is not only a criminal but abuses the good will of the US government and American people.

The words “illegals” and “illegal immigration” these two words were used in different manners. “Illegals” is used to tie a person to their “illegal status”. In doing this, the person ceases to be a person with complex experiences, and rather is transformed into

a designated category, one that is based on socioeconomic and political mobility.

Meanwhile “illegal immigration” refers to a whole movement and not one person. It is more descriptive of the kind of immigration that is taking place, which is an unauthorized one.

“Invaders”, “invasion”, and “invaded” are provocative words. They illicit a certain response the response can vary depending on one’s political beliefs people. The UCP used these kinds of words often in their radio show and live streamed videos. I found the UCP uses these words to describe their realities in narrating and constructing their realities at the border to the public they begin to position themselves in the figure of the patriot. The patriot is typically white and likes to position their work as good and necessary for the sake of protecting their version of America.

Lastly, “caught” and “capture” are two words used by the UCP to describe how they detained the migrants. These two words both position the UCP in a superior position along with criminalizing the migrants at the same time and it evokes the language of policing. The migrants are forced into an inferior position because they are “caught” or “captured” by another because the migrants are seen as “illegally” crossing into the US. These two words contribute to the production of the “illegal alien”, the “illegals” need to be “captured” because of their “illegality”.

For the following part, I give brief summaries of what occurred in each video to give a general gist of what was said and seen. These summaries provide a necessary backdrop to place the figures clearly in chapter 6. After all the video summaries, I examine the rhetoric used in Crusius’s manifesto.

Video 5

In video 5, Gary Franchi, a reporter of the Next News Network, an alternative conservative news media source, is reporting on the viral video of the UCP. He first begins by stating “more than 300 hundred asylum seekers ‘asylum seekers’ [Franchi does air quotes for when he repeats asylum seekers the second time here]”. When Franchi for the second time says “asylum seekers” with air quotes, he says it with a sarcastic tone. Later, Franchi repeats “asylum seekers” a third time again with a sarcastic tone. He continues the report by citing another source that details the activities of the UCP at the border. Next, a clip from the viral video (video 15) is shown mostly footage of the migrants kneeling and sitting on ground while UCP members surround them. After this clip, Franchi says “wow...look at those... look at ‘em all” (video 5). This act continues to reinforce the third figure of the spectator. The migrants are the object in which Franchi gazes and comments on. Franchi continues by condemning the US government for not upholding the “most basic commitment to the American people to secure the border from invaders” (video 5). He finishes the segment by reporting on the numbers of “illegal aliens” entering the US.

Video 1

Video 1 is of JLP discussing the UCP and their recent actions at the New Mexico border. Later, in the video, JLP shows a clip of a Fox News reporter discussing the UCP. Then JLP discusses that New Mexico has a liberal female governor. JLP talks about Jim Benvie, the spokesperson for the UCP, who talked to Fox News about the UCP getting along well with border patrol. JLP moves on to condemn the ACLU because the ACLU blamed Trump for white nationalist activity. Then, JLP shows a clip of Fox News

discussing the ACLU's condemnation of Trump's administration. After the clip, JLP, again, condemned the ACLU and showed another clip of Jim Benvie talking to Fox News of how their leader Hopkins was arrested. JLP moves on to discuss the fact that the border patrol reported 720 arrests on one day. JLP then goes on to talk about that the governor of New Mexico is a Latina and JLP says if this is the case, we should say goodbye to New Mexico because it will become another Tijuana.

A theme found in video 1 the common racist trope of immigrants bringing crime and (a less common theme of) taking away resources from Black people such as jobs and displacing people from Black communities. The 'Great White Hope' a slogan used by Trump campaign is used here by JLP in using this term he is showing solidarity with Trump and his administration stance on immigration. JLP condemns the ACLU multiple times in the video for supporting immigrants and for "put[ting] the illegal alien before the American citizen" (JLP). Another theme found in video 1 is that JLP engages in patriotic language by justifying the actions of the UCP. The patriotic rhetoric here comes in the form the right to defend one's own country. JLP supports the UCP are justifiable because they are defending their country from "illegal aliens". The video ends with JLP making a racist remark about the Mexican border patrol and their unwillingness or laziness of stopping migrants of crossing the border.

In the Mexican Constitution Article 11, it states "Every person has the right to enter and leave the country, to travel through its territory and to move house without the necessity of a letter of safe passage, passport, safe-conduct or any other similar requirement." (Translated version). This means the Mexican constitution allows its citizens to enter and leave the country without going through any official points of exit

and you don't need a passport to enter or leave. JLP made an ignorant remark by stating that the Mexican border patrol is too lazy to stop Mexicans from crossing the border into the US when it's the Mexican's legal right to leave their country in how they see fit. The US does not have a similar law under 8 U.S. Code § 1185 - Travel control of citizens and aliens; "it shall be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter, or attempt to depart from or enter, the United States unless he bears a valid United States [passport](#).". Mexico and the US have two different legal requirements for travel this difference is a possible cause for JLP to lowly portray the Mexican border work ethic.

Video 2

The JLP Radio Show opens with the Hake Report; Hake covers some US and some international news. Hake reports the FBI arrested the leader, Larry Hopkins, of the UCP and later, he covers Jim Benvie's statement of Hopkins arrest. Later, he notes that this arrestment came after the ACLU accused the UCP of illegally detaining migrants. Hake reports "the ACLU called the UCP a fascist militia" and then adds a personal comment: "sounds like a smear campaign." (video 2). Hake makes another personal comment after reporting that the New Mexico governor has condemned the actions of those that threatened the undocumented immigrants and stated that no citizen has the power to detain or arrest the migrants. He responded to this by saying it "sounds like a lie" (video 2).

The next segment of the JLP radio show, JLP and Hake discuss their concern for their country and migrants. JLP expresses his concern of the unauthorized migrants coming into US: "I'm concerned about my country how we've been set up too, all these illegals are coming in and just all kind of things just happening, and everybody is sitting

back...” (JLP, video 2). In this quote, JLP engages in constructing the “illegals” as invaders, the criminality of their actions by using “illegals” and is bothered by what seems to him that the public is not concerned and is allowing unauthorized migrants to enter the country. The next segment is the Hake Report again and Hake covers the statements made by Mexico’s Foreign Relations Ministry of their concerns of militia groups in New Mexico. He quotes the statement made by the ministry and ends it by adding a personal comment saying, “that’s rich they have no place to talk” (Hake, video 2).

A persistent pattern found in video 2 is Hake’s coverage first begins by presenting a neutral outlook of the news but after or in between he will add a small comment that indicates his opinion on the matter. Hake uses “illegals” and “illegal aliens” when referring to migrants and sarcastically uses “undocumented migrants”. Hake here is participating in his own rhetoric production by becoming the audience in the video. He engages in his own form of spectatorship and brings the audience into being as he comments on his own news presentation. The conversation between JLP and Hake that takes place after the Hake Report both form the figures of the “illegal alien” and the spectator. Overall, the rhetoric in this video works to construct the “illegal alien” as a criminal and the spectator because JLP and Hake both engage in their own rhetoric production by either adding in personal comments after a news report or conversing on the news topics.

Video 3

In this radio live stream uploaded on April 12, 2019, a few days before the viral video was recorded, the members of the UCP discuss their most recent actions down at

the border such as reporting the number of “captures” they had. Nuclear Warrior (second in command) starts off the live radio, then She Wolf takes over and gives a report. They detained 10 Salvadorians at base camp and another 5 migrants later that day. Nuclear Warrior takes over again and asks for donations in money or resources. After, he goes over a separate incident at the white house. Preacher comes on and talks about, at the time, President Trump threatening to place all the “illegal aliens” in sanctuary cities. Preacher states he does not want this to occur and because the “illegal aliens” would “still be in this country beating off the system” (Preacher, video 3). This phallogentric use of language here is a crude masculine expression that denotes a using or abusing of the system for one’s own pleasure. Phallogentrism maintains masculinity as the norm, privileges masculinity as a symbol of power, and equates the phallus as the only way to reach sexual pleasure (Osborne, 200).

Next, Nuclear Warhead took over again and discussed other unrelated news. Then, he goes one by one with everyone in the chat room to speak up if they had any information they would like to share. Preacher talks again and then Nuclear Warhead goes on again after. Preacher comes on to close off the live stream but before doing so, Preacher discusses his excitement to go back down to the border for his shift; “I’m kinda looking forward. I got itchy trigger finger hahaha” (video 3). After Preacher made this disturbing statement⁸, he closes the live stream with a prayer.

Overall, the main pattern found in video 3 is that it engages in the construction of the “illegal alien” in their rhetoric and their actions. A strong example of this is when the UCP members referred to detaining the migrants they used terms like “capture” and

⁸ I address this statement in-depth in the “contradictions” subsection of chapter 6.

“captured”. As I explained in the beginning of this chapter, these terms reduce the migrant from a human to a “capture”, who is inextricably linked to a criminal. Another interpretation is that the migrants become stripped of their humanity and become “animal like” through framing the migrant’s detentions as “captured” out in the harsh desert (i.e., la frontera). The second pattern found is that of the spectator the virtual text in video 3 creates the spectator by inviting the created audience to take pleasure in calling migrants “illegal aliens” or “captures”.

Video 4

Video 4 is where the UCP members discuss the viral video (4a) and another video (4b) recorded by what I believe to be a non UCP member, a Latinx man. In other words, two separate videos are discussed within video 4. The discussion of these videos brings into the third figure the spectator and in doing this we see race pleasure occurring. I discuss how the rhetoric in this video helps with the construction of all four figures in chapter two. In this section, I detail what occurred in video 4 and the contents of 4b. I do not discuss what is seen in 4a because I describe that video on its own in video 15, this is discussed later.

The radio show (video 4) begins with Commander Horton talking about video 4b and the viral video (4a) recorded by She Wolf. Horton says the people detained in video (4a) are still “being processed” by border patrol, so they do not have an exact count of the number of migrants detained yet. Horton gives out a warning to their viewers that they will be showing a disturbing video (4a) and to not let children watch it. Afterwards, the second video (4b) is shown and the narrator in that video is Latinx named Anthony.

Video 4b is blurry and shaky making it difficult at times to make out what is shown/said. The narration by Anthony helps alleviate this a little but there is audio interference by the wind. Video 4b depicts migrants climbing in and out of the desert embankments. I was able to make out one child carefully sliding down an embankment covered in rocks; during this, Anthony repeatedly stated migrants do not care about the kids because they are making them slide down the rocky embankments which he declares as dangerous. Commander Horton comments on video 4b saying the children were being “pushed” or “forced” down the embankment. Since quality of the video is bad, it does not shed light on whether the statement by Horton or Anthony is accurate.

After the video 4b is shown, Horton comes back on and discusses the video 4b and argues the importance of the wall. He then asks for donations and that they needed vetted people who are “level-headed” and can “follow orders”, they don’t want any “Rambos”. The UCP is asking for former military and law enforcement, in other words people who are familiar with a hierarchal system of power and with military grade weaponry. Nuclear Warrior comes on discussing other nonrelevant news and after that Horton brings on Laurie (a YouTuber that runs the Atomic News channel and a potential UCP member). Afterwards, Horton congratulates She Wolf for doing an excellent job on the viral video (4a). Horton goes on to acknowledge the migrants are humans as well and the migrant children are possibly being exploited by child traffickers. Preacher comes on to discuss other immigration news. Horton comes back on to ask for a prayer and help. The video ends with Preacher doing a prayer.

Video 6

In video 6, a Fox News reporter, an unnamed white woman, first begins by reporting on the arrest of Hopkins the leader of UCP. The reporter then brings on Hector Garza, a border patrol agent, and the vice president of the National Border Patrol Council to ask him a few questions about where border patrol stands on the citizens organizing at the border. The reporter asks his stance on the UCP and their activities at the border. Garza begins by stating that he appreciates support from the American public. Garza mentions he has not worked with the UCP personally but has worked with another group in Texas and commends the work the Texas border volunteers have done. He states the Texas volunteer's work consisted of rescuing migrants abandoned by smugglers.

The reporter details the aftermath of Hopkins arrest as well as quoting a statement made by the New Mexico attorney general. After, the reporter talks about Jim Benvie, the spokesperson for the UCP, he believes Hopkins charges will be cleared. Then, the reporter plays a clip of Jim Benvie talking to Fox News. Benvie states Hopkins will be okay, and that the attorney general has "declared war on the American Citizens at the order of the ACLU" (video 6). The reporter asks what Garza's message is to the "private groups policing the border" (video 6). Garza later mentions that it is okay for "organizations" to be helping at the border if they are following the law such as not trespassing illegally and in possession of illegal firearms.

Garza continues by detailing the exploitation of children at the border to gain entry to the US. The reporter mentions this border issue will be discussed in Congress to find solutions to improve the situation at the border. Garza goes on to say he has good communication with Trump and other governmental agencies. He urges Congress to fix

immigration laws to not attract anymore unauthorized migrants because “people are abusing our immigration laws and we need to stop that” (video 6). He concludes with urging for better border security for the American people and border patrol agents.

Video 7

In this video, Fox News covers Crusius, the El Paso shooting, and the targeted demographic in the attack (i.e., Hispanics). The Fox News reporter refers to Crusius as the reported killer. The reporter, Rick or Richard Gary Leventhal, gives an overview of the Crusius shooting, arrestment, and court case. The overview consisted of Crusius’s confession of targeting Mexicans in the attack. Leventhal states Crusius waived his rights and was arrested without a fight.

After, the reporter, Jeff Paul (reporting live), gives more details of the case and what the charges are that will be brought against Crusius. Paul reports a history of Crusius’s mom’s reports with the police. The mom had previously called the police because she found Crusius’s AK type rifle and asked advice from police department on what to do. The mom was worried Crusius would injure himself. Crusius’s mom made this call in July a month before the attack. During the call, she never gave her name or Crusius’s name.

Sergeant Jon Felty comes on and makes a statement on the call Crusius’s mom made to the police before the shooting (Felty is from Allen, TX police department). The first responders on the scene of the shooting are praised for their heroism; afterwards, the police officer Lionel Gutierrez, a first responder, discussed his emotions of the aftermath. The video ends with Paul talking about the memorial for the victims and gave a count of the number of victims while calling the shooting a domestic terrorism attack. Meanwhile,

in the background the video switches to show clips of the memorials people made for the victims and close ups of candles/flowers. Overall, video 7 gave a neutral report of the shooting and the details of Crusius's case. The reporters did not name Crusius in the video, the reporters solely addressed him as the "alleged shooter" or "suspected shooter" (video 7).

Video 8

Video 8 is a clip of a Fox News segment with political commentator Hannity, in which he comments on the El Paso and Dayton shootings. Video 8 begins with Hannity stating we need to pray for everyone killed in El Paso, Dayton, Chicago, Baltimore, and Detroit. Next, a clip is shown of CCTV footage catching the people running from the Dayton shootings. Hannity declares a large wave of violence is occurring in the US and those that blame Trump for it are in the wrong. He explains such violence has predated Trump. Hannity goes on a short spiel of the evilness of those acts of violence. After, he shows a clip of Trump's press statement on what happened with the El Paso and Dayton shooting. Trump declares that America has "no room for hate" and asserts those to blame will be held accountable. Moreover, Trump states he has asked the FBI to disrupt hate crimes as well as domestic terrorism.

Hannity criticizes people on the left that have politicized and exploited the shooting to score cheap political points. Fox News reporter, Trace Gallagher, comes on, Gallagher and Hannity discuss the two shootings. Gallagher covers the facts of El Paso shooting and then talks about the Dayton shooting. Hannity reiterates the evilness of the violence and that asserts we should mourn those that died and not politicize the shootings. He shows short clips of other news media reporters and politicians blaming Trump for the

El Paso shooting. Hannity complains about this type of coverage of the shooting. He goes on to talk about how the Dayton shooter supported Elizabeth Warren and was a socialist.

Hannity brings up past shootings and acts of verbal/ physical violence that were not as scrutinized nor had the same politicized coverage as the El Paso shooting. Hannity introduces his own Abrahamic religious understanding of God and life and contends those who follow this similar mindset are good people. He continues to argue we should all be mourning those that lost their lives in the shootings and to end the politicization of the shootings. He goes on to discuss that Democrats are claiming the border crisis was manufactured to which Hannity declares is a lie. To support his claim, Hannity reports “statistics” on the violence by “illegal immigrants”. He complains the Democrats do not say anything about the violence committed by the “illegal immigrants” and finds flaws in the logic of Democrats. Hannity effectively says it’s fair to blame Democrats for not wanting to secure border and all the deaths from drug use (i.e., the drugs brought in from Mexico because of the unsecure border). Video 8 concludes with Hannity discussing school shootings and arguing Democrats are exploiting the shootings to discuss gun control reform.

Video 9

Video 9 is the JLP radio show, it opens with the Hake Report in which Hake covers international events and other related news occurring at the time. After, the opening theme song/clip comes on, JLP is shown, and he presents the biblical question of the week: “what is a white supremacist?” (video 9). JLP discusses the biblical question with two staff members of the JLP team. The conversation carries a slight joking tone and JLP questions whether the Democratic party is a white supremacist party. One of the staff

members answers the biblical question and defining what a white supremacist is: “a white racist...someone who is white and wants things to only be white” (video 9). After, JLP asks Hake to answer the biblical question to which Hake declares that a ‘white supremacist’ is a slur towards white people. JLP and Hake further continue with conversation and the format of the conversation is as follows: JLP asks questions and Hake answers in response. Hake cites a previous conversation held between JLP and Richard Spencer⁹. In that conversation, Hake recalls Spencer arguing that Black people are doing well under white supremacy.

JLP questions if ANITFA is a white supremacist group and the staff of JLP respond saying no because ANTIFA is against whites. The main theme of the video is of JLP questioning who/what is considered a white supremacist/supremacy. Trump is called into question of whether he himself is white supremacist as well as questioning Trump’s own use of the term white supremacy during his press release statement on the El Paso and Dayton shootings. Crusius is called into question if he is a white supremacist or not and the consensus is he was considered one.

After this discussion, JLP wonders if people know what a white supremacist is and the definition of it. Throughout these conversations the JLP team are cracking jokes and laughing at each other. Later, JLP states BLM is worse than the KKK and wonders if people of color can be called white supremacists for hating whites. Sometime after these remarks, JLP shows two clips of the mayor of El Paso statements of the shooting. JLP asks if the El Paso mayor is a white supremacist and Hake responds he is a white

⁹ Richard Spencer is a young American white nationalist who is known to have coined the term “alt-right”. He is a “radical white separatist whose goal is the establishment of a white ethno-state in North America.” (“Richard Bertrand Spencer”).

supremacist, according to the definition of JLP, (i.e., A white supremacist is someone who thinks they are better than others).

JLP takes several callers and each one gives their own answer of “what is a white supremacist?” (video 9). The first caller, a man, states it is anyone who is white. Another caller answers and says a white supremacist is “a so-called white man that thinks he is better than everyone else just because he is white” (video 9). JLP and this caller discuss the El Paso shooting and asks JLP if there is a need for more security as a potential solution. The third caller answers the biblical question and states “there is no such thing as white supremacy.” (video 9). The fourth caller answers the question and argues the KKK are white supremacists. The caller goes on to clarify that ANTIFA is not a white supremacist organization because they are not saying whites are better than everyone. The caller makes this remark in answer to JLP’s consistent theme of asking if ANTIFA are white supremacists.

Video 10

The JLP Radio Show opens with the Hake Report. Hake begins with coverage on democrats calling Trump a white supremacist and democrats declaring Trump’s actions lead to a larger support of white supremacy. Hake moves on to report on a few other news topics after JLP begins with the biblical question of the week: “what is a white supremacist?” (video 10). In response, Hake discusses people calling the El Paso shooter a white supremacist. Hake argues when a shooting occurs white nationalists/ supremacist voices are stifled. JLP replies he does not understand why in the US people accuse men and do not allow them to defend themselves. Hake begins discussing the free speech

forum they put on for men's history month and felt this forum to be necessary because of the recent El Paso shooting.

Afterwards, JLP takes callers and one of them is a 13-year-old boy that believes there is no such thing as a white supremacist, he argued that it is just a label people call others. Later, another Hake report comes on and Hake covers more details about the El Paso shooter case. He includes the phone call the mother made to the police before the massacre about her son Crusius. Hake pathologizes the connection between mass shootings, cannabis, and mental illness such as schizophrenia and psychosis. Lastly, Hakes covers ICE arrests and other border politics.

The radio show switches back to JLP, and he is seen wearing a comically large Make America Great Again hat, which was given to him by a fan. JLP once again takes callers, and they answer the biblical question. Their answers range from anger, ignorance, and trauma as motivators in what makes a white supremacist to declaring planned parenthood as a white supremacist organization. A caller from Albania, answers defining a white supremacist can take on different meanings for different people but then the caller claims it is a phrase used to put white people down by shaming them and continuing hate towards them. The caller claims there is no such thing as white supremacy, no country has white supremacy, and it is all just misunderstood history. The caller believes people of color are using white supremacy as a tactic to keep European descent people down so that people of color will have more power. Two other callers echo a similar sentiment to the caller from Albania, they too claimed there is no such thing as white supremacy. The last caller answers saying that a white supremacist is a person who believes in the

advancement of whites over all other races and the caller says whether it exists or not is debatable.

Video 11

Video 11 opens with JLP answering calls from listeners and the main question asked by the caller is “Jesse why do you justify white mass shooters?”. The caller was listening to JLP’s previous discussion on the El Paso and Dayton shootings. According to the caller, JLP was wondering what the shooters mindsets was. The caller found fault with this because they did not understand why the mindset of the shooters mattered when this kind of violence has occurred repeatedly before. The caller notes a discrepancy between the way JLP discusses violence committed by Black folks versus white folks. The caller claims JLP calls Black people who have committed crimes as “savages” and other derogatory names. This has all led the caller to ask, “why do you justify white mass shooters?” (video 11). JLP argues that it is necessary to look at the mindset of shooters because of “cause and effect” (video 11). JLP believes if we know the mindset (i.e., the cause), we can learn on how to prevent future shootings (i.e., the effect).

JLP continues to say Black folks have a great deal of anger they receive from their mother and adds a religious comment to this. JLP later states this is the same for white people as well, white folks receiving anger from their mothers. JLP uses this line of thinking to explain the El Paso shooting. JLP states people have been attacking the white man:

finally get[got] the white guys to overreact like we saw in Texas and Ohio and now they are passing laws against the white folks... and that anger that you see in white people is anger get from their mothers as well. Because every white man is

too weak to stand up not only in the home but outside the home as well. (video 11)

The caller then identifies himself as a Black man and asks if Black people are so angry then why do they go out and shoot other people for racial reasons. JLP responds saying that he is not justifying Crusius and says the caller is wrong because Black people are going out committing mass shootings in the inner cities, but this information is not told to the public. The caller asks JLP for facts on the matter to which JLP retorts that the caller needs to face the truth/reality and not facts. After, JLP cites a website that reports the statistics of Black on white crime. JLP and the caller continue to disagree on several other points. The two's discussion circles back to mindsets and JLP claims he knows that the mindset of a Black shooter is that "he hates his momma and longs for his father" (video 11). The caller then asks if the anger of the white man is from their mothers and JLP says yes. The caller disagrees and says no it is not, the violence comes from their "lineage" meaning how whites are historically raised to be in this country. The caller is saying that the whites are committing the same kind of atrocities over the last four hundred years to which JLP disagrees with. The call eventually ends soon after.

Video 12

Video 12 begins with JLP declaring men need to be men again and "men [need to] return to their natural state of being". According to JLP, if this occurs, everything will go back into balance. JLP covers the El Paso shooting and includes clips of phone footage people took during the shooting. Right after showing footage of the shooting, JLP comments "amazing! (pause) seeing that work" (video 12). JLP continues to discuss

Crusius's age, race, and family background particularly Crusius's father meanwhile showing images of Crusius's father. Later, JLP found that some people have said that Crusius supports Trump, but JLP does not agree with this because he believes people are trying to blame everything on Trump. JLP continues to discuss Crusius's manifesto. JLP comments on Trump's statement on the two shootings and afterwards shows a clip of Trump's press release statement. Later, JLP and another staff member critiques Ivanka Trump's tweet calling for red flag laws to which JLP believes its an "overreaction to this incident" (video 12). The incident referred to here is the El Paso and Dayton shootings.

Video 13

Video 13 opens with a Fox News reporter introducing Rep. Kevin McCarthy. McCarthy begins with stating that we are a nation in mourning, and nobody should be fearful of their life while out shopping. After McCarthy goes over his opening remarks, the Fox News reporter asks what McCarthy believes the shooters motives were. McCarthy responds that regardless of their intentions their actions were rooted in hate and evil. McCarthy commends the first responders on the scenes for both shootings. The Fox News reporter asks McCarthy for his opinion if there needs to be a conversation about the possible connection between social media and video games to shootings. McCarthy believes there does needs to be a conversation to find if there is any connection. McCarthy personally believes there is a connection but agrees that finding the facts first is imperative before making conclusions. The reporter asks McCarthy about gun safety/gun rights to which McCarthy does not discuss. However, he questions if there are systems in place that allow for catching early signs of potential shooters and finding means to prevent shootings.

Video 14

Video 14 is of former President Trump press release statement on the El Paso and Dayton shootings. The speech begins by discussing what occurred in the two mass shootings. After, he begins to give his sympathies to the families of the victims and the of the shootings. Trump declares he stands in solidarity with the survivors and mourns the lives the lost. Trump demonizes the shooters and condemns their actions. Trump argues citizens should not have to fear for their lives and that America has no place for hate, bigotry, racism, and white supremacy. He believes Americans are entitled to live in a peaceful and safe society. He sends his condolences to the Mexican President Andrés Manuel López Obrador for all the Mexican nationals who died at the El Paso shooting. Trump addresses the manifesto Crusius posted online and proceeds to blame the internet for providing a place to dangerous people who share radical/dangerous ideas. Trump continues to blame video games, society's glorification of violence, and a lack of better mental health laws. Lastly, he urges for widespread legislation on red flag laws as currently only 17 states have red flag laws (Williams, par. 5)¹⁰.

Video 15

Video 15 is the viral video the UCP became known for and garnered attention from the media. This video is one of three of primary texts I used for this thesis. The other two primary texts are other two “viral” videos I used. I use “viral” in quotations because they did not actually go viral, but the videos did have views in the thousands on

¹⁰ Red flag laws are state laws that allow for courts to “issue a special type of protection order” (Williams, par. 2). These orders permit the temporary confiscation of firearms from individuals at risk of being dangerous to themselves or others, the conditions of each of these statutes vary from state to state (Williams, par. 2).

YouTube. Additionally, for organizational purposes, these two videos fit best under the category of viral videos.

Video 15 is 41 minutes long and it covers the detainment of migrants at the US-Mexico border. The number of migrants detained in this video is quite large reaching to the hundreds, however, it is not clear the number of migrants detained. In video 4, the livestream by the UCP, the leader Commander Horton claims the number of migrants detained were estimated around 850 to 1200. The exact number is not confirmed but it is clear many migrants were detained that night. The video was recorded from a member of the UCP, a white woman, code name She Wolf. In video 15, She Wolf is narrating what is going on, what she sees, and her reaction to it.

Video 15 begins by showing the Latinx migrants some kneeling and some standing on the ground. A large huddle of migrants is under the careful watch of the UCP and car headlights/flashlights are shed on the migrants. She Wolf estimates about 200 are detained. Another white man, possibly a UCP member, is seen recording a separate live streamed video of the migrants. He describes the location they are at and where the UCP wants the wall to be built. The man continues saying the UCP is negotiating with landowners and is asking to donate on their GoFundMe page.

There is a man speaking in Spanish and asking questions to the migrants; they respond in almost unison. The migrants are asked where they came from, they said Guadalajara (a state in Mexico). They are asked how they came, and they responded by truck. At one point you can see the migrants passing each other water bottles and a lot of migrants are coughing throughout the video. A few migrants are holding each other. At times, the migrants chat among themselves and at other points they are silent. They seem

to be waiting for instructions. Eventually border patrol comes (at this point you cannot see border patrol), but their arrival is indicated because border patrol instructs the migrants to sit on the ground.

A man whistles at a migrant and says “hombre sientase”¹¹ with an English accent (video15). Its difficult to make out expressions of the migrants because the video is low quality, but some are seen with their faces cast down possibly to hide their identity from the UCP members taking videos or because of the lights being flashing on them. The energy the group of migrants give off is somber. She Wolf is circling the large group of migrants to show the viewers the large number of migrants detained. Later, the border patrol agent starts giving instructions to the migrants in Spanish about where they are going to go. The migrants get up and follow border patrol who is going to walk them to the location where they will be taken in vans.

Somebody whistles at the migrants and yells “vamonos”¹² and “Pasale, go go”¹³ (video 15). She Wolf notes one of the women migrants look like she might pass out and is possibly pregnant. She Wolf comments the migrants in the back of the group are either very sick or lagging slowly purposefully. She Wolf says there are some migrants trying to hide in the bushes. Throughout the video, She Wolf gives directions to the migrants in a harsh authoritative tone.

After walking for a while, the migrants stop walking and She Wolf mentions that they seem like they do not want to go where they are being taken to. The migrants eventually start walking again, begrudgingly, at the orders of the border patrol. The

¹¹ Translation: Man sit down

¹² Translation: Lets go

¹³ Translation: Move on

migrants stop walking a few times during the video and some of the migrants start running away. The border patrol tells the migrants to follow the truck. The woman claims there are about 400 migrants detained. She Wolf comments that some of the adult migrants are gripping the children's wrists hard. She Wolf believes the kids are not theirs because of the "tight" grip on they have on the children's wrists. She Wolf says she does not know where border patrol is taking the migrants after they are put into vans.

The border patrol separates migrants into two groups. They are taken into an area called "the bowl" (video 15). A group of migrants just stop walking and do not listen to the orders of border patrol. She Wolf notes that some kids were picking up rocks and that the UCP members/border patrol need to be careful. She Wolf states President Trump and other people in high positions need to see this video.

One woman and her child are sitting on the ground, not moving. The woman seems to be showing defiance in this act. She eventually goes into the border patrol truck. She Wolf goes on to say this video must be shared. She continues to say this occurs on a nightly basis and lastly asks for people to pray for the men at the border.

Video 16

Video 16 is posted by Atomic News, and it is a 11-minute-long video. The person who took the video is a white man and is affiliated with the UCP. The man never comes into the frame, so I am assuming from the way he speaks. In video 16, it shows the detainment of a few migrants and the border patrol talking to them in Spanish. Meanwhile, the man recording the video is narrating what is happening as well as arguing that the large influx of migrants coming across the border is a crisis.

Video 16 opens with the view of a group of people huddled together near a car. The man narrates the migrants have a few suitcases with them. The video shows a man talking in Spanish to the migrants talking about their luggage. The audio is hard to make out because of the interference with the wind. A border patrol officer asks the man recording the video to back up further because he was getting too close to where the migrants and border patrol are. The narrator continues saying that the migrants will be processed because they need to be identified and it will take time. The narrator says they are near the open border location where the cartel and coyotes bring the migrants. According to the narrator, a lot of migrants are coming through on that small road where drugs and people are trafficked. The narrator says he is working with border patrol. He argues there is a crisis happening at the border.

He starts giving his opinion on catch and release which is that it needs to end. After, giving his opinion on certain policies, a van is seen entering the frame and the narrator notes three patrol officers are tied up with the small group of migrants. The narrator says the van will take the migrants to be processed and then sent to a detention center. The narrator complains the detention centers are filling up quickly because many migrants are coming in. He continues to criticize Democrats because they convince voters to vote against contributing more resources to border security. The narrator claims migrants are going to take healthcare benefits from American citizens. He believes the migrants will become voters and vote as democrats.

The narrator continues discussing the number of migrants coming in and the labor needed for it. He argues the news does not show what is happening at the border. He claims this war is being fought outside of public knowledge and that even people in El

Paso do not believe it is a crisis. The video ends with the narrator emphasizing the importance of what they are doing and the need for more to be done about the crisis at the border.

Video 17

Video 17 was posted by Atomic News and was taken by a UCP member. In video 17, the person who recorded the video is the same white man that recorded video 16. I was able to recognize his voice and just like the previous video he is narrating what is going on and arguing for the importance of the wall. Video 17 shows two migrant teenage boys detained by the UCP and border patrol.

The video opens with showing one man dressed in military garb/camo with a gun strapped to him, as he lays on the ground. There are two people crouching down and hiding behind bushes. I can hear a woman talking in Spanish loudly but what she says is not clear because of wind interference. After, two migrants are seen sitting on the ground separated (they appear to be boys). The narrator says they called border patrol. He says they caught the migrants right outside the UCP's camp. The narrator argues a crisis is occurring at the border, a main argument carried throughout the video. For a few seconds, we see a man carrying a gun and flashing a light at the two migrants. The gun is not pointed directly at the migrants, but it is present. The narrator says they are near the New Mexico border. He states a large number of people come through the border and many kids come through, but they do not know if the kids belong to the parents they come with. He continues to say many cartel kids are coming through and the work the UCP is doing is dangerous because it interferes with the cartel business.

The narrator answers someone's question in the distant giving an estimated age range of the two migrant boys they detained. The narrator notes that many migrants are good people that is the humanitarian side of the crisis, the problem is that there are way too many people coming "illegally" through the border. The border patrol arrives, and the agent asks the two boys in Spanish where they are from the answer is not clear because of wind interference. The narrator says the kids don't seem dangerous, but they could be smuggling drugs or being trafficked. Later, the border patrol takes the two boys into their vehicle.

The narrator argues the mainstream media does not show what is happening at the border. He comments that it costs a great deal of money for the migrants to be brought up there and many times migrants cannot pay the expensive costs, so they are held accountable by threatening to kill the family members of the migrants. He mentions there are little girls that are guided to the US and get raped along the way. The narrator states they are going to continue to catch migrants until there is more border security or a wall. By the end of the video, the two migrant boys are taken away by the border patrol agent.

Crusius Manifesto: The Inconvenient Truth

In Crusius's manifesto, he explains his reasonings and thoughts of why he decided to target Hispanics. Furthermore, Crusius covers the kind of firearms he will use and what he expects the response from the media will be for his attack. His manifesto is similarly set up in MLA format as if it was written for an assignment. In the left-hand margins, he has the title and his name. Each section of the paper is titled, and he has a thesis, introduction, body, and conclusion. The essay structure of the manifesto reflects

him as a high school student. His manifesto is a 5-page essay detailing his fears and intentions on dealing with them.

Crusius declares his support for the Christchurch shooter and cites the Great Replacement as his reasoning for targeting the Hispanic community for he fears the “Hispanic invasion of Texas” (Crusius, 1). He believes his actions are not imperialist rather they are an “act of preservation” (Crusius, 1). He is against race mixing and prefers to have each race in a separate territory (Crusius, 4). He does not believe he is a White supremacist but knows the media will call him that to which he retorts the media is fake news (Crusius, 5).

Crusius political and economic reasonings range from blaming Republicans and Democrats, as well as the US government because it is being ran by corporations (Crusius, 1-2). Crusius blames Democrats because of their appeal to immigrants meaning they want to “open borders, free healthcare for illegals, citizenship and more to enact a political coup by importing and then legalizing millions of new voters.” (Crusius, 1). The republican party (certain factions) are blamed because they are pro corporation which Crusius sees as pro immigrations. Crusius recognizes that immigrants are used as a source of cheap labor. (Crusius, 1-2). He also blames the American lifestyle as being wasteful, he notes that consumer culture is destroying the environment which will burden future generations. He criticizes the amount of unnecessary plastic waste and electronic waste the US produces. He criticizes oil drilling for polluting the environment as well as fresh water being polluted by farming. Crusius declares a solution to the wasteful American lifestyle is to “decrease the number of people using resources” (Crusius, 3). The following chapter discusses the 5 figures that emerged from the data: the “illegal

alien”, the immigrant child, the spectator, “the patriot or the white nationalist”, and the “monster”.

Chapter 6: Discussion – The Emergence of the 5 Figures

In this chapter, I discuss the 5 figures that I identified in the data (the “illegal alien”, the immigrant child, the spectator, the patriot or the white nationalist, and the “monster”) citing examples of how the rhetoric constructs each figure. I also discuss the purpose of each figure, how the figure is used for the reporter or narrator’s argument, and why understanding each figure is necessary. The format I follow in each figure is covering the rhetoric in the UCP videos, the El Paso videos, and then the viral videos. I conclude the chapter by discussing contradictions found in the rhetoric, explaining how all 5 figures come to support one another, and the significance/purpose of the overall anti-immigrant/white nationalist rhetoric.

The “Illegal Alien”

Figure 1 is the most prominent figure across all three data sets. The “illegal alien” figure appears similarly across all three sets, this includes Crusius’s manifesto. In this sub-section, I discuss the two ways the “illegal alien” is presented first as the criminal and second as the scapegoat.

In video 1, JLP discusses the actions of the UCP he states that the UCP is a border militia group that is “fight[ing] the recent surge of illegal aliens”. Overall, JLP’s radio show supports the UCP and their actions at the border and JLP’s rhetoric work to reaffirm the “illegal alien”. JLP’s initial usage of “illegal aliens” begins to form the narrative of the criminal immigrant and is used as an exclusionary practice of who “belongs” and who does not. If you recall, I discuss exclusionary practices as a way of building nationalism in the literature review. This idea carries over to how “illegal aliens” are presented. The

“illegal alien” is inherently “the other” “the outsider” and the one who does not belong.

In creating and reaffirming the “illegal alien”, US nationalism is solidified.

when did it become okay for the *illegal aliens* to just *burst* into our country do whatever they want bring *drugs* and *crimes* and looking for *free stuff* and *run* Black people out of their communities, *take* Black peoples *jobs*, and other people when did it become okay to do that but American citizens can’t stand at the border and say no you ain’t coming over here why is that wrong. (JLP, video 1)

The use of “illegal aliens” begins to form the criminal immigrant into the “freeloader” immigrant who only “takes”. The immigrant that “takes” advantage of the American social welfare system and “takes” away opportunities from “good American citizens” or takes from other marginalized groups. In this example by JLP, he is specifically concerned for the opportunities “taken” away from the Black community. This is a strange appropriation of the larger discourse of immigrants taking away opportunities from American citizens. I have only heard this sentiment once before in a show called *Blackish* but in the show the sentiment was challenged by another character. This appropriation coupled with the criminal immigrant creates an interesting narrative of the “invader” immigrant. This narrative helps support JLP’s position from which the UCP’s actions are good and a patriotic act. I discuss in depth in the “patriotic or white nationalist” figure if the UCP’s actions are patriotic or a guise of white nationalism.

Commander Horton was driving in along the wall and they happened to run right in front of his truck and I’m *so impressed* he jumped up out and *captured them all by himself* he said he even ran a little bit to go get’em. But he got’em. So that was 3 Ecuadorians that he *caught* right there at base camp. So far today we are at

49...we are not that very far from hitting 5000 *captures* since we have been done there. So, we have done a lot of *good* down there folks... *hopefully* today we will hit 5000 we are that close. (She Wolf, video 3)

The rhetoric of the excerpt above is a good example of how the UCP views their actions and that of the migrants. Firstly, the rhetoric used engages in othering and dehumanizes the migrants by calling them “captures”. In this context, the UCP reduces the migrant to a “capture” this strips the migrant of their identity as anything other than a “capture”. The UCP’s use of language helps construct the “illegal alien” which is again reinforcing the idea that migrants are criminals that need to be “captured” and dealt with. Additionally, the UCP members discuss their “captures” with pride and present Commander Horton’s “captures” as an impressive feat. There was a slight undertone of happiness at the possibility of reaching 5000 “captures”. In their discussion, they are reinforcing their actions as “good” and fully believe the more they “capture” the migrants the more successful their operations are.

we don’t have the exact amount yet that came, invaded our camp and we stopped them some of them wanted to be violent, but it didn’t work out too well and border patrol had it all under control. But when we walked out and seen what was coming in, we had to take an action that we had never taken before there was no violence anything it was avoided but, in the group, there was probably...3 coyotes we don’t know for sure. Border patrol-we had their back, and they had our back. (video 4; Horton)

Video 4 is particularly interesting because it is where the UCP members discuss the viral video and another by I believe a non UCP member, a Latinx man. First, the UCP

members discussed the viral video in a celebratory manner. I should note that the goal of the UCP is to bring awareness “to the crisis at the border” through their live radio show and YouTube channel; posting their live videos is a great example of this. They want the public viewers to tune in to their show and become aware of the situation at the border. Thus, I bring this goal in connection to why the viral video is seen as a success for the UCP. The UCP leader Johnny Horton, whose real name is Hopkins, congratulates She Wolf the white woman who took the video because it had received 50,000 shares at that point in time. From the rhetoric used to discuss their viral video, it is clear the UCP takes an immense amount of pleasure and satisfaction from the attention the video has received as well as the large number of migrants they detained or in their words “captured”. Horton discusses the migrants as invading their base camp this kind of language again alludes to the rhetoric around the “illegal aliens invading” the US. The second video shown in the live stream is taken by a Latinx man, whom I speculate to be Mexican American, but I am unsure if this assumption is accurate. Anthony in video 4b states:

“...there they go like roaches. They run out of everywhere like roaches.”

“We have take these freeloaders. Act like uber drivers and take'em off into a detention center or a holding facility.”

These three excerpts are descriptive of how Anthony views the migrants by referring to them as “roaches” he is equating migrants to less than humans, a nuisance to society. They are dirty filthy disease carrying pests that need to be eliminated. Anthony describes the migrants as “freeloaders” again equating them to people who take advantage of the immigration system.

In video 5, after discussing what the UCP has done at the border, Franchi reports on the numbers of “illegal aliens” entering the US. He presents the numbers and immediately follows with “what happens when they all have children. The numbers will just multiply.” (video 5). The framing of the “surge” in numbers of the migrants entering the country coupled with this alarmist dying of the white race narrative encourages the othering of the “illegal alien” by reinforcing that other non-white races are not welcome in the US because if the migrants reproduce there will be “more of them” and possibly less of “us” (the Whites).

The following quote is from video 6. A Fox News reporter asks Garza for his stance on where border patrol stands on the citizens organizing at the border:

The Texas border volunteers have done an amazing job in reporting observing different criminal activities along the border and they are actually responsible for saving a lot of people that have been left abandoned by smugglers. So, what we do ask is that border security work is left up to the border security experts, and those are border patrol agents, and we ask that any organization that's operating along the border that they do so that they follow the law as they try to help achieve border security. (Garza, video 6)

Garza constructs the narrative that the work of another group in Texas is “good” because they are saving the migrants who were abandoned by smugglers. By framing the Texas volunteers as saviors Garza is positioning the volunteers as hero types because they are “saving a lot of people”. Garza does not provide any detail and what the “saving” looks like when they find the migrants abandoned. Is there medical assistance? Is water and food given? If so, at what point after do the migrants get taken to a detainment facility or

taken back to their countries of origin? I ask these questions because there is a lot of room for interpretation and assumption about whether the “saving” they do actually saves the migrant, or whether they are just placed in another location where they face a different form of violence. What I am trying to say is that the savior trope and “saving” as a concept is dangerous especially coupled with border politics and with the border patrol, the UCP, or even Crusius. I can confidently argue all these organizations and people would argue that what they are doing is “saving” people whether that be the migrants themselves, who are put in dangerous situations when crossing the border, the American citizens, or the US as a nation. Border security is justified as “protecting” the US and its citizens and “saving” those potential/real victims. To save, there needs to be saving “from” something or someone and the implications of the something or someone is that they are bad, in this case criminal. It is the binary that one needs the other, to save from the bad.

This is important to note because it is continuing the justification of the UCP’s actions as needed and wanted. Furthermore, Garza’s urging of this matter feeds into the narrative that migrants are “freeloaders” and are “abusing” the immigration system. In video 6, Garza states:

Once we achieve border security that means its gonna make a big difference in our country and save a lot of those families that are being *victimized by illegal aliens* and its gonna solve a lot of issues that we are having in these sanctuary cities and ...*its all about the safety of our American people, the safety of our border patrol agents we want to achieve border security.* Plain and simple.

(Garza, video 6, emphasis added)

Garza later mentions that it is okay for “organizations” to be helping at the border if they are following the law. In other words, border patrol is okay with the presence of militias and the militias detaining migrants at the border if they are not breaking any laws such as trespassing on private property and illegal possession of firearms etc. Again, the safety rhetoric promotes the idea that the work they do at the border is necessary to protect the people and there is an urgent need for border security. However, no matter how much money is poured into border security, the border will never be “secured” and that is not because the US lacks border security but because there needs to be a different system, one that provides accessible pathways to legal status and targeting transnational criminal organizations among other necessary changes (Ewing, 214-215).

Again, on the topic of “safety”, Garza perpetuates the rhetoric that the migrants are criminals and the border patrol’s actions are necessary to achieve border security. When Garza referred to families being victimized by “illegal aliens” it was not clear on whether Garza meant to differentiate between different types of migrants or citizens. Garza’s word choice is unclear; however, this lack of clarity provides more room for interpretation, and this means the viewers can interpret the information that best suits/reflects their own ideas. Overall, the narrative constructed in the video continues to uphold the assumption of the “illegal alien” as a criminal, freeloader, and an abuser as well as the border patrol and other militia’s actions as necessary in the name of protecting US citizens and “border security”.

Video 8 partly does contribute to construction of the “illegal alien”. Hannity reports on the number of “illegal immigrants” that have committed crimes to US citizens. Whether the numbers reported are accurate is questionable. Hannity reports:

2-year period; over 4,000 Americans murdered by *illegal immigrants* in the country...100,000 violent assaults carried out by *illegal immigrants* against American citizens...30,000 violent sexual crimes yes *illegal immigrants* against the American citizens thousands of American murdered in 2 year period.

(Hannity, video 8)

Tens of thousands of *illegal immigrants* also have been arrested for smuggling drugs, each week in this country heroin is killing three hundred Americans, 90 percent of the heroin comes across that southern border. A new drug called fentanyl, don't all lives matter, uh the people that don't want to secure the border they responsible for the heroin deaths considering 90 percent comes across the border? (Hannity, video 8)

Hannity is constructing the “illegal immigrant” as rapists and criminals by reporting on the number of crimes and types of crimes the “illegal immigrants” have allegedly done. In doing this, Hannity is connecting the drugs coming in from the US-Mexico border to the deaths of American citizens reinforcing the narrative that the migrants pose a threat to the American citizens through drugs and other crimes. Hannity is blaming immigrants for all the heroin deaths and blaming people “who don't want to secure the border” (video 8). Hannity is utilizing fear to convince the public that immigrants and those who do not want a “secure” border are responsible for the heroin deaths.

The excerpt below is almost all said by She Wolf, in video 15. There is only one statement made by someone else, who I believe is a UCP member, a white man whose name is unknown. I just want to briefly clarify that the two speakers I quote below I did not see in the video, I just heard their voices. However, I think it is an accurate

assessment for me to conclude that they are in fact white by how they speak and other factors. These are some excerpts from the data collected:

“Somebody call border patrol”

“How do we stop this guys”

“I don’t know if we got’em all.”

“I don’t know what to say about this other than the fact its got to stop”

“this is going to make me sick”

“the people are getting sicker”

“I’ m at a loss for words guys”

“Its overwhelming”

“Yes, it is real. Yes, it is happening. Yes, it is in our backyard”

“It is an invasion”

“Sorry if I’m a little shaky guy. This one got me a kind of riled up”

“they are trying to scatter a little bit”

“They are a lot more aggressive. They stormed the southern border”

The above excerpts are mostly reactions to what is being seen in the video but there are a few descriptor statements of what is being seen. The order of the quotes is in the same order of what was said in the video. The first one is “Somebody call border patrol” this was the second statement said in the video. I decided to include it because it is an important seedling from which the rest of the video grows from.

This construction in conjunction with other fear inciting statements by She Wolf creates the narrative of an “illegal alien invasion” after all She Wolf does explicitly state

that is an “invasion”. Additionally, the other possible UCP member contributed to the narrative of a hostile “invasion” by his comment of “They are a lot more aggressive. They stormed the southern border”. The inclusion of the term “aggressive” is positioning the migrants as hostile which build the “illegal alien” frame they are creating. The “stormed[ing]” of the border creates fear mongering of the unauthorized migrants as well as building of the “illegal alien”.

She Wolf uses an interesting word to describe her encounter with the migrants when she describes seeing all the migrants detained as “sickening”. She does not expand as to why she finds it sickening. This again invites audience interpretation that suits the viewers ideas. Is it distressing to see the condition the migrants are in (i.e., exhaustion, sickly, hungry, thirsty etc.) and to see them detained (lack of human rights)? Or is it sickening to see so many migrants trying to cross the border and “invade” the US, or is it some sort of combination of the two to see migrants come into the country?

The quotes below were from video 16 and they are said by man his name is not known:

“We just grabbed some more”

“Once we detain them. What happens is that we wait for the other truck because they’re coming so fast.”

“These ones are dressed nice. They got their suitcases all packed ready to come to America.”

“We are catching them over here”

“When you talk about how many people are coming through here its just unbelievable. It just doesn’t stop”

“We can stop some of the people we think have criminal records or might have some association to terrorism”

“We should close the borders who don’t come here legally”

“This truly is a crisis.”

“We are just trying to get the message out here”

“It’s a war out here man. Its a border war.”

“we’re in a hot spot for drug trafficking. This is hot spot for human trafficking, sex trafficking, all kinds of trafficking all the reasons we talk about that we need more wall everybody says oh the wall doesn’t work this is proof the wall works”

A common thread I found in video 16 and in video 15 is how they speak of the migrants: “We just grabbed some more” and “We are catching them over here”. The phrasing of this statement alludes the migrants to an animal or an object (video 16). How can you “grab” or “catch” a human? This language is not only used by this man but used in border patrol policies such as “catch and release”; they are “catching” humans and “releasing” them as if humans are some sort of wild animal. The theme of the migrants being equated to animals contributes to the construction of the “illegal alien” who is after all a less than human species. In addition to this framing, the man constructs the migrants as criminals in the video. The framing of the migrants as criminal was done by description of the location, he was in. The location is described as an open road where the cartel and coyotes bring the migrants, traffic drugs, and people. Furthermore, the man said, “We can stop some of the people we think have criminal records or might have some association to terrorism” (video 16). The man is using the possibility of drug trafficking and human

trafficking to urge people to realize there is a crisis at the border and there needs to be a wall to prevent people and drugs coming in.

These are just a few comments he made in video 16 about the migrants and what is occurring at the border.

“we just detained two illegals”

“this is a crisis guys”

“this is a very dangerous border”

“they are coming in by the thousands”

“its like the wild west out here”

The man’s statements in this video echoes the very same statements that She Wolf made in video 15. It is playing into the fears of the “invasion” of the “illegal aliens”, again solidifying that the migrants are unwanted, and that the reality of the border is dangerous. This helps support UCP’s argument for more border security and a wall to keep out the “illegals” because if we do not do this, they will wreak havoc in towns and cities whether this may be by taking away resources from American citizens or committing violent crimes on American citizens. Nevins asserts the usage of “illegal” is a rather recent term used in public discourse. It first began to appear after 1950 in a database of judicial decisions. Nevins states “Language has a power of its own” (96). Nevins refers to Hugh Mehan who notes the language used in public discourse influences how we come to perceive certain events and people and as a result affects our behaviors toward it (96).

The figure of the “illegal alien” is pervasive and necessary for the UCP, Crusius, and other reporters/media personalities to promote dark times rhetoric. The formation of this figure floats in their words and is attention grabbing as something to fear. The

“illegal alien” is a criminal and a scapegoat ready to be used for whatever agenda by the actors in the data.

The Immigrant Child

Figure 2 emerged from the data collected on the UCP live stream videos. The UCP use figure 2 to create support for the need of a border wall and overall better border security. Below, I detail the ways the UCP have created the figure of the immigrant child to gain support for their activities at the border as well as urge for more resources to be allocated to border security. I do not try to contest or support the information given by the UCP, rather my focus is on examining what is being said and the purpose of it.

“look at all the children”

“This is right here in base camp, a man with a little child-together”

“Look at the men with the little children”

The above quotes were taken from video 15, the viral video, and were said by She Wolf. During this part of the video, She Wolf is calling attention to all the children that were detained along with the adult migrants. She Wolf begins to note the children accompanying the adult men, and these kinds of statements invite speculation of why there is a man with a child; this apparent caretaking position of man and child is challenged. She Wolf challenges the accompaniment more with the men than with the women who also have accompanying children. She Wolf does not say anything about these men being predators or coyotes but the mere juxtaposition of the children with men is enough to begin speculation by the viewer. Later in video 15, She Wolf claims the adult migrants are gripping the children’s wrist hard and speculates the kids are not theirs because of the “tight” grip. This again invites speculation by the viewers to question the

intentions of the adult migrants with migrant children. Here, we begin to see the figure of the immigrant child forming as a person to be concerned about their welfare.

The following quote is from video 17 said by an unnamed white man: “you got little girls being brought up here raped *along the way*, kids being abused, people being murdered.”. The narrative of the immigrant child as abused and exploited begins to form by the rhetoric of UCP members. Here, the narrative is portraying the border as a dangerous place where a vast amount of crime is occurring such as human trafficking and sexual abuse. Additionally, the placement of the “illegal alien” as the criminal begins to occur here as well because of the implications of the criminality of the migrants that travel with the children. In the quote, the unnamed man said “along the way” suggesting the migrants that that travel with the children are harming the little girls.

Anthony, a Latinx man, said the following quote: “These people do not give a damn about their kids seriously. Little kids sliding off the rocks right here right now.” (video 4b). Anthony is claiming the adult migrants in the video are mishandling the children that are accompanying them. Anthony claims the adult migrants are forcefully grabbing the children and pushing them down a rocky slope. Here, we continue to see the portrayal of the adult migrants as unfit caretakers and alluding to the criminal alien, for seemingly not caring about the welfare of the migrant children.

You can see how cold blooded these people are. These children are not their children that’s why they do that. They don’t care but, they, the border patrol was pretty upset over it. We were pretty upset over it. And the hardest part is we have to watch it and we can’t do anything about it and border patrol is doing what they can. This is the reason we don’t want these people here. You got to support that

wall folks. You got to support the wall this wall may not stop all of them, but it will stop 90% of it. (video 4b)

In the excerpt above, Anthony continues the “rhetoric of fear” by claiming the migrants are “cold blooded” because the children were sliding down a rocky slope (Correa-Cabrera and Garrett, 245-246). Moreover, Anthony claims the children are not the adult migrant’s children because of the adults put the children in danger by having them slide down the rocky embankment. Anthony uses this endangerment as a segue into arguing for the wall. This is a common theme in the UCP live stream videos, they will describe the dangers of the migrants “flooding” the border and use it to back up their argument for a border.

It shows how *cold blooded* these people are that’s coming into our country *they don’t care* about those children. (emphasis added)

The above quote is from video 4, Horton refers to the migrants as “cold blooded” and “they don’t care” about the children accompanying them in the videos. The narrative the leader of the UCP uses is constructing the migrants as cold-hearted criminals with no care for children. According to the statements Horton has said, he believes the migrants are exploiting children to get into the country. This ideology is reinforcing Horton’s beliefs that the UCP’s work is necessary and will continue until more border security is achieved. If you recall in video 4, this narrative of the concern for the children is carried throughout that livestream.

The UCP’s rhetoric positions the migrant children as victims by the adult migrant, the “illegal alien”, who is as a predator/criminal. In western society, children are seen as “fragile” or a “problem to be solved” thus they need to be protected or

controlled/governed (Malkki, 81; Royer, 55; Roche, 477). Children are viewed as human but not as a person with their own agency and autonomy. Children are placed outside of complex histories, politics, borders, racisms, and cultural identities (Malkki, 65). Since western society carries the view that children “need” to be protected and have no self autonomy (Malkki, 81; Royer, 55; Roche, 477), the UCP addresses the child migrants in such a manner. Horton describes “kids they were literally dragging them by the arm” (video 4). Already what this framing is doing is positioning the children as helpless and at the mercy of the adult “illegal aliens”. Horton uses what he views as mishandling or even exploitation of migrant children as dangerous and places “a forceful grabbing of the child” as a character trait of the adult migrant. This allows for the further condemnation of the “illegal alien”. It propels his argument overall that there is a need for a wall at the border and that there is a need for him and the UCP to be at the US-Mexico border. Overall, Horton whether knowingly or not cleverly positions his argument by using the pervasive western discourse of “innocent and helpless” children to argue for a border wall in order to “save/protect” migrant children from exploitation and most importantly to protect the US from invaders.

This figure is important to understand because it is used as a discursive practice that reflects, produces, and embodies anti-immigrant rhetoric. The immigrant child is used to propel fear of “illegal aliens” and their criminality while under guise of “protecting” migrant children from being “exploited”. This savior mentality is discussed in depth in figure 4 as well. Similarly, as US politicians use the “rhetoric of fear” to promote stricter immigration policies and a heavily militarized border, the UCP use the immigrant child as a figure to continue that “rhetoric of fear” the fear of what will happen

to the exploited children (Correa-Cabrera and Garrett, 245-246). To justify the UCP's actions and continue the argument for a wall, the UCP uses possible endangerment of the migrant children to argue their position. The danger the UCP speaks of migrant children facing are not by the US citizens but rather the migrants that accompany them.

The Spectator

The spectator is an interesting figure because it is where we see the audience come to life through the discussion held by the news media reporters/ media personalities, the UCP, and through JLP's callers. I cover the ways the news media reporter's discussion of the UCP and Crusius bring about the spectator and how the discussion in the UCP live stream videos also create layered forms of the spectator. The purpose of the figure is to show the embodiment of the audience and the way the embodiment of this figure shifts depending on who/what is discussed; for example, the discussion of the El Paso shooter differs from the discussion by the UCP.

In video 5, the figure of the spectator begins to form through Franchi's viewing of a clip from the UCP's viral video. He watches captivated and comments on the clip as if looking at a virtual human zoo with his "Oooing" and "Awwweeing". Franchi's continues with comments like "wow" and "look at 'em all", these comments are similar to the reactions of the UCP members when detaining migrants. If you recall, in video 4, Laurie was "absolutely in awe" when she saw the viral video. A sense of pleasure seemingly reverberates from Franchi's reaction to the video and reinforces the migrants as less than human.

Laurie from Atomic News in response to seeing both videos 4a & 4b in live stream:

the first video was probably some of *the best footage* that I have seen yet down there... I was just *absolutely in awe* the whole time about what's going on down there...seeing Anthony's video that was the first video I've seen from him today *so I'm excited to go back and rewatch* that on a bigger screen and with a little more detail that was some pretty serious stuff. (emphasis added)

In video 4, Laurie is given a chance to speak and gives her impression of the two videos. From the excerpt above, Laurie's reaction is soaked in excitement as seen from her usage of "best footage I've seen" to wanting to rewatch the second video (4b) on a "bigger screen and with a little more detail". There is pleasure and happiness felt by the UCP members from these kinds of videos. This is once again placing migrants as the less human subjects. They are objects of entertainment yet at the same time reinforcing the migrants as criminals. This was done specifically by Commander Horton in his response to Laurie.

In video 4, Horton states he wanted to congratulate She Wolf on the live stream (she did not attend the live stream) because she recorded the viral video and posted it online. Horton states the video received 50,000 shares and this was celebrated amongst the UCP members because their goal is to reach as many people as possible about what is happening at the border. According to Horton, She Wolf was in awe because her video became viral. Horton's retelling of his previous exchange with She Wolf showed a sense of pride in She Wolf's video, which is once again reinforcing the pleasure they take from detaining migrants but also the attention they receive from it.

Spectatorship takes a different turn when it comes to discussing the El Paso shooting as we see from JLP. The below quotations are said by JLP in video 12:

“Amazing! (pause) Seeing that work”

“Did you know its so weird to me to see, its amazing to me seeing Americans running when they go shopping or now they’re in crowded place now they cant relax”

The way JLP comments on the video clips of the El Paso shooting is strange because he does not outright condemn Crusius actions immediately after seeing the clips. Rather, he says “Amazing!” this almost ambiguous response to the shooting is troubling because he does not outwardly denounce the violence. Instead, JLP focuses on the “amazingness” of seeing Americans not being able to relax when shopping. JLP becomes the spectator in this scenario of watching the clips and almost seems to indulge in Crusius actions. From the data I gathered, JLP does not seem to outright condemn Crusius but rather blame his actions from receiving anger from his mother. This misogynist explanation is applied to Crusius but also to Black people (video 11). JLP argues that constant attacking of white men has led to “white guys... overreacting” (video 11). This oversimplification of Crusius actions is troubling because it dismisses any other possible explanation for his actions and even dismisses Crusius own reasonings for committing an atrocity.

A caller calls out JLP’S justification of Crusius violent actions to which he retorts with his own understanding of anger being passed on from mother to child. JLP even argues that a bigger issue is the lack of attention on Black shooters, the caller contests this argument, but JLP argues to the caller “why don’t you go off the truth rather than face the facts... only blind people go off of facts you need to go off of reality.” (video 11). The shift between discussing the El Paso shooter and Black shooters is strange in that JLP (a

Black man) would rather visibly condemn Black shooters than white shooters. In this way, JLP contributes to a common racial trope of Black people being criminals.

Franchi, JLP, and the UCP are engaging with the UCP when viewing videos of the migrants at the border. They are commenting on what they see, meanwhile I and others who are watching these videos are all engaging in spectatorship. Furthermore, the people like the callers for JLP and live stream viewers for UCP are engaging with them in a communal spectatorship. An audience is brought into being when the callers/ live stream viewers engage with JLP and the UCP. A call and response is formed, an audience is brought into being, and they take pleasure in sharing racist tropes. The figure of the spectator demonstrates how the text is produced and becomes constant and fluid in its circularity. The videos are the text and within each video there is a form of spectatorship occurring through the reporters/media personalities commenting on the El Paso shooting and the UCP. The viewers of these videos either engage directly with the creators of these videos or engage through the comments, thus the audience produces another layer of text/spectatorship within the videos. I, too, contribute to the circularity of the text/spectatorship by engaging with it in this thesis through this figure.

This figure is necessary to understand because of its fluid nature, the way spectatorship shifts depending on the topic. The main purpose of this figure is to personify the audience and build community. This figure shows how racial tropes are a part of this community building as well as the collective pleasure experienced from viewing violence and participating in the use of racial tropes.

The Patriot or the White Nationalist?

In this section, I argue the division between the patriot and the white nationalist is blurred. Oftentimes, in the UCP live stream videos, they present their work as necessary and “patriotic” because they are defending their country from “invaders”. What I am trying to do in this section is not to differentiate who is a patriot or white nationalist, but rather to explore the murkiness of where these two categories lie. It is there where I explore the similarities between the two and certain tactics used in the gray area of the two. The patriot or white nationalist are figures that are two sides of the same coin.

The UCP is an excellent example of the double-sided coin, after all their name is the United Constitutional *Patriots*. The UCP rhetoric and actions often blur the line between patriotism and white nationalism, although they would argue their actions and words are more aligned with patriotism. However, I argue much of their rhetoric and actions link to white nationalism as well. Overall, the rhetoric used by most of the reporters/media personalities use patriotic language and white nationalistic language. I use Kimmel’s definitions of white supremacist ideals to narrow the white nationalistic rhetoric used by these US news media outlets. Patriotism is shared sentiment among these reporters/media personalities, but when does that patriotism become enveloped with white nationalism? The data suggests that patriotic language and white nationalistic language are used in ways that support each other. The reporters/media personalities themselves may view their rhetoric as white nationalistic, however as I cite Kimmel below, they use similar tactics. Masculinity plays an interesting role in propelling rhetoric of fear of the other. The UCP, JLP, Crusius, Hannity, and Franchi consistently use dark times rhetoric to promote fear of the “illegal alien”.

Kimmel states white supremacist ideological visions in the US consists of three components: they are pro-capitalists but are anti-corporations, they are extremely patriotic, however that does not mean they like the current US government, and believe they are entitled to inherent the “real America” (252-254). What is the “real” America exactly but a glorified version of white America, an ideal nation that the UCP, Crusius, JLP, Franchi and others alike aspire for. Consistently throughout the data, these actors dream of their envisioned America and how current America is far gone from their ideal America. The “real” America is a white America that unquestionably privileges the whites and restores America to its former glory where the little guy still mattered, small business was supported by the government, the middle-class wages were livable, patriarchal values are the unquestioned norm, racialized people were still in the minority, the government still protected its people from “invaders” and most importantly conservative white American ideals/politics remained at the forefront etc. The idealized version of America appears a little different depending on the person and can be more extreme than others.

For example, JLP when expressing his distaste for the ACLU, declares they are “Anti-American” because they “put the illegal alien before the American citizens” (video 1). JLP takes issue with the ACLU because of their public complaint of the UCP’s leader, Hopkins, detaining migrants illegally, which led to his arrest. JLP publicly supports the UCP for their border actions because he states the US is being “invaded” by “illegals”. Additionally, JLP takes issue with the ACLU blaming Trump for the El Paso shooting and other white nationalist actions. In video 12, JLP calls Trump “The Great White Hope”, a signal that JLP views Trump as the white savior of America. In JLP’s allyship

with Trump, JLP's rhetoric alludes to a time when America was "truly great". Not only does JLP express his distaste for current America he states, "things are never gonna get better in this country or around the world until men return to the natural state of being" (video 12). Misogyny and heteropatriarchy join in his rhetoric in addition to his patriotic devotion to his ideal America. JLP states in video 12:

"Evil at work, I want my country back and its only going to come back to order, we gotta bring men back to the natural state of being."

"We got to vote out these wicked politicians you need to keep your kids out of public schools public universities and places like that and men need to take over their families again."

JLP is a Christian preacher, and his reclaiming of manhood may very well stem from his Christian beliefs and conservative views. Ironically, Kimmel writes the Ku Klux Klan had similar sentiments. The KKK had "reclamation[s] of southern manhood" and linked this to their Christian beliefs (259). Kimmel states many contemporary white supremacists use masculinity to "delegitimize and discredit the other" a common tactic used in the JLP's rhetoric (260). The reason this is of significance is because this is important in the framing of what JLP's "real" America is— a patriarchal white America which is ironic considering JLP is a Black man.

Masculinity plays a large role in anti-immigrant rhetoric and does so in ways that are not always obvious. For example, in video 3, Preacher states:

The president... threatened to place all of these illegal aliens in sanctuary cities only which was rather interesting...the only problem I'd have with it is that these people would still be in this country beating off the system.

Hypermasculine rhetoric of the “other” (i.e., the illegal alien) is used to describe what the “illegal aliens” would do to the US system, in other words, Preacher is concerned migrants will take advantage of the services and resources provided in the US. In video 15, She Wolf says “They are a lot more aggressive. They stormed the southern border”. This statement is directly hypermasculinizing the migrants by calling them “aggressive” and therefore inferring the “other”, the migrant man, is uncivilized and out of control.

Kimmel states anti-illegal-immigration protesters use similar rhetorical tactics to Nazis promoting genocide. As Kimmel writes, immigrants are described as “a ‘cancer’ threatening the healthy body from within, a foreign invading army, threatening from outside—often both.” (53). The connection between the white supremacist vision and anti-immigration groups is the shared sense of aggrieved entitlement. Aggrieved entitlement is defined as the feeling of being entitled to “positions of unchallenged dominance” and when the angry white men do not receive such positions, they become angry (Kimmel, 21). Kimmel states the anger that American white men experience is defensive and reactionary anger in which “it seeks to restore, to retrieve, to reclaim something that is perceived to have been lost” (21). Angry white men want to regain what was lost and “look to the past for their imagined and desired future” (Kimmel, 21). JLP in video 1, shows support to the UCP’s actions. He says:

I’ve always thought that citizens have a right to protect themselves and their country that’s one of the reasons for the second amendment...the militia temporarily arrested illegal aliens about a way of citizens arrest that’s normal that’s America!

The above quote by JLP demonstrates a sense of aggrieved entitlement. JLP's statement expresses aggrieved entitlement through his sympathies with the UCP's exercising citizen's arrest. In his justification of the UCP, JLP's evocation of his desired America engages in the "real" America rhetoric. The "real" America is an idealized vision of the US expressed by multiple reporters/media personalities in the data. The UCP is undoubtedly in a position of dominance when detaining migrants and simply by patrolling the border. Their whole reason to patrolling the US-Mexico border is a defensive and reactionary response because they seek to reclaim their US from "illegal aliens".

Kimmel states angry white men engage in us-them framing. The "us" or the "we" are the angry white men or in their eyes the "enlightened few" who are trying to restore American men to their manhood and their entitlement to positions of power and the "them" is "illegals", "feminazis", and the government that is "screwing them over" etc. (42-51). One of the strategies Kimmel states angry white men engage in is exclusion. The exclusion is to preserve manhood by purposefully arguing for the exclusion of certain groups to "minimize the competition and maintain the opportunities that white men had earlier" (51).

In video 4b, Anthony says:

Assault on country and sovereignty continues here comes a group of *illegals* running into the bushes over here...there they go like roaches. They run out of everywhere like roaches. Look at that.

You can see how cold blooded these people are. These children are not their children that's why they do that. They don't care but, they, the border patrol was

pretty upset over it. We were pretty upset over it. And the hardest part is we have to watch it and we can't do anything about it and border patrol is doing what they can. This is the reason we don't want these people here. You got to support that wall folks. You got to support the wall this wall may not stop all of them, but it will stop 90% of it.

Anthony in the quotes above is declaring that the migrants entering the country “illegally” are committing “*Assault on country and sovereignty*”. This both engages in rhetoric that hypermasculinizes the migrants but also engages in rhetorical tactics of presenting migrants as cancerous. In addition, Anthony engages in the rhetoric that hypermasculinizes migrants as presenting them as violent exploiters of children. Anthony is also framing his rhetoric using an us-them framework to show how the migrants are sub-human for their treatment of children and comparing them to a pest. He then presents his actions as necessary and argues for the need for a wall.

The following quote was said by Franchi in video 5:

Unbelievable look at all those people this what happens when the US government doesn't even uphold its most basic commitment to the American people to secure the borders from *invaders* there is a crisis going on at the US-Mexico border and the democrats and activist judges are fighting president trump at every turn if you ask me those people those activist judges those democrats are *traitors* to America they should be treated as such. In March alone over 100,000 illegal aliens were detained by US border patrol the Cornery reports over 1.5 million illegal aliens will enter the United States in 2019. If the surge continues at the current rate, then what happens when they all have children the numbers will just multiple.

This quote draws on one of Kimmel's white supremacist ideological visions here by stating what America is not. Franchi's America is not a nation where the government disregards the safety of its people, it is not a place where we question a sitting president (i.e., a conservative white president), it is not a place where any "illegal alien" would be allowed to enter because that may lead to unwanted procreation of these racialized "illegal aliens". Franchi is a white American and loves his America, but he does not love "illegal" brown individuals invading his beloved America. Franchi despises the democrats and the government overall for allowing "illegal migrants" to enter the glorious USA, and those who support the "invasion" are anti-American. This aggrieved entitlement to America is necessary in creating an us-them framework because Franchi belongs to the group of "the enlightened few".

Michael Kimmel's discusses the angry white men who are predominantly present on radio with the purpose to "preserve the dominance of American white men" (38). Kimmel states these Angry white men like Rush Limbaugh have utilized victimhood in their rhetoric and morphed victimization which is seen as a "feminine trope" and have made it masculine. The victimhood at play here is that your masculinity is at stake (40).

The following excerpt is a dialogue held between JLP and the staff of JLP in video 9 in which they discuss the victimization of whites:

JLP: "What is a White supremacist?"

Joel: "I don't really even know somebody who is apparently racist and wants to control all the other colors and is in power"

JLP: "who the democratic party? Is the democratic party a white supremacist party?"

JLP: “by their definition...because they are the ones that want to control everybody with free stuff”

Nick: [answers the 1st question] “a white racist...someone who is white and wants things to only be white”

JLP: “but who are they where are they?”

Nick: “I have an idea of what people want me to believe it is, but are there other types of supremacists are there Asian supremacists, Black supremacists?”

Jake: [answers the 1st question] “It’s a slur against whites... not just whites but against truth tellers. Truth telling whites and you too because you are labelled by media matter types as a white supremacist. A Black white supremacist. And that is somebody who in reality somebody who is telling the truth on the attack on whites. And the fact that this is a white rich made country and that it should stay that way, but in their minds their saying we think that whites are superior to other races and that’s why that we should remain a white majority country.”

[After a clip of Trump’s speech on the El Paso and Dayton shooting is shown]

JLP: “That wasn’t him... that doesn’t sound like Trump”

JLP: “I didn’t understand why he used the word white supremacist”

Jake: “The real racists slash white supremacist are the people that call people that when you call someone that you take away their humanity it’s the worst thing you can be called and your no longer human and its okay to punch a Nazi... racists... take away other peoples humanity by calling them racist so called but it the people who call the people racist that are guilty of taking away the so called racist humanity.”

[Later in the same video]

Jake: “when they call Trump a white supremacist, they are dehumanizing him...so its okay to hate him and punch his supporters”

Jake: “fear mongering about whites”

The discussion between JLP and the staff is very interesting because they are actively discussing what is a white supremacist, and while there is an acknowledgement of white supremacy there is still a somewhat denial of white supremacy and the consequences of it. Jake, for example, argues the term white supremacist is a slur to whites, a notion made with full conviction. Jake argues when calling a white person, a white supremacist they are being dehumanized and the white person’s outcries are not being heard. The most noteworthy result from this conversation is not their discussion on what a white supremacist is but rather what they take away from calling a white person a white supremacist. Jake’s rhetoric garners sympathy for the plight of the whites, or at least the truth telling whites. He wants there to be a restoration of humanity in those called racists, white supremacists, Nazis, Trump, and Trump supporters. Jake, and the tacit support from the JLP staff, use victimhood and the idealized America to argue why white supremacists are just truth tellers who “is telling the truth on the attack on whites. And the fact that this is a white rich made country and that it should stay that way” (Jake, video 9).

Crusius’s manifesto and his actions are exemplary of when patriotism becomes white nationalism. If you recall from earlier, Kimmel highlights three white supremacist ideological visions, one of them being pro-capitalist but anti-corporation. Crusius expresses in his manifesto his distaste for corporations. Although it is not clear if he is

pro-capitalist, he makes several arguments that he is against corporations because they use “illegal” migrants for low skilled labor work. Furthermore, Crusius argues that it is because of corporations that our environment is being destroyed, and he says the government does not deal with corporations because “they are owned by corporations”. Although he does outwardly criticize the American government and lifestyle, he still “can’t bring myself [himself] to kill my fellow Americans”. He does not explain why he cannot bring himself to kill Americans. I argue it is because there is a sense of loyalty, or in other words patriotism, towards American citizens, or more precisely white citizens, because he later explains he is against race mixing and racial diversity. He deems his actions as necessary because he is saving America thus reifying his patriotism to the US.

Although Crusius may not personally categorize himself as a racist or white supremacist his manifesto and actions do align with white supremacist ideals and consequently racism. He clearly aligns himself with white supremacist ideals in his support for the Christchurch shooter and citing The Great Replacement for his reasoning for choosing Hispanics as his targets. Additionally, Crusius shares a sense of aggrieved entitlement so much that he was propelled to “defend” his country from Hispanics and reclaim the US. Crusius’s atrocious act of violence is justified in his eyes as necessary to “defend” his country from “cultural and ethnic replacement”.

In UCP’s live stream videos, the UCP members consistently argue the need for a border wall, and they will continue to defend the US-Mexico border until there is better border security. They use the anxieties of white men to instill fear into the audience by stating the southern border is being “invaded” and there is a “crisis” at the border. Kimmel argues these angry white men, in this case the UCP, use masculinity to instill

these fears. Kimmel writes “the fear that “they” are taking over is an insult to “our” manhood—for they will take our jobs, our homes, and our women if we are not vigilant.” (57). This is the case with the UCP and JLP, who use similar tactics in their rhetoric. Crusius, I argue, fell victim to the fear rhetoric of dark times, his anxieties were tapped into and because of his aggrieved sense of entitlement he killed innocent people. Crusius and the UCP are examples of what happens when white men’s patriotism and anxieties fall prey to dark times rhetoric: they commit violence in defense of their beloved USA.

It seems the data provides an abundance of evidence on how truly murky the area between patriotism and white nationalism is; there are a lot of commonalities the two share and because of that it seems the two are a double-faced coin. The two are enveloped in each other but do they both need to exist in order for one of them to exist or can they exist without the other? This thesis does not answer this question, but it should be explored in further research. What unites the double-faced coin is the tactics/feelings used to sort of promote both, such as using masculinity to motivate the patriot to act on his country’s behalf. Aggrieved entitlement is necessary to act, dark times rhetoric is needed to convince others that the US is under attack, and lastly the idealized version of your America is needed an object to protect. All these components are what lie in the murky area of the two. To conclude, my argument is that the line between patriotism and white nationalism is so blurred and the division of who is who is irrelevant because Crusius and UCP both see their violent actions as patriotic, as a form of self preservation, as a form of protecting their America. The question then becomes how far does a patriot go to protect their idealized version of America?

“America has got to stand up” (video 9, JLP)

America stand up!

*Your whites and sympathetic non-whites are requesting action to defend our borders
from invaders.*

I recoil in disgust and pain.

They get to loudly claim this is not their America and they want it back!

Well, guess what this is not your land, and you are not the only angry ones.

I AM ANGRY TOO! I AM AN ANGRY MEXICANA!

I, too, am unsatisfied with the state of this country.

*I loathe the US for its destructive ways and genocidal history, there is nothing pleasant
about the formation of the US and I do not take any pride in it.*

*I am not proud to be an American, it fills me with great shame, and I am not sure if I
could ever love such a country.*

I am ANGRY knowing how racialized peoples have been treated in this country.

I am ANGRY because my people have been attacked since the formation of this country.

*I am ANGRY at Crusius and the UCP for continuing the perpetuation of violence against
mi gente¹⁴.*

I am ANGRY at the dehumanizing rhetoric used to describe my people.

Mi herida y la herida en la frontera sigue abierto porque la violencia sigue a mi gente.¹⁵

¹⁴ Translation: my people

¹⁵ Translation: My wound and the wound at the border continues to be open because the violence continues against my people.

The “Monster”

In my examination of the data, the consistent theme I found across the video coverage of El Paso is that they refer to Crusius as “evil”, a “deranged killer”, “psychopath”, and “disgusting monster” (video 8, video 13, video 14). The rhetoric used to describe Crusius creates the figure of the monster. In this section, I use examples from the data to show how this figure is built and the importance of it.

“We are not going to let one bad individual come mess everything up for our city”

- (Police Officer Gutierrez, video 7)

The anti-illegal-immigration media uses the “monster” figure, which is in line with the rhetoric of the “bad apple” or the “one bad individual”, rather than connecting Crusius’s actions/words to a larger movement/discourse of empowered white men or white nationalism. The “monster” figure begins to form with the assertion that the shooter is “one bad individual”. Crusius’s actions here only represent himself and there is no critical investigation on his motivations. Crusius may have not been directly connected with a white nationalist group thus his actions can be seen as solo; however, this does not mean his atrocities were done as a “lone wolf” since his words connected him to the “Great Replacement theory”. Crusius wrote he targeted Hispanics because of this white supremacist theory, therefore his actions and rhetoric can at least partly have been derived from white supremacy/nationalism.

Hannity in video 8 referred to Crusius and the Dayton shooter as:

Disgusting monster people, sick evil agenda, that carry out these heinous acts, they deserve to rot in hell, like many of you I am disgusted as we are all

Americans, when acts of evil are perpetrated against our family members our American family, we have a right to be upset and demand we fix the problem. Hannity explicitly calls Crusius and the Dayton shooter “disgusting monsters”, demonstrating the name calling and the casting of Crusius as the “other” a form of branding, as he committed an act of “evil” against “our” American family. Hannity, here, is in engaging with the “bad apple” rhetoric by casting Crusius as a “monster”, a form of branding. Wingard explains branding is a form of neoliberal rhetorical practice that “cultivates an ethos that allows the U.S. public to identify and make choices within a given set of circumstances.” (2). Branding is effective at “mystify[ing] the structural dimension to any social problem or event” (Wingard, 2). By Hannity and other media reporters/personalities framing Crusius as “evil” or a “bad individual”, they are making Crusius exceptional and in the mystification of Crusius’s actions they are eliciting “emotional responses” to the violence “not analytical ones” (Wingard, 2-3). Wingard argues the branding is used to show how the “bad apple” rhetoric creates them to be the exception through isolation and this is an example of neoliberal rhetorical practice.

“Deranged killers”

“Evil in both cases”

“Both hate filled psychopaths”

“There have been hateful evil monsters on all sides of the political spectrum”

The quotes above were said by Hannity in video 8; the sentiments above were echoed in many of the El Paso videos I have gathered and again they continue to brand Crusius through rhetoric that demonizes and vilifies him. Thus, they help to construct the figure of the “monster”. Wingard states branding creates a simplified image of a person

based on their actions/behaviours. Their actions become representative of them, thus the image created elicits “sympathetic *or* revolting” reactions to the individual; in Crusius’s case the image created elicits a revolted reaction (Wingard, 8). This continues the perpetuation of the media reporters/personalities discussing the shooting with emotional responses rather than analytic ones. This, then, forgoes any responsibility placed on the state and rather reaffirms institutionalized state violence as necessary to deal with the deviant behavior (Wingard, 20). An effect of branding Crusius as a “monster” is that the deaths of Crusius’s victims become “rationalized to maintain the rule of law” thus rationalizing the atrocious violence to define boundaries between citizens and deviant citizens (Wingard, 21).

In video 14, Trump echoed similar statements to Hannity and referred to Crusius as “a wicked man”. Trump describes the El Paso shooting as follows:

These barbaric slaughters are an assault upon our communities, an attack upon our nation, and a crime against all of humanity. We are outraged and sickened by this monstrous evil the cruelty the hatred the malice the bloodshed and the terror.

In video 13, McCarthy also stated similar sentiments to Hannity and Trump:

“These monsters that did this based upon evil”

“Whatever their intentions were we know it was based on hate and evil”

As seen from above quotes, a clear pattern of rhetoric has been established, creating an image of an “evil” “monster”, a deviant citizen who is not like “us” and hurts “our American family”. The anti-illegal-immigration news media sites that I examined do not report or question what circumstances and what systems have bred a shooter like the El Paso shooter. Crusius in his manifesto uses rhetoric that can be traced to nationalist

and white supremacist language. Crusius himself does not believe his actions were racist, but those with racist behavior usually do not identify as such. The purpose of this figure is to identify why this monster rhetoric is being used and if it hides the systematic racism that allows for the existence of these white shooters. I argue it does. Through the individualization of Crusius's actions, he becomes a "bad apple" a "monster", a deviant citizen who does not represent the state. The state therefore takes no responsibility for creating a breeding ground of white male shooters, it is in fact through the necessary condemnation of these "bad apples" do we see the reaffirmation of institutionalized racism because the problem is not the current racist institutions, it is the "bad apple" or "monster" in this case (Wingard, 21).

"hate has no place in America"

- (Trump, video 14)

A fundamental component of the creation of the United States as we know it is hate. Hate is seen in our very laws and hate is seen throughout the history of the founding of the US. You need hate to displace thousands of Indigenous peoples from their lands just as you need hate to murder them. You need hate to enslave millions of Africans and you need hate to lynch and murder them. You need hate to create the Chinese Exclusion Act and you need hate to place Japanese people into concentration camps. So, Trump you are wrong. America does have a place for hate. America thrives on hate. Hate is what has fueled this country for so long. Hate is what empowers its white citizens to commit atrocious acts of violence against Indigenous peoples, Black people, Asian people, Brown people, and other marginalized communities.

Contradictions

There were a few contradictions found in rhetoric amongst the UCP members. Preacher states “I got an itchy trigger finger hahahaha.” (video 3). This statement allows a glimpse into how the members may view the migrants. An “itchy trigger finger” is a disturbing tell tail sign of how some or all UCP members may be at the border to not only “protect their country” but to get a few kicks from threatening and/or harming migrants. This comment made by Preacher contradicts what Commander Horton says in a later video about viewing the migrants as human beings who the UCP themselves do not want to harm. It also contradicts their hiring practices because in another video the UCP claims to want to hire volunteers who are level minded and are not trigger happy (Preacher, video 3).

if they would have decided to gone violent we would all been in a lot of trouble and there would have been a lot of people hurt. This is what we are trying to avoid from happening. *We are trying to give this people their dignity and their respect as far as not being mean to'em.* Anybody knows that *if you react in violence you get reaction in violence...* I know a lot of people say well we outa shoot'em and we outa do this. They *are still human beings* you know they have been lied to our country and I am not standing up for them in a any way...*kids they were literally dragging them by the arm* dragging them and this is very disturbing because we know must of them are not their kids... (Horton, Video 4, emphasis added)

This above excerpt was said by Commander Horton in response to video 4a. There is a verbal acknowledgment here that the migrants are human. Furthermore, Horton is trying to maintain their “dignity” and “respect” by not being “mean” and by not

shooting them as other people have suggested. Horton realizes using violence on the migrants would be a bad idea considering “if you react in violence, you get reaction in violence”. In this response by Horton there is a verbal attempt to reconcile what they are doing with trying to be “humanely” about it. The “humaneness” of it is done so by not being “mean” and not using violence on them like shooting the migrants. However, what is considered as “violence” here is debateable. I continue to reiterate *verbal* attempts because although the humanness of the migrants may be verbally recognized whether it carries to their actions is questionable. Horton attempts to humanize himself and the UCP’s actions as necessary in the “face of evil” (i.e. the migrants). Horton and other members do this consistently across their videos in justifying what they do; they present themselves as good in doing this necessary work in order to protect themselves and their country from “invaders”. The rhetoric of doing “goodness in the face of evil” is where the figure of the patriot emerges. From this excerpt, it is concerning to know there are some people (unsure if it’s from UCP members and/or outsiders) who have told Horton to shoot the migrants. This statement is an acknowledgement that there are others who view the migrants so negatively that their answer would be to shoot them.

Another contradiction found in the rhetoric was in video 17. The unknown white man refers to the two teenage boys that were detained in the video as “cartel kids”. The immediate assumption of the two teen boys as “cartel kids” continues the creation of the narrative of migrants as the dangerous “other”. This is a disruption to the narrative of concern for children and their safety because there is no concern expressed for these two teenage boys. The concern for children possibly ends when they reach adolescence and

then they are marked as an “illegal” which furthers the UCP’s justification of their actions and the need for a wall.

At Home in the Borderlands

Act I

Scene 1

Borderlands. Night.

The cool arid desert sprawls for miles with mountains rising in the distance. The landscape is desolate scattered with a few cacti and hungry night desert animals. In the middle sits a small run-down house with a warm glow emanating from it. Soft laughter can be heard from within. Los atravesados viven juntos en una herida abierta.¹⁶

The 5 figures live together in their broken home seemingly live in somewhat peace with another. The “illegal alien” is the eldest and therefore the most responsible for the little family. The “illegal alien” supports all the other figures. The “illegal alien” coupled with the immigrant child both work to perpetuate a hypermasculine image of the “illegal alien”, the immigrant child is representing the exploited migrant children. The figure of the immigrant child serves to strengthen the fear and the othering of the “illegal alien” because if they are willing to exploit their own children who’s to say what chaos and danger the “illegal alien” will cause for our women and children. Next, the “illegal alien” supports the spectator by being spectated. The spectator is an observer and in order to exist in the data they need to spectate someone. The “illegal alien” becomes the object to be ogled at and comes under scrutiny by the spectator. The spectator’s role then is to

¹⁶ Translation: The *atravesados* live together in an open wound.

objectify the “illegal alien” and other them through their actions. Third, the “illegal alien” supports and is supported by the “patriot or the white nationalist” because the “illegal alien” is, according to the data, the primary target of the “patriot or the white nationalist”. The “patriot or the white nationalist” enjoys living in the shadows and murky waters of the two but the common unifying goal is to get rid of the “illegal alien”. Yet, at the same time, the “patriot or the white nationalist” is afraid of the otherness of the “illegal alien” and waits for a time when they can reclaim the home.

Lastly, the “illegal alien” gets along superbly with the “monster” because they are both narratives of othering, of exclusion, and of scapegoating. They are two narratives that seemingly work differently and do not have any connections but run parallel with one another. The monster is an “individual” who is “evil” and whose actions are in no way connected to the larger whole, and the “illegal alien” is an individual who is criminalized for their actions but is connected to a larger whole, to the migrants “illegally” crossing the border. This is where these two figures work differently. The monster stays an individual and does not pose a larger threat other than their actions meaning once the monster is arrested, they no longer pose a threat to society and their actions end there.

Meanwhile, the “illegal alien” is a figure that is “lurking in the shadows” meaning the illegal alien is an individual that represents the whole. There is always a constant stream of “illegals” entering the US and thus a constant threat. The fear of the “illegal” does not stop even after one is detained and/or deported. Though the figures are applied differently, their use is the same since both are easy forms of labeling. These anti-illegal-immigration news media do not further investigate into the complexities of Crusius and

his political motivations nor do they with the migrants. These figures serve the purpose of simplifying a person and people to their actions and creating a certain image of a person. Their purpose is to distance themselves from the “other” and separate them from the majority; we are not like them, they are not like us, therefore they do not belong. This act of distancing themselves from Crusius and migrants allows the demonization and criminalization of the two because they are no longer human. The dehumanization of the two is important and necessary because this allows for easy conclusions and no investigation by the anti-illegal-immigration media into the complexity of the issues. The “monster” is a designated scapegoat: an individual that is fully blamed and gets casted as a “bad apple”. There is no responsibility taken by any other party for the actions of a “monster”. Therefore, the “monster” is an easy and preferable designation for a person when they commit horrible acts of violence.

Chapter 7: Conclusion – Moving Forward

I argued the anti-illegal-immigration news media coverage of the El Paso shooting and the UCP reflect, produce, and embody anti-immigrant rhetoric as well as portray white nationalist behavior under the guise of patriotism. 5 discursive practices emerged in the data as figures, the “illegal alien”, the immigrant child, the spectator, the “patriot or the white nationalist”, and the “monster”, each one supports or is supported by the “illegal alien”. The 5 figures are interconnected with another and come together to display how these figures are used by the UCP, Crusius, and news media reporters/media personalities to promote their goals which can/have led to violence.

The limitations of this research are that a small number of data samples were used. In addition, this research could have benefited more with a section in the literature review on mass shootings as well as a in depth section on the history of the figure of the “illegal alien”. Moreover, my research could be improved on defining patriotism and exploring patriotic history in the US. Future research on this topic should address the blurred division between patriotism and white nationalism. Another area future research should address is Latinx and Black conservatives adopting white nationalistic political views on the topic of immigration. For example, JLP and Anthony both spouted similar rhetoric that sympathized and even promoted patriotic/white nationalistic rhetoric.

The significance of *los atravesados* shows how social imaginaries are used to propel anti-illegal-immigrant and white nationalist goals. The UCP themselves used every figure except the “monster” figure to garner support for their actions, for a border wall, and for more border security. As they spectate the migrants, the UCP paints the migrants as the “illegal alien”, and they paint the image of the immigrant child who is

exploited by the “illegal”. The UCP argues what they are doing is necessary and patriotic because they are defending their country from invaders.

Crusius, on the other hand, is painted as a monster and the rhetoric surrounding his image promotes emotional responses not analytical one there is no scrutiny of who/what led him to do commit mass murder. Meanwhile, in Crusius’s manifesto he implies he is patriotic, and his ideas overtly connect him to white supremacist theories. The media reporters/personalities do not paint Crusius as a patriot, but Crusius does do so and wrote that his mass murder was necessary to defend his country from invaders. Simply put, the significance of the 5 figures is to show how dangerous anti-illegal-immigration/ white nationalistic language is people are willing to commit large acts of violence if it’s for protecting their beloved USA.

The significance of this research is that it is entering the conversation of border violence, white nationalism, and anti-immigrant rhetoric in a unique manner. Since I am an immigrant, myself, who has entered the border “illegally” and has gone through the immigration process. This research project is original and a necessary contribution to the existing literature because I believe it reiterates the danger of anti-immigrant rhetoric and border violence. I hope this research can help reaffirm existing knowledge and help people understand that there needs to be systematic changes made to create overall effective change.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict R. OG, "Introduction" *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, 1991.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands the New Mestiza = La Frontera* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books. (2012).
- Blackbourn, Jessie, McGarrity, Nicola, and Roach, Kent. "Understanding and Responding to Right Wing Terrorism." *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism* 14.3 (2019): 183–190. Web.
- Bhargava, Rajeev. "Overcoming the Epistemic Injustice of Colonialism." *Global policy* 4.4 (2013): 413–417. Web.
- Binder, Matt. "BitChute Welcomes the Dangerous Hate Speech That YouTube Bans." *Mashable*, 14 Dec. 2020, mashable.com/article/what-is-bitchute/.
- "Border Bust: El Paso New Mexico Border Patrol & United Constitutional Patriots." *YouTube*, Atomic News, 9 Mar. 2019, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q5J8tlrrAwo>.
- Borunda, Daniel. "Border Militia Group United Constitutional Patriots Kicked out of Sunland Park, NM, Camp." *El Paso Times*, El Paso Times, 23 Apr. 2019, www.elpasotimes.com/story/news/2019/04/22/united-constitutional-patriots-militia-kicked-out-new-mexico-camp/3543335002/.
- Cabrera, Luis, and Glavac, Sonya. "Minutemen and Desert Samaritans: Mapping the Attitudes of Activists on the United States' Immigration Front Lines." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 36, no. 4, Taylor & Francis Group, Apr. 2010, pp. 673–95, doi:10.1080/13691830903531967.

Calafell, Bernadette. "Rhetorics of Possibility: Challenging the Textual Bias of Rhetoric through the Theory of the Flesh." *Rhetorica in Motion*, edited by K. J. Rawson and Eileen E. Schell, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010, p. 104–117, doi: 10.2307/j.ctt5vkff8.11.

Castañeda, Heide, and Milena A Melo. "Geographies of Confinement for Immigrant Youth: Checkpoints and Immobilities Along the US/Mexico Border: Geographies of Confinement." *Law & policy* 41.1 (2019): 80–102. Web.

Charlton, Laretta. "What Is the Great Replacement?" *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 6 Aug. 2019, www.nytimes.com/2019/08/06/us/politics/grand-replacement-explainer.html.

"Citizen's Arrest." *Legal Information Institute*, Legal Information Institute, 6 June 2021, https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/citizen's_arrest.

Correa-Cabrera, Guadalupe, and Garrett, Terence M. "The Phenomenology of Perception and Fear: Security and the Reality of the US-Mexico Border." *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, vol. 29, no. 2, Routledge, Apr. 2014, pp. 243–55, doi:10.1080/08865655.2014.915700.

Crawford, Ilene. "Growing Routes: Rhetoric as the Study and Practice of Movement." *Rhetorica in Motion*, edited by K.J. Rawson and Eileen E. Schell, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010, p. 71–85, doi: 10.2307/j.ctt5vkff8.9.

Crusius, Patrick. "The Inconvenient Truth". Aug. 2019. <https://randallpacker.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/The-Inconvenient-Truth.pdf>

Danner, Chas. "Everything We Know About the El Paso Walmart

Massacre.” *Intelligencer*, 7 Aug. 2019,
 nymag.com/intelligencer/2019/08/everything-we-know-about-the-el-paso-
 walmart-shooting.html.

Davies, Margaret. “Home and State: Reflections on Metaphor and Practice.” *Griffith Law Review*, vol. 23, no. 2, 2014, pp. 153–175.,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10383441.2014.962447>.

Denhart, Matthew. Third ed., pp. 1–257, *America’s Advantage: A Handbook on Immigration and Economic Growth*, gwbccenter.imgix.net/Resources/gwbi-
 americas-advantage-immigration-handbook-2017.pdf.

Edelman, Lee et al. “The Future Is Kid Stuff”. *No Future Queer Theory and the Death Drive*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004. Web.

“El Paso Suspect Confesses, Admits to Targeting Mexicans.” *Fox News*, FOX News Network, 9 Aug. 2019, <https://video.foxnews.com/v/6070700481001#sp=show-clips>.

Ewing, Walter. “‘Enemy Territory’: Immigration Enforcement in the US-Mexico Borderlands.” *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, vol. 2, no. 3, Sage Publications, Inc, Sept. 2014, pp. 198–222, doi:10.1177/233150241400200303.

Gerber, Marisa. “For Latinos, a Spanish Word Loaded with Meaning.” *Los Angeles Times*, Los Angeles Times, 1 Apr. 2013, www.latimes.com/local/la-xpm-2013-apr-01-la-me-latino-labels-20130402-story.html.

Gonzalez, Irina. “Most People Don't Know What the Term ‘Latinx’ Means, a Recent Survey Suggests.” *Oprah Magazine*, 6 Oct. 2020,
www.oprahmag.com/life/a28056593/latinx-meaning/.

“Great Replacement Theory.” *Counter Extremism Project*, 3 Oct. 2020,
www.counterextremism.com/content/great-replacement-theory.

“Hannity: Media Ignoring Gun Violence in Chicago, Baltimore, Detroit.” *Fox News*,
 Fox News Network, 6 Aug. 2019,
<https://video.foxnews.com/v/6068389156001#sp=showclips>.

Hopkins, Anna. “Border Security Should Be Left up to the Experts, Vigilantes Need to
 Follow the Law: Border Patrol Council Official.” *Fox News*, FOX News Network,
 22 Apr. 2019, [https://www.foxnews.com/us/border-security-armed-vigilantes-
 patrol](https://www.foxnews.com/us/border-security-armed-vigilantes-patrol).

Karma, Allen, “Why domestic terror designation in El Paso shooting likely won't result in
 terrorism charges”. ABC News Network, 6 Aug. 2019,
[abcnews.go.com/Politics/domestic-terror-designation-el-paso-shooting-result-
 terrorism/story?id=64777184](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/domestic-terror-designation-el-paso-shooting-result-terrorism/story?id=64777184).

“Kevin McCarthy Touts First Responders in El Paso Shooting.” *YouTube*, Fox News,
 Aug. 2019, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vz9p6CpAIT4>.

Kimmel, Michael. *Angry White Men: American Masculinity at the End of an Era*. Bold
 Type Books, 2019.

Larsen, Solana. “The Anti-Immigration Movement: From Shovels to Suits.” *NACLA
 Report on the Americas* (1993), vol. 40, no. 3, Routledge, May 2007, pp. 14–18,
[doi:10.1080/10714839.2007.11722307](https://doi.org/10.1080/10714839.2007.11722307).

- Lavandera, Ed, and Jason Hanna. "El Paso Suspect Told Police He Was Targeting Mexicans, Affidavit Says." *CNN*, Cable News Network, 9 Aug. 2019, www.cnn.com/2019/08/09/us/el-paso-shooting-friday.
- Leach, Joan. "Rhetorical Analysis." *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2000. Web.
- Lorde, Audre. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Crossing Press, 2007.
- Lua, Lupita. "I'm Not Mestiza." *The Daily Californian*, 12 Apr. 2019, <https://www.dailycal.org/2019/04/12/im-not-mestiza>.
- Nevins, Joseph. *Operation Gatekeeper: the Rise of the "Illegal Alien" and the Making of the U.S.-Mexico Boundary*. Routledge, 2002.
- Malkki, Liisa. "Children, Humanity, and the Infantilization of Peace." *In the Name of Humanity: The Government of Threat and Care*. New York, USA: Duke University Press, 2020. 58–85. Web.
- Maxouris, Christina, and Elliott C. McLaughlin. "El Paso Walmart Gunman's Actions 'Influenced and Informed by People We Don't Know,' His Family Says." *CNN*, Cable News Network, 6 Aug. 2019, www.cnn.com/2019/08/06/us/el-paso-shooting-tuesday/index.html.
- "Migrants BUSTED Crossing Border By United Constitutional Patriots! El Paso New Mexico Border." *YouTube*, Atomic News, 9 Mar. 2019, <https://youtu.be/w5I7teT0P6Q>
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Boundary 2*, 12/13, 1984, pp. 333–358. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/302821.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Cartographies of Struggle: Third World Women and the

Politics of Feminism." *Feminism Without Borders*, Duke University Press, 2003,

p. 43–84, doi: 10.2307/j.ctv11smp7t.6.

"More Than 300 Asylum Seekers Surrendered to Armed Militia at the Border." *BitChute*,

Next News Network, 23 Apr. 2019,

<https://www.bitchute.com/video/vUwL6VjnbZQ/>.

Osborne, Richard. "Phallocentrism." *Megawords: 200 Terms You Really Need to*

Know. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2001, pp. 200-200. *SAGE Knowledge*. 10

Jan 2022, doi:

<http://www.doi.org.proxy.library.brocku.ca/10.4135/9781446221532.n166>.

Parker, Jim. "Federal Hate Crimes Case against Accused Walmart Shooter Delayed Due

to Covid & Complexities." *KVIA*, 1 Feb. 2021,

[kvia.com/news/crime/2021/02/01/federal-hate-crimes-case-against-accused-](https://www.kvia.com/news/crime/2021/02/01/federal-hate-crimes-case-against-accused-walmart-shooter-sees-delay-due-to-covid-complexities/)

[walmart-shooter-sees-delay-due-to-covid-complexities/](https://www.kvia.com/news/crime/2021/02/01/federal-hate-crimes-case-against-accused-walmart-shooter-sees-delay-due-to-covid-complexities/).

"Patriotic." *Oxford Learner's Dictionary*,

<https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/us/definition/english/patriotic>.

"Patriotism." *Oxford Learners Dictionary*,

<https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/patriotism>.

Peterson, Jesse Lee. "FRI, AUG 9 - CALL-IN: 888-77-JESSE, LIVE 6-9 AM PT (LOS

ANGELES)." *BitChute*, 8 Aug. 2019,

<https://www.bitchute.com/video/PCHZsvPWESs/>.

Peterson, Jesse Lee. "'Jesse Why Do You Justify White Mass Shooters.'" *BitChute*, 5

Aug. 2019, <https://www.bitchute.com/video/5brcNt9HG6Q/>.

Peterson, Jesse Lee. "Weekend Carnage: Two Mass Shooters Over The Weekend." *BitChute*, 5 Aug. 2019,

<https://www.bitchute.com/video/uSw6Tdo4RCU/>.

Peterson, Jesse Lee. "Armed Militia Helps Border Patrol Stop Illegal Aliens (The United Constitutional Patriots)." *BitChute*, 22 Apr. 2019,

https://www.bitchute.com/video/_Y2CyndJwJE/.

Peterson, Jesse Lee. "MON, APR 22: JESSE LIVE 6-9AM PT (LOS ANGELES) CALL-IN: 888-77-JESSE." *BitChute*, 19 Apr. 2019,

<https://www.bitchute.com/video/8bYycFbRdhE/>.

Peterson, Jesse Lee. "TUE, AUG 6 - CALL-IN: 888-77-JESSE, LIVE 6-9 AM PT (LOS ANGELES)." *BitChute*, 5 Aug. 2019, <https://www.bitchute.com/video/OgEzqbV1bU/>.

"President Trump Complete Remarks on Mass Shootings (C-SPAN)." *YouTube*, C-SPAN, 5 Aug. 2019, <https://youtu.be/CznjqYW3l9Y>.

"Richard Bertrand Spencer." *Southern Poverty Law Center*,

<https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/individual/richard-bertrand-spencer-0>.

Roche, Jeremy. "Children: Rights, Participation and Citizenship." *Childhood* (Copenhagen, Denmark) 6.4 (1999): 475–493. Web.

Romo, Vanessa. "El Paso Walmart Shooting Suspect Pleads Not Guilty." *NPR*, NPR, 10 Oct. 2019, www.npr.org/2019/10/10/769013051/el-paso-walmart-shooting-suspect-pleads-not-guilty.

Royer, Emily K., "(Un-)American Movement: Unaccompanied Immigrant Children and the Rhetoric of Space and Identity" (2017). Political Science Honors Projects. 68.

Sabo, Shaw, Susan, Ingram, Maia, Teufel-Shone, Nicolette, Carvajal, Scott, de Zapien, Jill Guernsey, Rosales, Cecilia, Redondo, Flor, Garcia, Gina, and Rubio-Goldsmith, Raquel. "Everyday Violence, Structural Racism and Mistreatment at the US–Mexico Border." *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), vol. 109, Elsevier Ltd, May 2014, pp. 66–74, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.02.005.

Shoichet, Catherine E., and Paul P. Murphy. "This Militia Group Detained Migrants at the Border. Then Their Leader Got Arrested." *CNN*, Cable News Network, 22 Apr. 2019, www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/us/united-constitutional-patriots-what-we-know/index.html.

Simonson, Peter. "The Ugly Resurgence of Border Vigilantism." *ACLU of New Mexico*, 4 June 2019, www.aclu-nm.org/en/news/ugly-resurgence-border-vigilantism.

Taylor, Helen. "Domestic Terrorism and Hate Crimes: Legal Definitions and Media Framing of Mass Shootings in the United States." *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, vol. 14, no. 3, Routledge, Sept. 2019, pp. 227–44, doi:10.1080/18335330.2019.1667012.

"Texas Man Charged with Federal Hate Crimes and Firearm Offense Related to August 3, 2019, Mass-Shooting in El Paso" *The United States Department of Justice*. February 6, 2020

The Bill of Rights: A Transcription. National Archives, U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, 1 Dec. 1, 2021, <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript>

The Constitution of Mexico of 1917 with Amendments through 2015, Translated by M.

Fernanda Gomez Aban for the Comparative Constitutions Project (anonymous)

(constituteproject.org)

Tuck, Eve and Yang, Wayne K. (2012) “Decolonization is not a

metaphor.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, vol.1, no.1, 2012,

pp.1-40.

“United Constitutional Patriots.” *Southern Poverty Law Center*,

[www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/united-constitutional-](http://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/united-constitutional-patriots)

[patriots.](http://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/united-constitutional-patriots)

“United Constitutional Patriots - New Mexico Border Ops, More Still Flooding

In.” *BitChute*, News Archiver, 31 July 2019,

<https://www.bitchute.com/video/sn4zMk5N0s9E/>.

“United Constitutional Patriots Radio Live Stream.” *YouTube*, United Constitutional

Patriots Radio, 12 Apr. 2019, <https://youtu.be/qX9QMK4de40>.

“United Constitutional Patriots Radio Live Stream.” *YouTube*, United Constitutional

Patriots Radio, 17 Apr. 2019, <https://youtu.be/vwIV9izr-ys>.

United States, Congress, House. United States Code. Office of the Law Revision

Counsel, 30 Sept. 1996,

[https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=\(title:8%20section:1325%20edition:pre-](https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=(title:8%20section:1325%20edition:prelim)%20OR%20(granuleid:USC-prelim-title8%20section1325)&f=treesort&edition=prelim&num=0&jumpTo=true)

[lim\)%20OR%20\(granuleid:USC-prelim-](https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=(title:8%20section:1325)&f=treesort&edition=prelim&num=0&jumpTo=true)

[title8%20section1325\)&f=treesort&edition=prelim&num=0&jumpTo=true](https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=(title:8%20section:1325)&f=treesort&edition=prelim&num=0&jumpTo=true)

United States, Congress, House. United States Code. Legal Information Institute, 17

June. 1952, 8 U.S. Code § 1185 - Travel control of citizens and aliens | U.S. Code

| US Law | LII / Legal Information Institute (cornell.edu)

Villagran, Lauren. “Walmart Mass Shooting Trial: Prosecution Wants 2023 Start,

Defense Wants a Delay to 2025.” *El Paso Times*, El Paso Times, 17 Feb. 2022,

<https://www.elpasotimes.com/story/news/2022/02/16/el-paso-walmart-shooting-patrick-crusius-defense-wants-2025-trial/6820636001/>.

Williams, Timothy. “What Are 'Red Flag' Gun Laws, and How Do They Work?” *The*

New York Times, The New York Times, 6 Aug. 2019,

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/06/us/red-flag-laws.html>.

Wingard, Jennifer. “Branding Citizens: The Logic(s) of a Few Bad Apples.” *Rhetoric in*

Neoliberalism, 2016, pp. 135–155., https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39850-1_7.

Young, Iris. M. “Five faces of oppression.” In *Justice and the Politics of Difference*,

Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 1990, pp. 39–65.

Appendix A: List of Videos

Video Number	Video Name, Site, and Channel	Link
Video 1	Armed Militia Helps Border Patrol Stop Illegal Aliens (The United Constitutional Patriots) BitChute Jesse Lee Peterson	https://www.bitchute.com/video/_Y2CyndJwJE/
Video 2	Mon, Apr 22: Jesse LIVE 6-9am PT (Los Angeles) Call-in: 888-77-JESSE BitChute Jesse Lee Peterson	https://www.bitchute.com/video/8bYycFbRdhE/
Video 3	United Constitutional Patriots Radio Live Stream YouTube United Constitutional Patriots Radio	https://youtu.be/Qx9QMK4de40
Video 4	United Constitutional Patriots Radio Live Stream YouTube United Constitutional Patriots Radio	https://youtu.be/vwIV9izr-ys
Video 5	MORE THAN 300 ASYLUM SEEKERS SURRENDERED TO ARMED MILITIA AT THE BORDER	https://www.bitchute.com/video/vUwL6VjnbZQ/

	BitChute Next News Network	
Video 6	Border security should be left up to the experts, vigilantes need to follow the law: Border Patrol Council official Fox News Website	https://www.foxnews.com/us/border-security-armed-vigilantes-patrol
Video 7	El Paso suspect confesses, admits to targeting Mexicans Fox News Website	https://video.foxnews.com/v/6070700481001#sp=show-clips
Video 8	Hannity: Media ignoring gun violence in Chicago, Baltimore, Detroit Fox News Website	https://video.foxnews.com/v/6068389156001#sp=show-clips
Video 9	Tue, Aug 6 - Call-In: 888-77-JESSE LIVE 6-9am PT (Los Angeles) BitChute Jesse Lee Peterson	https://www.bitchute.com/video/OgEzq-bV1bU/
Video 10	Fri, Aug 9 - Call-In: 888-77-JESSE LIVE 6-9am PT (Los Angeles) BitChute Jesse Lee Peterson	https://www.bitchute.com/video/PCHZsvPWESs/
Video 11	“JESSE WHY DO YOU JUSTIFY WHITE MASS SHOOTERS” BitChute Jesse Lee Peterson	https://www.bitchute.com/video/5brcNt9HG6Q/
Video 12	WEEKEND CARNAGE: TWO	https://www.bitchute.com/video/uSw6Tdo4RCU/

	<p>MASS SHOOTERS OVER THE WEEKEND</p> <p>BitChute</p> <p>Jesse Lee Peterson</p>	
Video 13	<p>Kevin McCarthy touts first responders in El Paso shooting</p> <p>YouTube</p> <p>Fox News</p>	https://youtu.be/Vz9p6CpAIT4
Video 14	<p>President Trump Complete remarks on Mass Shootings</p> <p>YouTube</p> <p>C-SPAN</p>	https://youtu.be/CznjqYW3l9Y
Video 15	<p>United Constitutional Patriots - New Mexico Border Ops, More Still Flooding In</p> <p>BitChute</p> <p>NewsArchiver</p>	https://www.bitchute.com/video/sn4zMk5N0s9E/
Video 16	<p>Border Bust: El Paso New Mexico Border Patrol & United Constitutional Patriots</p> <p>YouTube</p> <p>Atomic News</p>	https://youtu.be/q5J8tlrrAwo
Video 17	<p>Migrants BUSTED Crossing Border By United Constitutional Patriots! El Paso New Mexico Border</p> <p>YouTube</p> <p>Atomic News</p>	https://youtu.be/w5I7teTOP6Q

Appendix B: Coding Sheet

Link of video/ title of video/platform used/ channel name:	
Descriptive summary of video:	
Number of people/who is in video: Race: Gender:	
Key Phrases Used: Ex: d+k, a-c, a-e+k	
Supportive, Objective, or Anti?	
How are they making logical sense of occurrence?	
Reasons to blame (who/what/why):	
Side conversations they engage in:	
Personal Thoughts:	

Key Phrases:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. illegal(s)/illegal aliens b. migrants c. Mexicans d. Hispanic(s)/ Latin(o) e. terrorist/terrorism f. white supremacy/supremacist g. border h. border wall i. border patrol j. fear/scared
-----------------	---

	k. invasion l. worry/concern m. patriotism/patriot/patriotic
--	--

Appendix C: Visual Aid of Theoretical Framework

