The Apartheid Conscience: Gender, Race, and Re-imagining the White Nation in Cyberspace

R. Sophie Statzel
Graduate Center City University of New York

It is not just that the limits of our language limit our thoughts; the world we find ourselves in is one we have helped to create, and this places constraints upon how we think the world anew.
David Theo Goldberg

American equality began as an oxymoron. Although American nationalism is dedicated to the proposition of freedom, liberty, equality, and the pursuit of happiness, this proposition originally extended exclusively to a circumscribed community determined by race. While citizenship is now defined by more equitable means, racial inequality remains the norm. This is clear in a variety of ways but is especially visible spatially in that race continues to provide the organization of U.S. urban geography. Forty years after the striking down of the Jim Crow laws that legalized segregation, self-segregation is ensuring that cities in the United States remain the "most racially segregated urban areas in the world." Despite massive racial changes following the civil rights movement and the contemporary widespread acceptance of multiculturalism, massive segregation persists. As Jessie Daniels writes, whereas statistically whites are contemporarily more likely to be tolerant of racial diversity, "white people vote with their moving vans" whenever people of color represent more than seven percent of the population

in their neighborhood. David Goldberg shows that residential racial segregation has persisted despite massive demographic shifts, from the creation of urban ghettos in the 1950s and 60s and white flight to the suburbs, followed by white "urban renewal" programs resulting in gentrification of those same urban spaces and a movement of color to the suburbs.

Such racial segregation has always characterized U.S urban geography. The United States legally condoned racial segregation from its founding through the Civil Rights movement of the 1950's and 60's. The Jim Crow laws, put in place after the abolition of slavery to defend all-white businesses, schools, and neighborhoods, were not struck down until the landmark decision in Brown v. Board of Education in 1954 and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Although today no national laws define the relationship between race and resi-dence, statistically segregation remains the rule. Acknowledging California as emblematic of the country, Dale Maharidge writes that California's "white com-munities form 'islands' that are surrounded by vast ethnic or transitional commu-nities." Such elaborate racial segregation requires widespread participation and intricate organization. Although a variety of institutional phenomenon exacerbate the problem of segregation, the most significant factor continues to be informal pressure by whites to maintain white neighborhoods. It is important to ask what secures this investment by whites to participate in segregation and other ra-cially exclusive practices. Why, despite the increasingly racially tolerant beliefs by whites and the public embrace of multiculturalism and condemnation of racism does the racial "melting pot" of America continue to reproduce virtually all-white spaces?

David Goldberg asserts that such extreme racial segregation is a product of the modern West. He argues that racial apartheid is far from only a South African phenomenon and attempts "to show just how deep a certain kind of ex-perience of racial marginality runs in 'the West'." Although the term "apartheid" was created to describe the specifically South African system of legalized racial segregation the idea it was based on, of keeping races physically apart, is preva-lent throughout the West. While South African apartheid was extreme in the level of violence employed to enforce segregation, the United States also clearly practiced its own similar version of segregation that could also be referred to as apartheid. As a tour through any major U.S. city will show, American apartheid continues today, but is now enforced by other means than jurisprudence.

Apartheid secured both white supremacy and the racial concept of whiteness, yet the majority of whites historically would not have described their motivations for living in segregated communities in these terms. How was such widespread support for apartheid secured and what continues to motivate whites to support segregation despite increasingly tolerant racial views and a public dis-

avowal of racism? What I am suggesting is a key to understanding this question is the idea that racial segregation is perpetuated not as much by overtly racist belief, but through other forms. The first one hundred and fifty years of building a national U.S. culture imagined the nation as legitimately white and justified the racist practices and racial segregation that secured this white nation fantasy. Not only was racism practiced in the form of genocide, slavery, segregation and disenfranchisement, but its justification was actually central to the creation of a national culture. Alongside legal codes demanding racial segregation and racist practices, moral codes also served to justify racism by making racist behavior the ethical option for whites. At different periods of U.S. history the moral and popular choice for whites was to support slavery, condone genocide as justified by the inherent savagery of First Nations people, and utterly refuse the humanity of blacks, First Nations, and other people of color by denying them the right to integrated schools, businesses, and communities and criminalizing the potential for legitimate romantic relationships with whites.

The realm in which this exclusion was justified is morality. Although legislation now criminalizes the majority of racist practices, the moral system created by the legitimization of such widespread racist practices is more difficult to change. Similar to Claudia Koonz, who argues in The Nazi Conscience that the Nazi Party actually succeeded in shifting the German public conscience to exclude Jews from the moral agreement of reciprocity, I argue that a racial conscience has always defined a racially exclusive national American community. Despite the seeming contradiction between the role of conscience in governing moral action while simultaneously necessitating racist exclusion, Koonz argues that conscience is actually always defined by borders and the "universe of moral obligation, far from being universal, is bounded by community." The race line determines the parameters of this community.

As this American racial conscience is both determined by and determines racial segregation it should be thought of as an apartheid conscience. This cultural phenomenon is inherently connected to a spatial imperative and spatial segregation, limiting the social agreement of reciprocity to only within the white community. Koonz writes:

> Across cultures, an ethic of reciprocity commands that we treat others as we wish to be treated. Besides instructing us in virtue, the conscience fulfills a second, and often overlooked, function. It tells us to whom we shall and shall not do what. It structures our identity by separating those who deserve our concern from alien "others" beyond the pale of our community. Our moral identity prompts us to ask, "Am I the kind of person who would do that to this person?"

Historically a white person ought to see people of color and First Nations

peoples as residing in a separate category than other whites and to understand the agreement of moral reciprocity as limited to only within the white community. The role of conscience however is not simply to designate who belongs inside or outside of the community, but also to regulate behavior within the community. Although this conscience regulates apartheid by pushing people of color outside of the bounds of the moral community, it is not conceptualized as a racist conscience by its adherents but as a moral conscience. The emphasis is not on racial exclusion, but community and moral regulation. Apartheid and racism are the effects of this conscience yet the emphasis is on encouraging moral behavior as expressed not just through race but through respectable gender roles and sexual codes. To understand the way that this conscience is elaborated we need to look at the way it functions not only to racially segregate, but also to internally regulate the white community. For, is it not clear that segregation is important not just for what is kept out but also what is defended within?

This type of analysis, on the production of a white racial identity as a central component of white supremacist society, would be impossible without over a century of writings and scholarship showing the socially constructed and relational nature of race as the constituent element of racism. As early as the 1890's W.E.B. Du Bois was writing that race was socially constructed and not a biological fact: "perhaps it is wrong to speak of it [race] at all as a concept rather than as a group of contradictory forces, facts, and tendencies." In the tradition of Du Bois' critical anti-racism scholarship, a body of theory interrogating the socially constructed nature of race has developed, furthered by the work of Derrick Bell, Kimberly Krenshaw, Cheryl Harris, among others, which is called collectively Critical Race Theory. While originally focusing on racism and the law, it has come to be more broadly understood as theories attempting to critically grapple with the reality of racism in the post-Civil Rights United States. Together these works explore how racism continues to structure US society despite the de-codification of overt white supremacy and changes in popular understandings of race in the contemporary United States.

Out of critical race theory has grown a field of study specifically focused on exploring the construction of whiteness as a racial category. While whiteness studies have tended to focus on the everyday forms of racial privilege and prejudice which structure white identity and its relations to white supremacy, there have also been several studies focusing on organized white supremacist thought and activism. Particularly useful to this study has been David Goldberg's Racist Culture and Charles Mills' The Racial Contract . Both works are largely focused on showing the racially exclusive roots of philosophy, modernity, and liberalism.

This study attempts to build on the insights developed in critical race theory and critical whiteness studies about the social construction of whiteness,

but expands the analysis through an engagement with theories of nationalism to explore the variegation of whiteness. Benedict Anderson's Imagined Communities highlights the way that nationalism serves to actually construct an imagined community, creating what Ernest Renan calls "a large-scale solidarity" through regulating the legitimate roles and identities of community members. Ghassan Hage challenges that all racial practices are actually better described as nationalist practices. He writes that the concept of "racially motivated practices" is a fallacy as "even the belief that there is a hierarchy of races or cultures, is not in itself a motivating ideology. Racism on its own does not carry within it an imperative for action." Racist action is connected to a "white nation" fantasy, where nationals yearn for a clearly established privileged relationship with a nation-state. This sense of entitlement is inherently linked to the national's self-concept, therefore their behavior is seen as self-motivated as opposed to connected to a racially privileged nationalism. The link between racial prejudice and a need to act on them is more connected to national rather than simply racial identity. To this end, race is always spaced and whiteness is committed to reproducing white spaces. Studying the nationalist elements of whiteness as opposed to just its supremacist aspects is insightful, showing that while whiteness is about culture and supremacy it also functions as an imagined community that is expressed spatially and is regulated by gendered subjectivities and sexualized identities. Such an analysis thus allows for an exploration of the way whiteness is lived in varied meanings and identities.

Like all communities, the national imagined community is organized by gender, sexuality, and class as well as race. Studies of nationalism allow for an analysis of the ways that these different identity categories are tied together through moral regulation. Linking studies of Western nationalism, particularly the work of George Mosse, to this study of an apartheid conscience elucidates how a fear of degeneracy and desire for respectability fuel and tie together a dedication to racist, heterosexist, and sexist practices and identities. Through this imagining, nationalism functions as a regulation of morality, and the imagined white nation ensures that this morality is bounded by race. Sherene Razack writes, "Race contaminates morality through infecting the very premise of pershonhood." It is the translation of embedded racist differentiation into a governing conscience that facilitates white involvement in both perpetuating and defending racial apartheid and white supremacy. These racial foundations and their resulting relationships both serve to create a white identity. As David Goldberg writes:

Social relations are constitutive of personal and social identity, and a central part of the order of such relations is the perceived need, the requirement for subjects to give an account of their actions. These accounts may assume the bare form of explanation, but they usually tend more imperatively to legitimate or

to justify acts (to ourselves or others). Morality is the scene of this legislation and justification.

Thus, whites who are both constituted by the apartheid state but who also legitimate and cement this segregation, describe and understand their motivations and actions as following a specific morality. But, morality implies not just a motivation to distinguish between good and evil and right from wrong, but also a focus on good or right conduct. Although I am working to show the way that race serves as the moral boundary marker around the white community, I do not mean to imply that this apartheid conscience regulates all whites equally and in the same way. To truly understand the configuration of this conscience we must interrogate the ways which race intermingles with and enforces other aspects of this national conscience, particularly the convergence of class, gender, and sexuality in defining morality and identity.

Racism was historically justified not as a way to defend white power, but as a defense of white morality and respectability. The links between morality, gender, sexuality, and racism are evident throughout the history of U.S. racism as racial violence was consistently justified as defending white women from the perceived threatening nature of black and First Nations male sexuality. Andrea Smith quotes Ann Laura Stoler that imperial and racist societies "cast white women as the bearers of moral racist imperial order." Smith writes that American colonialism conceived of Native bodies as "immanently polluted with sexual sin," framing Native men as posing a sexual threat to white women despite the fact that such a threat was virtually nonexistent. Similarly, the lynching campaigns which secured white supremacy after Reconstruction in the South were virtually all organized around the perceived threats black men posed to white women. Showing these connections exposes that much racist violence and racist belief, though accomplishing racial privilege and oppression, are clearly tied to sexuality and gender and are motivated by a fear of safety and of moral transgression. Conceptualizing bodies of color as inherently morally and sexually threatening forecloses even the thought of their inclusion in the moral community and perpetuates apartheid through continually recycling the fear of racial Others.

To explore this apartheid conscience and its connection to white nationalism I have chosen to study the group most adamantly committed to defining, elaborating, and defending this conscience and the link between whiteness and nationalism: the contemporary white nationalist movement. While many denounce the white nationalist movement as a peripheral group, in this study I recognize that although the movement exists on the fray, that understanding its weave is informative of what is inscribed in the broader social fabric. Although the movement represents an ossification and amplification of broader racist and nationalist dynamics, as the fray it also has much to tell us about the patterns that shape and

reproduce white supremacy. My intention is then not to simply denounce the site and its participants, but to trace its inner logic. Despite their core founders having begun racial activism in the KKK, as a movement white nationalism defines itself not as a supremacist movement but a nationalist one. Although racism clearly organizes the discourse on the site, the discussion also focuses on elaborating the perceived need for apartheid and articulating what apartheid protects. Through showing the meaning of the movement and the motivation to participate by its members my goal is to show the organization of this apartheid conscience.

There are several problems with studying a fringe group like white nationalism with the intent of understanding more mainstream practices and identities. As I mentioned above, the fringe is often defined against the mainstream as opposed to representing it. We cannot guarantee that white nationalism as a fringe social movement is simply an extreme version of more popular beliefs and practices. They are on the fringe because of their dedication to changing dominant practices not supporting them. An example is the extreme anti-Semitism found throughout the website blaming Western states and global problems as being controlled by ZOG, white supremacist shorthand for the Anti-Semitic conspiracy of a Zionist Occupation Government. Although anti-Semitism is widespread throughout the United States, the level of anti-Semitism, particularly seen in a loathing of Israel and a violent hatred of Jews as non-white, is not matched in broader society and is certainly not represented in policy. I contend that despite these challenges this comparison's usefulness outweighs its potential problems.

In an essay about her study of women in white supremacist movements, Kathleen Blee writes that although the "ideas that racist activists share about whiteness are more conscious, elaborated, and tightly connected to political action than those of mainstream whites they also reflect the views of whiteness dominant in mainstream culture." Although white nationalism is not entirely representative of the mainstream, it is part of a history of white racial organizing that stems back to the abolition of slavery. The founder of Stormfront, Don Black, and the political leader of the movement, David Duke, both began their racist careers in the Ku Klux Klan. Since the year following the end of the Civil War, the KKK has been the organizational manifestation of white resistance to racial change through every major period of potential racial change in the U.S. White nationalism is thus part of a century long tradition of defending whiteness and the white community from racial change and racial Others. As the self-defined border guards of whiteness, white nationalists have much to contribute about what this resistance to racial change is about, about the importance to whiteness of segregated space, and of the white justification of this segregation.

This paper is based on monitoring and analyzing the discourse of the online hub of this movement, the bulletin boards of stormfront.org. I have chosen

to analyze the discussion in this online community for many reasons. Stormfront is not a formal group, but an electronic meeting grounds with just under 100,000 white racial activist members from a variety of different organizations; it is thus an ideal site for tracing the broadest beliefs of the movement, as opposed to just studying one organization. The online venue also provides a unique possibility for the study of white nationalism as it is both semi-private (individuals can engage in extended, heated and seemingly personal debates) but also semi-public (anyone online can watch these debates unfold and often can contribute to them). I thus had access to a wide variety of rants and dialogues, between new members and old movement comrades, potential recruits and senior moderators, and anti-racist challengers and member's responses. Stormfront member's demographics covered a broad range of beliefs and geography, with neo-pagans, National Socialists, and Christian Identity enthusiasts conversing together across North and South America, Europe, South Africa, and Australia. The topics ranged from banal conversations to esoteric philosophical rants to heated and ongoing debates. Through this diversity of types of writing and writers the bulletin boards cover the breadth of white nationalist beliefs and serve as an excellent site to study the meaning of this movement. The goal in attempting to understand the logic of the white nationalist movement is not to increase its acceptability, but to understand its draw. To better understand how to challenge white supremacy we should learn how it is organized. To recognize the paradox of American equality for what it is, a racially bound concept of equality, we have to understand the moral regulation which perpetuates the continued belief in equality alongside practices of inequality. I believe that studying what the defenders of whiteness believe they are defending can offer insights into how whites understand and perpetually defend their whiteness. By hearing the motivation of this call to white nationalism, understanding what at base these seekers are seeking, I am hoping to reveal some insights into how best to expose and challenge all manifestations of white *nationalism*.

Contributions

Although a variety of scholars have studied the link between white supremacist activists and broader manifestations of white supremacy, this study contributes to this literature by engaging with a new form of data (online bulletin boards instead of interviews or literature reviews) and connecting the literature about white supremacy with that of nationalism. I believe this focus on nationalism also allows for a new type of interrogation of the meaning of the movement. Unlike an analysis of race and supremacy, studying nationalism opens up the inquiry to show the way that various identities (race, gender, class, and sexuality)

are intricately woven together in the imagining of the community/nation and thus reinforce and are dependent upon each other. This is significant because white supremacist and white nationalist movements have never only focused on race as a separate or singular identity, but rather framed whiteness as a moral community defined by sexual codes and gender roles. Studies of nationalism help to show the way that these various identities are regulated by shared morality, which when applied to studies of white nationalism allows for a better interrogation of the motivation and meaning of the movement. Scarcely little has been written about the nationalist elements to this new white supremacist movement.

There are two other significant contributions that this study makes to the scholarship exploring white supremacy and white nationalism. The first is showing the qualitatively different roles that anti-Semitism and racism play in the white supremacist There are two other significant contributions that this study makes to the scholarship exploring white supremacy and white imagination. Although not enough literature explores the relationship and distinction between racism and anti-Semitism, the conversations on Stormfront show that Jews play a distinctly different role in white nationalism than do people of color/indigenous people. Whereas people of color are viewed in white nationalism as aliens or what Charles Mill's calls "subpersons," inspiring fear in whites but posing a threat easily contained through protecting racial difference and distance, Jews are conceived as strangers who trouble the very concepts of race and nation upon which white nationalism is based. White nationalists appear to be obsessed with Jews and with attempting to teach other whites to view Jews not just as non-white, but as evil. In this study I attempt to elaborate the differences between racism and anti-Semitism in white nationalism. And, the final significant contribution this study makes is in further exploring the nature of the racial threats feared by white supremacists. This paper focuses on the major themes I found on Stormfront and explores the broader implications this study suggests.

Family values

At the core of the moral order, of the imagined white nation, is the heterosexual family which is seen as the apotheosis of white morality, the biological and moral reproduction of whiteness. And while the movement on Stormfront is defined by its opposition as hate inspired, it could just as easily be described by its members as focusing on family values, though a type of values framed by unacknowledged violence. In the white nationalist imagination the family is the metonym of white morality, representing racial purity and respectability. Critical scholars Jennifer Fluri and Loarraine Dowler write "the family trope represents the foundation of white purity, because it is the embodiment of racially 'pure'

reproduction and the idyllic construction of the white nation." The discussion throughout the Stormfront website is highly gendered and focused on reproduction. Deviant sexualities and gender roles, legalized abortion and divorce, and non-nuclear family forms are all seen as direct attacks on whiteness, one member writes, "The displacement of our traditional family structure has been our enemy's most powerful weapon against us."

The racial warriors on Stormfront see themselves as defenders of the white race, thus protectors of their history, culture, and sense of self. They frame themselves as vigilantes, like the cowboy heroes in Western dramas, protecting their homes and communities from the uncertain dark threats which linger on the outskirts of their community, ready to attack or be attacked. This articulation is based on the hyper-masculine warrior, the strong man, willing to defend his family by whatever means possible. As Abby Ferber writes, the "central project of the contemporary white supremacist movement is the articulation of a white male identity." But, just as crucial in white nationalism, what these warriors are defending, is the feminine white mother and the home and children she cultivates. This division of whiteness, between reproduction and border protection is highly gendered in itself. Within the home women bear and raise children while men defend and protect it.

A women's commitment to the movement is called into question if she doesn't take her first responsibility, procreation, seriously. One member writes "if you have no children and desire no children, unless you are physically unable to bear/produce children, I personally will have a hard time taking you seriously as a WN." Another member responded, "EXACTLY! All this talk about preserving the White race, but not actually wanting to produce the next generation that will preserve us. I just don't get it. I know I am thought 'divisive' with these beliefs but this sums it ALL up: Without the next generation of White children, our race WILL die and there will be nothing left to fight for." Breaking with this strict understanding of gender is seen as unquestionably defying the natural order. Another woman writes, "We don't want or respect little boys who are afraid to act like a man." This implies that the focus of child-rearing is not simply on reproducing white babies, but on training white babies in their proper gender identity. The implication of not respecting "little boys who are afraid to act like a man" is that these women will teach boys about improper masculine behavior, and likely do the same for girls. The drive for whiteness is also a call to challenge changing gender roles. One young women writes:

> As a young adult, it's disappointing to see the roles of men and woman turn inside out. The ZOG machine shaping the today's woman to be more viciously snobby, greedy, mean, trashy and one could say uncaring and unwomanly. Men also turned this way. Certain persons have predicted

this inside out and backwards reverse roles. It's not healthy, logically right, or what nature intended.

In this schema any threat to patriarchal gender roles is seen as a racial threat. Take for instance the following quote discussing feminism:

Men have lost their way. Men were once considered the breadwinners. Now they are the replaceables often making less than and being dependent on their wives. Poverty rates rising, those holding onto the dream of a two parent home struggling, it's all just a bi-product of a movement designed to destroy us.

Throughout the site the breakdown of patriarchal gender roles is framed not only as a threat to whiteness but also as destroying white male economic power. In this naturalized racial, heterosexual logic, gender provides the organization of whiteness and helps to protect economic stability. It is in the performance of these strict gender categories that whiteness will be protected and, through the heterosexual reproduction of white babies, the white race will be saved.

To Stormfront women the only way to maintain a sense of respectability is to date and mate with white men. One member writes that although she wasn't raised "racially aware," the white nationalist descriptor for whites who are consciously white nationalist, that she "was taught respectable values and instilled with a sense and importance of honourability." For her then a commitment to respectability and honor are implicitly connected to a commitment to whiteness. This theme of honor is also connected to moral degeneracy:

I fight the fight to maintain the White heritage and culture for future generations. Why is that important? I see the degeneration of morals, certain urban areas are no longer considered "civilized", racemixing has caused violence in public schools and the American people have become pacified as we lose more and more rights for the sake of "public safety". I find it interesting how there are no quarantines of drug resistant, highly infectious diseases for the sake of "public safety".

This leap from white culture to moral degeneracy, threats to civilization, and disease is not a unique connection. As Ann Laura Stoler demonstrates it is discourses of sexuality which define both the bourgeois self and the borders of the nation, correlating diseases and miscegenation as biological threats. And as George Mosse explicates in his study of the emergence and dominance of nationalism in Europe, respectability serves as the national unifier, connecting sexuality, gender, and race roles. Whiteness, sexual purity, and traditional gender roles all form a nexus of respectability. As one Stormfront member writes she is drawn to white nationalism with "[t]he hope to have good clean White babies with a good clean White man."

This moral purity is intimately tied to the heterosexual family. A thread about the issue of gay marriage defends marriage as a preeminent heterosexual institution important to the maintenance of white culture. One member writes, "The whole promotion of gay marriage is just one more, of many attempts to destroy our society and redefine our definitions of right and wrong, so they can further weaken and demoralize us." Another post explains that white nationalists should oppose gay marriage by bringing the discussion back to procreation. They write, "I'll tell you why queers should not be married, nor accepted. It's very simple. Marriage isn't about the two people involved, whether they're queer or straight. It's about the children such a union would produce, and/or care for." The post continues that two men cannot raise a "socially-stable adult" and "whether the child is raised by queer men or queer women, he will be raised with seriously disharmonious values—values which are ultimately deadly to our race." Although there is some disagreement about whether or not gay marriage should be accepted, the arguments keep coming back to the idea that marriage is really a contract between a man, a woman, and the state whose purpose is about safeguarding children. One member asserts, "Homosexuality and National Socialism do not come together. NS rejects this disease and shameful behavior and so does WN."

Aliens and Strangers

Although there are similarities between the fears of people of color and of Jews in white nationalism, there are qualitative differences between anti-Semitism and racism in the movement. Although both inspire fear and animosity, racism and anti-Semitism have different historical meanings. Philosopher Charles Mills argues that a racial contract supplements the social contract in the West, casting people of color outside the realm of humanity, eternally marking the body of color as alien and other. This division between alien subpersons and persons required elaborate conceptual and physical framing of bodies and ideas, particularly in colonial societies where there was much interracial contact. Such is the case in the United States, where the institution of slavery required that African Americans live in intimate proximity to whites, serving domestic duties and even raising white children. Although seen as aliens, people of color were tolerated within a restrictive framework where their movements and options were almost entirely controlled by whites. White nationalists fear that this control has slipped and these dark bodies, no longer totally controlled by whites, are imagined as threatening to destroy white society. The fear is that the "aliens" will spread their perceived immoral and chaotic nature and transform the nation into something alien and foreign itself. The two most popular manifestations of this alien invasion

discussed on Stormfront are the fear of increasing numbers of immigrants of color and the idea that people of color are violent and are engaging in a race war with whites.

The fear of immigrants of color is the theme of the continually popular thread entitled "News from the Border (and why it should be protected)." This thread focuses on the U.S./Mexico border, which also serves as the metaphorical limits of the white nation and the frontier of whiteness. The borderlands are portrayed as the new frontier, a lawless place rife with violence full of dangerous bodies attempting to cross over and attack the white nation. The thread begins with an article link about a farmer living on the U.S. side of the border whose cabin was attacked with gunfire after the farmer shot at drug-smugglers crossing his property. This story exemplifies the conception that a porous border allows for the infiltration of a criminal and chaotic element into the United States. Members respond to this post with comments such as "I cannot think of a better reason to mine the border" and "Mining it is an excellent idea! Also behind the minefield and razorwire fences, a road with Hummers and Army soldiers taking pot-shots at the Mexicans." The posts portray all Mexican undocumented immigrants as drug smugglers or inherently prone to violence, and as this last post shows, advocate violent solutions.

Anti-Semitism takes a different form. In Black Skin, White Masks Franz Fanon characterized the difference between racism against blacks as a bodily and sexual phobia versus Anti-Semitism as focused on a fear of economic exploitation. As Fanon wrote regarding racism from a psychoanalytic perspective, "In the case of the Jew, one thinks of money and its cognates. In that of the Negro, one thinks of sex." This seems to apply fairly well to the white nationalist movement, with people of color framed as physical threats or sexual threats, with immigrants also framed as economic threats, and Jews framed as economic and cultural threats. White nationalists also recognize that people of color pose a more contained threat than Jews to white supremacy because the race line effectively segregates whites from people of color spatially and relationally. While at different points in U.S. history Jews were viewed as racially other, in How Jews Became White Folks & What that Says about Race in America, Karen Brodkin writes that deliberate policies in the post-WWII United States changed the racial status of Jews from non-white to white. While the majority of Americans now view Jews as white, white nationalists maintain a view of Jews as non-white and see their current status in the racial majority as immensely threatening. Thus, part of the difference between anti-Semitism and racism in the movement is responding to the fact that Jews are not segregated racially in the same way as people of color. While the anti-Semitism on the site is historically precedented, it must be taught to many of the new members. This issue is summed up in the following post:

For the average white person, the blacks & mexicans are much more of a real threat. They will murder, rape and rob you, these facts are in the newspapers every single day. And, yes they need to be dealt with first. That said, to help develop a person into a WN, they do need to understand that the Jews do the same thing, using much subtler methods Naturally, the vast amount of the people in the US are oblivious to this threat, despite their very obvious control of the media, Wall Street and banking. When are they ever going to wake up??

Although most whites share in racist fears of people of color, white nationalists are the more astute racists in broadening their racist awareness to include Jews. Although similar and related to racism, Anti-Semitism is of a different quality even though racism and anti-Semitism both endorse a violent expulsion. While the racialization of people of color ensures that white nationalism is defended through securing segregation, the slippery racial categorization of Jews mandates different means for securing white supremacy. The following discussion thread from Stormfront explains the nature of white nationalism's rampant anti-Semitism. In the thread "My feelings on Jews," Stormfront member Indefens writes that he doesn't understand the anti-Jewish obsession on the site. He acknowledges that he's "stepping into a snakes' den" when he writes that he wants to post his confusion around the "whole 'Jewish thing'" but wants to hear arguments for anti-Semitism. He begins:

Let me say that having grown up in an upper-class southern New Jersey town, I know a lot of Jews, and my two best friends growing up literally were Jewish. I attended their bar mitzvahs, went with them down the shore, etc...I became racially aware after living in a mostly black neighborhood, so when I first began identifying as a WN, I didn't see the big deal about Jews but I kept my mouth shut because I didn't want to jump right into the pool and start making waves. Also, I wanted to keep an open mind and hear what people had to say on the issue.

Indefens continues that although he recognizes that as a group Jews "pulled their weight as scholars, historians, entertainers and so forth throughout history," he also recognizes that they are also "largely responsible for the multiculturalism that is destroying our western nations" thus have likely caused more damage than good in the Western. He recognizes that there is a qualitative gap between his views against the role of Jews in supporting multiculturalism and the vehement anti-Semitism in white nationalism and asks, "So, is there something important I'm missing, here?"

The Neo-Nazis and Hitler supporters undertake Indefens' education about the significance and meaning of anti-Semitism, with the first reply giving a link to the American Nazi Party. Through the ensuing exchanges he shows he fails to grasp the true threat of the Jew in the white nationalist imagination and so another member coins in with this clarification, "Just in case it hasn't been

stated directly... They are EVIL!!" Through more posts interspersing accusations about deceit, greed, an anti-white imperative, support for multiculturalism, and plans to take over the world, along with comments about their threats to white morality, Stormfront members coax Indefens into anti-Semitism. Responding to a suggestion that he search the site for similar previous posts he responds, "Thanks! Will do." His comment implying that Indefens is taking his anti-Semitic lessons seriously from this online community. Similar conversations and conversions are found throughout the website, suggesting the site is relatively successful at re-cruiting new Anti-Semites.

These differences between racism and anti-Semitism are confusing to those of us who do not ascribe to them. Zygmant Bauman's Modernity and the Holocaust is useful in helping to clarify these distinctions. Bauman describes modern Western societies as being organized like a garden, with race desig-nating the dangerous and chaotic weeds from the beautifully cultivated rows of the gardening state. Given that Jews are now commonly considered white, the designation between who belongs in the moral "garden" versus who is actually threatening that order through their impure racial essence becomes blurred. The de-racialization of Jews then is seen as incredibly threatening. On the other hand the extreme racialization of people of color continues to clearly designate those who do not belong in the society and effectively segregates society along the race line. While the racial status of Jews poses a different form of racial threat, the concept of the Jew actually troubles the very idea of race which also exacerbates anti-Semitism.

Bauman conceives of the Jew as the "stranger" who unsettles racial and national identity categories. When national identity became so important in the Modern era, the Jews were, as Arendt noted "'a non-national element in a world of growing or existing nations.'" As nationalism grew in prominence, the interna-tionality of Jews challenged the binaries holding the notion of the national com-munity together and, "The world tightly packed with nations and nation-states abhorred the non-national void. Jews were in such a void: they were the void." Thus the Jews are strangers in Europe, their very existence belying the categories which personhood and nationhood were predicated upon. But, unlike the other races which were clearly and consistently defined as unassimilable problems in Europe in the early 1900's, Jews "were an anti-race, a race to undermine and poison all other races, to sap not just the identity of any race in particular, but the racial order itself." Jews posed an insurmountable challenge to the creation of the utopic rational dream of order and fixity, their mass exodus from Europe was the purported only solution and thus the Holocaust when that became unfeasible.

White nationalist hatred of Jews is then not simply about policing the borders of the racial contract, but securing the very notion of race that governs

those borders. Through combining this fear of the strangeness of Jews with traditional anti-Semitic ideology of accusing Jews of possessing nearly omnipotent power, Stormfront members combine critiques of what they refer to as "Jewish supremacy" with more emotionally laden insecurities about the destructive potential of Jews; fearing their "parasitic nature," their "embodiment of evil," their "cancerous" essence. Jews are blamed for the "plague of multiculturalism," for supporting multicultural policies which challenge white supremacy, a conspiracy which fits strikingly into the historical fears fuelling anti-Semitism. As the race that destabilizes the very notion of race and nationalism and the race most conspiratorially depicted as possessing increasingly omnipotent control over white nations and challenging whiteness and white supremacy.

The nature of the threats

Racial Others invoke fear in white nationalists because they represent threats to respectability, purity and thus the moral order of society. To further understand the meaning of these threats and their perceived destructive nature it is useful to look at political philosopher Eric Voegelin's argument that the rise of secularism allowed for the growth of the race idea. Voegelin writes that with the rise of secularism, "we see the first symptoms of a process that we may call the externalization of evil," in which racialized others come to embody not just difference, but an evil or sinful essence. The demarcation of racialized peoples as "Other" left whiteness, the unmarked racial category, as the racial norm while its racialized foil allowed for whiteness to be imagined as good and moral as opposed to the inherently evil racial Other. Voegelin continues, "Parallel with the positive race idea we find the evolution of a counter-idea, the idea of a counter-race. The Satanistic idea of the Jew is a theologically essential part of the race symbol." Taking Voegelin's concept of race and the externalization of evil along with Mills' concept of the racial contract and its designation of persons from subpersons shows the way that the racial Other serves to define whites as moral and good as well as rational and autonomous. Externalizing evil provides a double purpose, both leaving the externalizing community clear of evil thus morally good while also providing this community with a constant foil as a reminder of just how good that community is as compared to the inherently dark and evil Other. The construction of a subperson population serves the same double purpose for establishing the population of full persons as moral and rational in contrast to the inchoate mass of subpersons.

While both construct people of color as racially other or alien, they are also both projections which secure white subjectivity as moral, rational, autonomous, and good. I am suggesting that to better understand the terror that the

racial other inspires in the white nationalist imagination we must explore the relationship between whiteness and projection. As the race concept emerged concomitant to European colonial expansion, it is clear that racial classification served to defend colonial violence. Through framing colonized populations as possessing a racialized essence which was irrational, sub-human, and inherently evil, the race concept justified European colonial violence while shielding Europeans from the guilt that such violence would induce. By framing racialized peoples as savages and sexual threats to white women colonial violence was actually construed as defending respectability. Yet prolific and horrifying savage violence was condoned and committed by whites in the United States as well as globally throughout colonization and through the institution of slavery. A strange inversion occurred however; whereas the violence needed to secure colonialism was immense the colonized population was always depicted as the violent and savage community. This inversion seems to hinge on projection.

Projection is defined as the process of externalizing negative feelings outside the self. The projection must be constantly secured as an external object so that the subject is not overtaken by the internal battle. While all projections are seen as external to those projecting but in actuality stem from the fears within the projector themselves. Drawing on Lacanian psychoanalysis, Teresa Brennan argues that the projection of internal negativity is connected to the need to dominate external space, that "the various pressures and fears produce a sense of spatial constriction and a fear of loss of territory. Since the sense of self depends on a certain spatial definition these pressures have a persecutory feel; they jeopardize that spatial definition." This fosters paranoia as the subject is both defined by, thus reliant upon, external objects and spatial control to maintain a sense of self and also generates fear that either the objects will shift or the external projections may return to persecute the one who projects. There is thus a need to control space in order to secure the projection.

Racially, the projection of evil as well as chaos, disorder, and immorality onto people of color is dependent on as well as inspires a need for segregation. Due to fear of encountering the other, social distance is maintained which secures the projection as natural and uncontested by relationships. Although spatial control through segregation helps to secure the projection this is never complete. So, "the passifier fears retaliation for the badness projected onto the other." The significant fear of people of color in white nationalism alludes to the question if the fear of racial Others and racial integration is actually a fear of retaliating projections. It is thus useful to ask what the racial Other represents to white morality and subjectivity, a question which points to the reliance on distance from people of color to secure the projections which define whiteness morally. As James Baldwin so aptly articulated the plight, "If I am not who you say I am, then you are not

who you think you are, and that is the crisis."

It is evident from the conversations in Stormfront that white nationalists are terrified of a break-down in the racial contract because they fear that what whites have done to others will now be done to whites. One member warns, "To you race-traitors, do you believe that when the white race falls there will be a place for you in a dark world? No... They will do to you everything we have ever done them and worse. The race war is already upon us. Just look at Rhodesia and South Africa." Not only is the fear that the violence will turn onto whites, but that the persecution will be genocidal, not just eventually destroying the white race but extinguishing whites today. Extreme paranoia is thick in the conversations and denotes a fear of destructive returning projections. One member writes; "'Don't make me extinct!' Why do I have to justify my existence? When someone says they don't care if whites disappear, point at a white child and say, 'So you don't care if she becomes extinct?' There is no comeback to that, and if they try, they then become easy to tear apart. I fight for whites because I want to live and I do not have to justify my life to anyone." The individual themselves and the imagined white girl are portrayed as somehow threatened with death by this dark onslaught.

The theme that whites are actually threatened with genocide is visible throughout the conversations on the site. One thread is specifically dedicated to the question "Is the US Federal Government committing Genocide?," meaning genocide against whites. The symmetry between white America being founded on the genocide of Native Americans and the present phobia by white nationalists that they themselves are experiencing genocide is stark. Of the nearly two-hundred respondents to this question of white genocide, 85% concur that there is currently a genocidal campaign against whites by the U.S. government. Uncannily associating this fear of ethnic persecution with genocide committed by whites in the making of America, one member writes, "Like the Cherokee trail of tears we are being forced out of our own communities by invading armies of illegal immigrants... and the steady loss of jobs, forcing us to live in non-white communities. " Throughout the site the violence originating in white supremacy is projected out and imagined instead as a threat to whites.

Concluding thoughts and broader ramifications

The white nationalism on Stormfront represents an extreme group, yet the nation they imagine and the fears they fan, of external dark threats bent on destroying the nation, immigrants stealing jobs, and attacks on the family values of patriarchal heterosexuality are widespread throughout contemporary popular politics and culture. And, even with the increasing difficulty of maintaining seg-

regated space given racial demographic changes, the racial segregation needed to maintain a white nation fantasy continues. According to an article in The New York Times Magazine from 1995, "whites this time are not just fleeing the cities for the suburbs. They are leaving entire metropolitan areas and states— whole regions— for whiter destinations... The whites leaving high-immigration areas are those most likely to be competing with immigrants for jobs, space, and cultural primacy." By the year 2025 while demographic trends show that twelve states will have populations that are less than 60 percent white, twelve states will have white populations exceeding 85 percent. Although four decades have passed since the striking down of Jim Crow laws and multiculturalism is now mainstream, whites continue to prove their allegiance is to living in racially homogenous communities even when that requires moving trans-regionally.

White supremacy has not been destroyed in the post-Civil Rights America it has simply been transformed. I believe that the apartheid conscience seen in the white nationalist movement is helpful to understand this reproduction of white supremacy in America. In the past forty years many civil rights laws have been implemented and school curriculum has changed to incorporate a broader understanding of American history which recognizes racism. But can this legislation change the culture created over a century and a half of legalized racism which was organized not only around institutionalized supremacy but also internalized symbolically on an individual level and imbedded in morality? While multiculturalism challenges some aspects of white supremacy, it stops well short of recognizing the way that whiteness as a supremacist concept and conglomeration of practices is inseparably connected to nationalist practices and identity. Unlike anti-racism which explicitly points to the relation between power and race, multiculturalism is not directed at ending white supremacy but on representing or celebrating different races, thus whiteness remains the unnamed and oppressive norm left invisible to whites.

Exploring the relationships between white supremacy and nationalism complicates both anti-racist strategies for challenging white supremacy as well as points to some disturbing potential future trends in race relations in America. It seems that efforts at anti-racist education and organizing will be hampered without understanding the role that subconscious fears and irrational projections may play in securing a white identity. There is great irony of course in understanding whiteness as based on racial fears and morality, for whiteness is itself the cause of widespread racial terror and a moral system based on violent exclusions. As David Roediger writes, whiteness is the "terrifying attempt to build an identity based on what one isn't and what one can hold back," whiteness has always required significant violence to bolster the façade of racial difference. What I believe this study is useful in explicating is that while white supremacy is clearly perpetuated

by a sense of white racial superiority and entitlement, that much racist action may also be perpetuated by terror, a terror based on exposing white morality as having an inherently mendacious character and for perpetuating tragedies of epic proportions. What white nationalists also show us is the difficulty in talking about whiteness without also talking about gender as a structuring element of white racial identity.

On the level of broader cultural politics there are also many concerns. With the continued disintegration of communities, traditional gender roles, and economies due to the constant destabilizing potential of globalized late-capital-ism there are many reasons for all of us to feel uncertain of our very locations and identities. For whites, this social and economic dissolution, coupled with racial transformation and a slow, if slight, loss of racial privilege may be a motivation to blame changing racial concepts for the broader social and economic instability of capitalism. Noam Chomsky argues that in the U.S., "a deliberate policy is driving the country toward a kind of third world model, with sectors of great privilege, growing numbers of people sinking into poverty or real misery, and a superflu-ous population confined in slums or expelled rapidly into the prison system." In response to these growing crises, "people who would have been working to build the CIO 60 years ago are now joining paramilitary organizations." Xenophobia and sectarianism may well be more appealing, comforting, and easy to grasp than the massive flux and inequality created by neoliberal global capitalism.

With pressure on states to decrease social spending, effectively cutting safety networks, the fear of destabilization is indeed a real one. The comfort found in imagining and defending the image of the nation as a secure racial home gov-erned by one's core values may be the appealing option. McLaren writes, "White-ness offers a safe 'home' for those imperiled by the flux of change. Whiteness can be considered as a conscription of the process of positive self-identification into the service of domination through inscribing identity into an onto-epistemological framework of 'us' versus 'them.'" Whereas McLaren hints that it is capitalism which must be contested in order to challenge racism, I believe it is clearly the opposite which we must be wary of, that it is racism which will inhibit our ability to challenge the monopoly of war-driven capitalism and its devastating effects on humanity and the environment.

For whites, this social and economic dissolution, coupled with racial transformation and a slow, if slight, loss of racial privilege may be a motivation to blame changing racial concepts for the broader social instability of capitalism. Coupled with decreasing public space to openly discuss this significant phenom-enon, Stormfront's capitalization of the internet may prove a successful tactic. As Swain argues, the anonymity of the internet may be one of the last places where many whites feel they may freely express their ambivalence, frustration,

and confusion about race. Many whites end up on Stormfront seemingly with a positive intention of finding a way to feel proud of their history, culture, and race and discuss their concerns. The limited framework and representation of views in the chatrooms lead many to become indoctrinated into white nationalist ideology. But, the broader cultural milieu also encourages this phenomenon. Swain concludes that the current social dynamic in America can only "nourish white racial consciousness and white nationalism" which she argues is "the next logical stage for identity politics in America." The white nationalist movement is successfully peddling its divisive and violent message and expanding its base through bolstering racist morality, my hope is that the anti-racist movement does a better job of dismantling it.

1. Jeff R. Crump, "Producing and Enforcing Geographies of Hate: Race, Housing Segregation, and Housing-Related Hate Crimes in the United States," in Spaces of Hate: Geographies of Discrimination and Intolerance in the U.S.A,

ed. Colin Flint, (New York and London: Routledge, 2004: 227).

2. Jessie Daniels, White Lies: Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality in White Supremacist Discourse (New York and London: Routledge, 1997), 14.

3. David Goldberg, Racist Culture (Cambridge, Massachusetts and Oxford: Blackwell, 1993: 188).

4. Dale Maharidge, The Coming White Minority: California's Eruptions and America's Future (New York: Random House, 1996): 10.

5. Grant Meyer, Stephen, As long as They Don't Move Next Door: Segregation and Racial Conflict in American Neighborhoods (Lanham and Oxford, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000); Douglas Massey & Nancy Denton, American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass (Cambridge, Mass. and Oxford: Harvard University Press, 1993).

6. Goldberg 1993:192.

7. Claudia Koonz, The Nazi Conscience (Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003).

8. Koonz 2003: 5.

9. Koonz 2003: 1.

10. Quoted in Lee D. Baker, From Savage to Negro: Anthropology and theConstruction of Race, 1896-1954 [Berkeley: University of California Press 1998] 112.

11. C.f. Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism [New York: Basic Books, 1992] and And We Are Not Saved: The Elusive Quest for Racial Justice [New York: Basic Books, 1987].

12. Critical race theory : the key writings that formed the movement [New York : New Press, 1995].

13. "Whiteness as Property" 106 Harvard Law Review 1709-91 (1993).

14. See: Kathleen Blee, "The Geography of Racial Activism," in Spaces of Hate: Geographies of Discrimination and Intolerance in the U.S.A, edited by Colin Flint, 62 (New York and London: Routledge, 2004); Jessie Daniels, White Lies: Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality in White Supremacist Discourse (New York and London: Routledge, 1997); Abby L. Ferber, White man falling: race, gender, and White supremacy, (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998).

15. Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning (Cambridge, Massachusetts and Oxford: Blackwell, 1993).

16. The Racial Contract (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1997).

17. Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism (New York and London: Verso, 1983).

18 Ernest Renan, "What is a nation?" in Nation and Narration, edited by Homi K. Bhabha, 19 (London and New York: Routledge, 1990).

19. Ghassan Hage, white nation: fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society (New York:Routledge, 2000): 32.

20. Sherene Razack, Dark Threats and White Knights: Peacekeeping and the New Imperialism (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004: 157).

21. Goldberg 1993:14.

22. Quoted in Andrea Smith, "Not an Indian Tradition: The Sexual Colonization of Native Peoples," Hypatia 18 (2003): 73.

23. A. Smith 2003: 73.

24. See Lisa Lindquist Dorr, White Women, Rape, and the Power of Race in Virginia, 1900-1960, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

25. Kathleen Blee, "The Geography of Racial Activism," in Spaces of Hate: Geographies of Discrimination and Intolerance in the U.S.A, ed. Colin Flint, (New York and London: Routledge, 2004: 52).

26. The main exception being Carol M. Swain, The New White Nationalism in America: Its Challenges to Integration (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

27. Jennifer Fluir and Loarraine Dowler, "House Bound: Women's Agency in White Separatist Movements," in Spaces of Hate: Geographies of Discrimination and Intolerance in the U.S.A, ed. Colin Flint, (New York and London: Routledge, 2004: 78).

28. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Newslinks, Thread "The Need for Family and Community, What it Means to our People by Vinlands Hammer," Post 8/31/04 , 11:38 PM #3, retrieved 09-01-2004.

29. Ferber 1998: 4.

30. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Lounge, Thread Women in the Movement, What DOES attract you to WN/Racialism, Post #08-22-2004, 01:39 PM #177, retrieved 08-25-2004.

31. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Lounge, Thread Women in the Movement, What DOES attract you to WN/Racialism, Post 08-22-2004, 03:18 PM #178, retrieved 08-25-2004.

32. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Lounge, Thread Women in the Movement, What DOES attract you to WN/Racialism, Post # 08-09-2004, 07:41 PM #65, retrieved 08-25-2004.

33. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Lounge, Thread Women in the Movement, What DOES attract you to WN/Racialism, Post 08-03-2004, 08:55 PM #49 , retrieved 08-25-2004.

34. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Ideology and Philosophy, Thread "Is

Feminism Evil?" Post09-04-2004, 12:36 PM #3, retrieved 09-07-2004.

35. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Lounge, Thread Women in the Movement, What DOES attract you to WN/Racialism, Post # 30 07-31-2004, 06:02 PM, retrieved 08-25-2004.

36. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Lounge, Thread Women in the Movement, What DOES attract you to WN/Racialism, Post 08-02-2004, 04:30 AM #38, retrieved 08-25-2004.

37. Ann Laura Stoler, Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1995: 7-8).

38. George L Mosse, Nationalism and Sexuality: Middle-Class Morality and Sexual Norms in Modern Europe (Madison and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1988).

39. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Lounge, Thread Women in the Movement, What DOES attract you to WN/Racialism, Post #33 08-01-2004, 01:40 AM, retrieved 08-25-2004.

40. <http://www.stormfront.org>,, Forum Ideology and Philosophy, Thread "Marriage is only a word," Post 08-31-2004, 12:33 AM #145, retrieved 09-30-2004.

41. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Ideology and Philosophy, Thread "Marriage is only a word," Post 04-01-2004, 08:53 PM #11, retrieved 09-30-2004.

42. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Ideology and Philosophy, Thread "Marriage is only a word," Post 04-04-2004, 03:05 AM #44, retrieved 09-30-2004.

43. Charles Mills, the racial contract (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1997).

44. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Opposing Views, Thread "News from the Border (and why it should be protected)," Posts 03-21-2004, 02:58 AM #3

and 03-21-2004, 04:42 AM #4, Retrieved 09-13-2004.

45. Franz Fanon, Black Skin, White Masks (trans. Charles Lam Markman, New York: Grove Press, 1967: 160).

46. Karen Brodkin, How Jews Became White Folks & What that Says about Race in America (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998).

47. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum "Ideology and Philosophy," Thread "My feeling on Jews," Post 09 10-02-2004, 07:55 PM #49, retrieved 10-10-2004.

48. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum "Ideology and Philosophy," Thread "My feeling on Jews," Post 09-11-2004,08:57 PM#1, retrieved 09-26-2004.

49. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum "Ideology and Philosophy," Thread "My feeling on Jews," Post 09-11-2004,08:57 PM #1, retrieved 09-26-2004.

50. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum "Ideology and Philosophy," Thread "My feeling on Jews," Post 09-12-2004,

04:21 AM #11, retrieved 09-26-2004.

51. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum "Ideology and Philosophy," Thread "My feeling on Jews," Post 09-13-2004, 12:21 AM #23, retrieved 09-26-2004.

52. Zygmunt Bauman, Modernity and the Holocaust (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1989).

53. Bauman 1989: 52.

54. Ibid.: 53 (emphasis in original).

55. Ibid.: 68.

56. EricVoegelin, "The Growth of the Race Idea," in The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin: Volume 10, Published Essays 1940-1962, edited by Elliz Sanoz (University of Missouri Press: Columbia and London 1989: 59).

57. Voegelin 1989: 59.

58. See Sharpe, Jenny. Allegories of Empire: The Figure of the Women in the Colonial Text (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1993).

59. Teresa Brennan, History after Lacan (London and New York; Routledge, 1993: 46).

60. Ibid.: 59.

61. James Baldwin, "A Talk to Teachers," in Graywolf Annual Five: Multicultural Literacy, Rick Simonson and Scott Walker, (eds) (Saint Paul: Graywolf, 1988: p.8).

62. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum: Ideology and Philosophy, Thread "What are arguments for WN and the preservation of the white race?" 09-02-2004, 01:57 PM #22, retrieved September 29, 2004.

63. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum: Ideology and Philosophy, Thread "What are arguments for WN and the preservation of the white race?" 09-02-2004, 01:57 PM #27, Retrieved September 29, 2004.

64. <http://www.stormfront.org>, Forum Ideology and Philosophy, Thread "Is the US Federal Government committing Genocide? Opinions sought," Post 02-25-2004, 08:50 PM #32, retrieved 08-26-2004.

65. Frey and Tilove quoted in Swain, 2002: 88.

66. Swain, 2002: 90.

67. Roediger quoted Peter McLaren, "Unthinking Whiteness, Rethinking Democracy: Or Farewell to the Blonde Beast; Towards a Revolutionary Multiculturalism." Educational Foundations, Vol. 11, No. 2 Spring, (1997): 16.

68. Noam Chomsky quoted in Dobratz and Shanks-Meile, 1997: 276.

69. Noam Chomsky quoted in Dobratz and Shanks-Meile, 1997: 293.

70. Peter McLaren, "Unthinking Whiteness, Rethinking Democracy: Or Farewell to the Blonde Beast: Towards a Revolutionary Multiculturalism," Educational Foundations, Vol. 11, No 2, Spring 1997, pp. 5-39: 26.

71. Swain, 2002: 423.