

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE

FAKULTA SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD

Institut mezinárodních studií

Kristýna Divišová

**Minutemen: New Racism on the
U.S.-Mexican Border?**

Diplomová práce

Praha 2015

Autor práce: **Kristýna Divišová**

Vedoucí práce: **PhDr. et Mgr. Kryštof Kozák, Ph.D.**

Rok obhajoby: 2015

Bibliografický záznam

DIVIŠOVÁ, Kristýna. *Minutemen: New Racism on the U.S.-Mexican Border?*. Praha, 2015. 111 s. Diplomová práce (Mgr.) Univerzita Karlova, Fakulta sociálních věd, Institut mezinárodních studií. Katedra amerických studií. Vedoucí diplomové práce PhDr. et Mgr. Kryštof Kozák, Ph.D.

Abstrakt

Hnutí „minutemanů“ působící na americko-mexické hranici deklarovalo, že jeho cílem je zabránit vstupu ilegálních imigrantů do Spojených států. Cílem této práce je zjistit, zda byla činnost hnutí motivována novým rasismem vůči těmto převážně mexickým imigrantům. Studie přitom vychází z předpokladu, že starý (zjevný) rasismus už není společensky přijatelný, avšak byl nahrazen novým typem rasismu, který se vyznačuje nápadně „barvoslepu“ rétorikou. Tato rétorika byla typická právě pro hnutí „minutemanů“, a dá se tedy předpokládat, že v sobě mohla skrývat nový rasový předsudek. Rétorika hnutí přitom kladla přehnaný důraz na ilegality imigrantů, kterou stavěla do opozice vůči právnímu státu, jež se hnutí údajně snažilo bránit. Nový rasismus není postaven na rase definované biologicky, ale bílou i černou rasu chápe jako společenské konstrukty. To umožňuje zachování dichotomie mezi bílou a černou rasou ve společnosti, a tím i pokračující diskriminaci vůči „nebílym“ rasám, která tuto dichotomii doprovází. K odhalení možného rasového předsudku práce provádí kritickou analýzu diskurzu „minutemanů“. Výsledky této analýzy ukazují, že zvláštní důraz, který hnutí klade na pojem „právo a pořádek“ je silně zavádějící a zdánlivě „barvoslepá“ argumentace hnutí vykazuje prvky skrytého, nového rasového předsudku.

Abstract

This study has for its goal to examine whether a new racist prejudice against Mexican illegal immigrants was driving the activities of the minutemen movement operating along the U.S.-Mexico border whose stated goal was to prevent illegal immigrants from entering the country. This work assumes that the old blatant racism is no longer

acceptable within society but was replaced by a conspicuously color-blind rhetoric, typical of the minutemen movement, that might harbor a new racist prejudice. New racism does not put forth a race defined biologically but understands the white and non-white races conceptually. It thus contributes to the maintenance of the white-black dichotomy within society and more importantly to the discrimination and exclusion of the non-white races. In order to disclose a possible racist prejudice, this study conducts a Critical Discourse Analysis of the minutemen's discourse. Results of this analysis show that especially the focus on the notion of law and order, so typical of the discourse, is hugely misleading and that under this seemingly color-blind reasoning, there is, indeed, a hidden expression of the new racist prejudice.

Klíčová slova

hnutí „minutemanů“, americko-mexická hranice, ilegální imigrace, nový rasismus, předsudek, kritická diskurzivní analýza

Keywords

minutemen, U.S.-Mexico border, illegal immigration, new racism, prejudice, Critical Discourse Analysis

Rozsah práce: 182 855 znaků

Prohlášení

1. Prohlašuji, že jsem předkládanou práci zpracovala samostatně a použila jen uvedené prameny a literaturu.
2. Prohlašuji, že práce nebyla využita k získání jiného titulu.
3. Souhlasím s tím, aby práce byla zpřístupněna pro studijní a výzkumné účely.

V Praze dne 13. 5. 2015

Kristýna Divišová

Poděkování

Na tomto místě bych ráda poděkovala vedoucímu práce PhDr. et Mgr. Kryštofovi Kozákovi, Ph.D. za vstřícné vedení práce a cenné připomínky v průběhu jejího vedení.

Institut mezinárodních studií
Teze Diplomové práce

Jméno:

Kristýna Divišová

E-mail:

kristyna.divisova@centrum.cz

Semestr:

ZS 2013

Akademický rok:

2013/2014

Název práce:

Hnutí "minutemanů": nový rasismus na americko-mexické hranici?

Předpokládaný termín ukončení (semestr, školní rok):

LS 2015

Vedoucí diplomového semináře:

PhDr. Kryštof Kozák, Ph.D.

Vedoucí práce:

PhDr. Kryštof Kozák, Ph.D.

V čem se oproti původnímu zadání změnil cíl práce?

Oproti původnímu záměru se diplomová práce v rámci problematiky "minutemanů" působících na americko-mexické hranici nesoustředí na důvody neúspěchu či úpadku tohoto hnutí, ani na absenci nebo ztrátu legitimacy, ale na aspekt nového rasismu (ten se oproti "starému" rasismu neodvozuje od biologického determinismu, ale od odlišností daných kulturou). Práce si klade za cíl vyhodnotit, zda je u hnutí "minutemanů" přítomný aspekt nového rasismu.

Jaké změny nastaly v časovém, teritoriálním a věcném vymezení tématu?

Věcně se práce zabývá hnutím "minutemanů" a nově aspektem nového rasismu. Teritoriálně je práce stále vymezena státem Arizona se zvláštním důrazem na oblast americko-mexické hranice, neboť počítá s tím, že jsou-li "minutemani" skutečně noví rasisté, pak budou pravděpodobně často jasně rozlišovat mezi "námi" a "těmi druhými", čemuž vnímání hranice jako předělu mezi dvěma kulturními skupinami napomáhá. Časově je práce vymezena obdobím nejaktivnějšího působení "minutemanů", tedy přibližně lety 2005–2011.

Jak se proměnila struktura práce (vyjádřete stručným obsahem)?

Úvod

1. Nový rasismus

1.1 Teorie nového rasismu

1.2 Vývoj rasismu (a nového rasismu) na území Arizony

2. Metodologie: kritická diskurzivní analýza

3. Vznik a vývoj hnutí "minutemanů"

3.1 Anti-imigrační hnutí v Arizoně

3.2 Kontext vzniku hnutí "minutemanů"

3.3 Charakter a stručný vývoj hnutí

4. Prvky nového rasismu v hnutí "minutemanů"

Závěr

Jakým vývojem prošla metodologická koncepce práce?

Vzhledem k důrazu na aspekt nového rasismu byla jako vhodná metodologie zvolena kritická diskurzivní analýza. Kritická diskurzivní analýza předpokládá, že noví rasisté

nebudou v opozici vůči odlišné kulturní skupině explicitně, protože takto otevřený rasismus není společností akceptován, ale implicitně bude toto jejich stanovisko přítomno v jejich diskurzu. Důraz je proto kladen především na jejich argumentační strategie, vnitřní logiku a soudržnost jejich vyjádření, užívání metafor, klišé atd.

Které nové prameny a sekundární literatura byly zpracovány a jak tato skutečnost ovlivnila celek práce?

Pro upřesnění metodologického přístupu byly nejužitečnější práce Teun A. van Dijka, který je jedním z předních odborníků na metodu kritické diskurzivní analýzy (CDA). Van Dijk zdůrazňuje právě roli CDA při poukazování na etnickou či rasovou nerovnost ve společnosti a udržování této nerovnosti. Ve svých pracích konkrétně ukazuje, jak lze text analyticky zkoumat v různých rovínách (povrchové, syntaktické, lexikální, významové, tematické atd.) za účelem "odhalení" implicitně přítomného rasismu nebo jiné formy vyjadřující dominanci určité skupiny nad jinými skupinami ve společnosti. Vybrané kapitoly ze sborníku "Border Rhetorics: Citizenship and Identity on the US-Mexico Frontier" přiblížily význam americko-mexické hranice pro hnutí "minutemanů" a vysvětlují, jak se s její pomocí (tzv. concept of alienization) dařilo "minutemanům" učinit svůj nový rasismus částečně sociálně akceptovatelným. Pro pochopení teorie nového rasismu byly využity i práce Eduarda Bonilla-Silvy a Roxanne Lynn Doty. Oba vysvětlují roli kulturních odlišností v rámci nového rasismu v opozici k tradičně vnímané rase podmíněné biologickými rysy. Všimají si také důrazu na typicky americké hodnoty jako je právo a pořádek, pracovní morálka nebo individualismus, pomocí nichž hnutí snadněji získává podporu v některých částech společnosti.

Charakterizujte základní proměny práce v době od zadání projektu do odevzdání tezí a pokuste se vyhodnotit, jaký pokrok na práci jste během semestru zaznamenali (v bodech):

- předefinování výzkumné otázky (důraz na aspekt nového rasismu v rámci hnutí "minutemanů")
- zvolena metoda kritické diskurzivní analýzy vzhledem k výzkumné otázce
- shromáždění nové literatury k tématu
- na základě nové literatury ujasnění konceptu nového rasismu, jak se může projevovat v diskurzu hnutí "minutemanů", důraz na roli americko-mexické hranice v chápání odlišností mezi dvěma kulturami ze strany "minutemanů"

Podpis studenta a datum:

Schváleno:	Datum	Podpis
Vedoucí práce		
Vedoucí diplomového semináře		

Obsah

INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 THE EMERGENCE OF THE NEW RACISM THEORY.....	10
1.2 KEY TERMS IN NEW RACISM	12
1.3 CONSTRUCTING RACE IN THE UNITED STATES	15
1.4 FRAMES.....	18
1.5 RELEVANCE AND CRITIQUE OF THE NEW RACISM THEORY	20
1.6 CONCLUSION.....	21
2 CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.....	22
2.1 BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CDA AND ITS GOALS	22
2.2 MAIN TENETS OF CDA	23
2.3 DOMINANT APPROACHES WITHIN CDA.....	25
2.4 SOCIO-COGNITIVE APPROACH.....	26
2.4.1 <i>Study of Prejudice in Discourse</i>	26
2.5 HART'S APPROACH TO CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.....	27
2.5.1 <i>Evolutionary Psychology in CDA</i>	28
2.5.2 <i>Cognitive Linguistic Aspect</i>	28
2.6 METHODOLOGY OF CDA	29
2.6.1 <i>Referential and Predication Strategies</i>	29
2.6.3 <i>Metaphors in Discourse</i>	32
2.6.4 <i>Force-Dynamic</i>	33
2.7 CRITIQUE OF CDA	34
2.8 CONCLUSION.....	35
3 MEXICAN IMMIGRATION AND ITS CONSTRUCTION AS A THREAT.....	36
3.1 MEXICAN PRESENCE FROM THE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	36
3.2 "LOSS OF CONTROL" AND "LATINO THREAT" NARRATIVES.....	38
3.3 (UNINTENDED) CONSEQUENCES OF "PREVENTION THROUGH DETERRENCE"?.....	39
3.4 THE FLAWED FOCUS ON THE BORDER	40
3.5 CONCLUSION.....	41
4 THE MINUTEMEN MOVEMENT.....	42
4.1 ARIZONA: THE ANTI-IMMIGRATION LABORATORY	42
4.2 VIGILANTES ON THE BORDER	44

4.3	THE MINUTEMAN PROJECT	45
4.3.1	<i>A Job the Federal Government Won't Do</i>	46
4.3.2	<i>Spectacle on the Border and the Role of the Media</i>	48
4.3.3	<i>Militarism and Masculinity</i>	49
4.3.4	<i>Racism</i>	51
4.3.5	<i>Success or Failure?</i>	52
5	CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE MINUTEMEN DISCOURSE	56
5.1	RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGY	56
5.2	DATA COLLECTION	57
5.3	REFERENTIAL AND PREDICATION STRATEGIES	59
5.3.1	<i>"We," the Law-Abiding American Citizens Versus "Them," the Illegal Immigrants</i> ...	59
5.4	TOPOI	64
5.4.1	<i>Topoi of Threat and Crime</i>	64
5.4.2	<i>Topos of Burden</i>	66
5.4.3	<i>Topos of Culture</i>	67
5.5	FORCE-DYNAMIC	68
5.6	"WE" ARE THE LAW	72
5.7	COHERENCE AND LEGITIMIZATION	75
5.8	MAIN CONCLUSIONS	78
5.9	PREJUDICE IN THE DISCOURSE	80
	CONCLUSION	84
	RESUMÉ	90
	SOURCES	93

Introduction

The Minuteman Project started operating on the U.S.-Mexican border in April 2005 with an aim to, firstly, stop the illegal immigration by spotting illegal immigrants and reporting them to Border Patrol and secondly, to bring the media attention to the situation on the border they believed was caused by the federal government's failure to enforce the law.

The minutemen conspicuously presented themselves as a patriotic and highly responsible civil movement that took up the duty as American citizens to fill in for the government. They were presenting themselves as speaking on behalf of all Americans, claiming they were a multiethnic group where racism had no place because the only thing they were concerned with was the *illegal* immigration as it contradicted the rule of law in the country they were trying to defend.

This study has for its hypothesis that despite this seemingly anti-racist rhetoric centered on the notion of law and order, a new form of racial prejudice against Mexican immigrants¹ might have been the driving force behind the minutemen's efforts along the border. In a broader sense, the rhetoric of the minutemen is to some extent representative of the rhetoric of the whole anti-immigration movement that greatly rests upon similar conspicuously color-blind, patriotic, and legalistic rhetoric. Claims of the anti-immigration movement are in no way marginal. They are, in fact, supported by a considerable part of the U.S. society.

They might be further echoed also by the political and academic elites who often use the very same rhetoric in order to justify concrete policies (e.g., the controversial anti-immigration policies passed in Arizona in the course of the last decade) that have very concrete consequences for migrants' lives. Proving this hypothesis might thus point out the deceptiveness and harmfulness of this whole kind of seemingly innocent immigration discourse.

This thesis draws on the assumption that the old blatant racism is no longer a relevant ideology both because most people do not believe anymore that non-white races are

¹ Despite the fact that not just Mexicans are crossing the southern border, they comprise a vast majority of the border-crossers and in addition, the minutemen's leaders specifically speak of Mexico as the source

biologically inferior and especially because the explicit form of racism has become inadmissible in the wake of the civil rights movement in the 1960s. An openly racist movement is thus inevitably seen as illegitimate by the general public.

Instead, a new form of prejudice, the new racism, has become relevant which explicitly rejects biologically understood race but it still targets particular groups of people. These groups can be defined, for example, by their culture that is typically deemed inherently incompatible with the dominant culture in the society. This "new race" might be defined by a number of traits that are, like the old race, understood as given and not subject to change. It can comprise a specific culture or even the notions of poverty or illegality that are conceptually understood as non-white. The whiteness, on the other hand, is still perceived as inherently human, civilized, or rational. New racism might be especially suitable for studying prejudice against immigrants, even more so on the border with Mexico as many Mexican immigrants are not necessarily non-white as far as the color of their skin (the "old race") is concerned.

In order to find out whether a new racist prejudice was present in the minutemen movement, this study will focus specifically on the discourse of the movement drawing on van Dijk who asserts that both ideology and prejudice are reproduced by discourse. Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach to Critical Discourse Analysis was chosen as an appropriate method of analyzing the discourse, along with the approach of Christopher Hart that is heavily influenced by cognitive linguistics.

The minutemen movement this study is concerned with comprise both the Minuteman Project (MMP), a joint project of Jim Gilchrist and Chris Simcox, and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps (MCDC) that was a project of Simcox. The latter group was technically part of the MMP but operated also independently both before the initiation of the MMP and also after the two leaders had parted their ways.

The movement's efforts basically came to halt around the year 2011, but this study is especially focused on the years 2004–2006 when the two leaders drew most media attention. The set of data examined comprises mainly interviews from the national TV channels with the two leaders, who were in fact speakers of the whole movement, most of which were conducted in the period of 2004–2006. Other data gathered to study the discourse of the movement included material from the web pages of both the MMP and

country of illegal immigration. It can be thus supposed that they are especially concerned with Mexican immigrants.

the MCDC and several other appearances of both Simcox and Gilchrist such as press conferences aired by C-SPAN.

Literature Review

Theoretically, this study draws on several scholars who examine the new racism and how it manifests itself discursively. Among the most relevant ones is Bonilla-Silva who identifies, in *Racism Without Racists* (2003), several frames that speakers use to conceal prejudice in their utterances. His approach explains very well how the white hegemony in a society is reproduced by the discourse by the use of these frames. Yet, he focuses mainly on Afro-Americans, but the prejudice against this particular group has some specifics that cannot be unconditionally transplanted onto Latino immigrants.

Doty's article "Racism, Desire, and the Politics of Immigration" (1999) is useful in understanding how the post-World War II immigration has helped establish the new racism but does not focus on how the new racism shows itself in the discourse. Meaning of the notion of the new race in the U.S. context was examined by Kretsedemas who studies how Latinos were constructed as non-white in his article "Redefining 'Race' in North America" (2008).

A number of scholars have studied specifically the intersection of the new race and immigration. In her article "Immigration, Law, Race, and Identity" (2007), Calavita explains how immigrants have been racialized in the U.S. history and emphasizes the conceptual white-black dichotomy that thus still persists in the U.S. society. Other scholars focus on how the notion of illegality replaced the notion of race as understood by the old racism.

De Genova points out in his study "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life" (2002) that the law creates the illegality that is made visible on the border, while the law itself remains invisible. Chavez, in his monograph *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation* (2013) focuses on how Latinos are constructed as unassimilable in terms of their culture. He deals with the notion of illegality, too, that he understands as constructed. The factors behind this illegal immigration are, as he points out, completely overlooked.

Kil examines, similarly, how immigrants have been defined in terms of crime, hence illegality, and how they were constructed as a threat to the "white national body" in his work "Diseased Body Politic" (2014). He also studies how the use of metaphors

contributed to these outcomes. Santa Ana with his monograph *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse* (2003) might be the most significant scholar exploring the use of metaphors in the immigration discourse that can serve to dehumanization of immigrants in a similar way Afro-Americans were being dehumanized by old racists.

Other scholars focus to a greater extent on the border itself. They typically claim that the notion of the "broken" border that the minutemen movement frequently operates with is both constructed and misleading but translates into real policies that are affecting immigrants. Andreas, in this respect, ponders the unintended consequences of the militarization on the border in *Border Games* (2009). Payan and Doty in *The Three U.S.-Mexico Border Wars* (2006) and *Border-Crossing Deaths and Spaces of Moral Alibi* (2013) discuss how the government might be complicit in the deaths of immigrants caused as a consequence of its policies on the border. Doty describes how migrants came to be understood as "bare bodies" completely stripped of their identity which makes their death more palatable.

In *Prejudice in Discourse* (1984), van Dijk studies the everyday, conversational discourse on ethnic minorities in the Netherlands which is especially helpful to be able to understand what strategies speakers use to express negative opinions about minorities while keeping positive self-representation. Hart shows in his monograph *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse* (2010) how findings from cognitive linguistics and evolutionary psychology can enrich the Critical Discourse Analysis with a special focus on the issue of immigration in the Great Britain.

With respect to the minutemen movement, there is a myriad of both articles and monographs dealing with the issue. Navarro examines the minutemen movement in *The Immigration Crisis: Nativism, Armed Vigilantism, and the Rise of a Countervailing Movement* (2008) in the context of nativist and broader anti-immigration movement and policies in the country. He labels the movement as racist, yet, provides little evidence supporting the claim. Doty concludes in her monograph *A Law Into Their Hands: Immigration and the Politics of Exceptionalism* (2009) that the current anti-immigration movement, including the minutemen, has some racist connections. She does not look for the evidence in the discourse, focusing on the links between organizations instead. In *Showdown in the Sonoran Desert: Religion, Law, and the Immigration Controversy*

(2012), Rose identifies the fear of a stranger and the perceived threat to the U.S. culture as the driving impulses for the minutemen activities. Shapira, on the other hand, concludes in his monograph *Waiting for José: The Minutemen's Pursuit of America* (2013) that was based on ethnographic research among the minutemen, that they are too often stereotyped by the media that label them as right-wing and further examines what other ideological aspects could be behind the movement. In addition, Gilchrist himself co-authored a book on the movement (*Minutemen: The Battle to Secure America's Borders*, 2006) that sheds more light on his attitudes regarding immigration.

The discourse of the minutemen was analyzed by several scholars who typically concentrated on their web pages. Oliviero, for example, focuses on the notions of masculinity and militarism in her study "Sensational Nation and the Minutemen" (2011). The new racism in the minutemen discourse is the subject of a paper by Smith and Waugh but it is, again, limited to the group's web pages.² Dissertation written at the University of Texas by Gradsky that dealt with the minutemen's discourse, too, could not be accessed but is also concerned only with the content of the movement's web pages.³

Studying the web pages in depth is useful as they present a comprehensive way of representing the minutemen and their ideas. Since the web pages are especially meant to work as a means of recruitment of volunteers without whom no organization or movement can exist, they often offer a more expressive language as the visitors are usually already sympathetic to the group's efforts.

This study can contribute to better understanding of the role of the new racism in the minutemen movement because it includes not only an analysis of the texts from their web pages but also, unlike previous studies, comprises interviews conducted with the minutemen leaders on the national TV. As the previous research implies and this thesis reasserts, the content of the utterances on the web pages is much more open in its opposition against illegal immigrants and more expressive in its language. However, when the speakers appeared on the national TV, they might have been seen as more tolerant towards the illegal immigrants. The perceived cultural threat from the part of

² Margater W. Smith and Linda Waugh, "Covert Racist Discourses on the WWW: Rhetorical Strategies of the Minuteman Project" (paper presented at the Sixteenth Annual Symposium About Language and Society, Austin, April 11-13, 2008), published in *Texas Linguistic Forum* 52 (2008), accessed May 3, 2015, http://studentorgs.utexas.edu/salsa/proceedings/2008/Smith_Waugh_2008.pdf.

immigrants, reiterated on the web pages, never came up. More tools therefore need to be used in order to disclose a possible prejudice in this kind of a discourse. Apart from the Critical Discourse Analysis, Hart's cognitive linguistic approach will be employed which offers new methods of studying immigration discourse, such as *force-dynamic*, that have been relatively recent, and therefore not yet fully made use of.

Structure

This work will be divided into five parts. The first chapter will introduce the theory of the new racism and its evolution. It will present different meanings this "new race" can acquire, especially in the U.S. context and with regards to immigrants.

Second chapter will deal with the Critical Discourse Analysis. It will define the theory, its main tenets and will also briefly discuss different approaches. Consequently, the socio-cognitive approach of van Dijk will be elaborated on as this thesis's methods to a great extent reflect his work. This part should shed some light on how prejudice can be mediated by discourse. Hart's approach will be also presented that draws on van Dijk but applies a greater emphasis on the cognitive linguistic aspect. In addition, based on his work, evolutionary psychology and its use will be explained. The chapter will conclude with examination of concrete methods of CDA that are especially useful for studying possibly prejudiced discourse that will be applied in the latter analysis.

The third chapter has for its goal to show how the Mexican immigration has been constructed as a threat. At first, it briefly summarizes the history of Mexican immigration into the United States which also demonstrates how and why the issue of Mexican illegal immigration emerged. This chapter will also explain the "Latino Threat Narrative" and the "Loss of Control Narrative" that are crucial to understand the current anti-immigration discourse. Finally, it will focus on the issue of the border itself and a set of policies known as "prevention through deterrence" employed in the course of the 1990s that further contributed to the flawed notion of the "broken" border fueling the anti-immigration discourses, including the one of the minutemen, up to now.

The fourth chapter will provide context for the minutemen movement. It will look at anti-immigration policies in Arizona, where the minutemen movement emerged, that

³ Normajeon Gradsky, "Vigilant patriots or vigilantes: A critical discourse Analysis of the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps' Web site" (PhD diss., University of Texas at El Paso, 2007), <http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/dissertations/AAI1448845/>.

have helped create the anti-immigration climate in the state. Secondly, it will present several civil border patrol groups that have operated along the border, and are therefore precursors of the current minutemen movement. Consequently, this chapter will focus on the minutemen movement itself. It will discuss its goals, the role of the media for their activities, and above all, the features that define the group and its ideology.

The final chapter will present the results of the Critical Discourse Analysis of the minutemen's discourse. It will explain the research design in a greater detail and evaluate the discourse of the group from different perspectives that should enable to assess whether the new racism is indeed present and the minutemen's claims of being sympathetic to immigrants and only being opposed to their illegality are thus deceptive.

1 The New Racism Theory

1.1 The Emergence of the New Racism Theory

In recent decades, there have been abundant claims that racism in the United States has vanished and the white racist structure was replaced by a post-racial society where race is no longer a relevant factor in determining one's status. It is sometimes referred to as a color-blind society where "race is not seen."⁴ These claims were seemingly vindicated by the election of the first president with Afro-American heritage in the U.S. history.⁵ Hsu, for example, poses himself a question in his article published in the *Atlantic*, "What will it mean to be white after 'whiteness' no longer defines the mainstream?"⁶ Yet, in this chapter, it will be argued that the white racist structure is still in place, but the racism of today often manifests itself in a more subtle, almost invisible way which in turn creates a false impression that racism is indeed a matter of the past.

The old blatant racism is deemed unacceptable by the general public and therefore, explicit racist rhetoric is largely absent nowadays. Episodic blatant racist utterances are promptly condemned by both the elite (politicians and the media) and the public.⁷ Last laws that had explicitly discriminated against non-white races were abolished throughout the 1960s but the old racism has only given way to other forms of racism that still underpin the same white racist structure of the U.S. society: institutional racism⁸, for example, prevents racial minorities from attaining equality with white citizens in the field of employment, housing, education, justice, or health. Moreover, it could be argued that there is a whole new form of racism in place that presents itself in a more subtle, conspicuously color-blind way.

⁴ H. Samy Alim, "Complicating Race: Articulating Race Across Multiple Social Dimensions," *Discourse & Society* 22, No. 4 (2011): 379.

⁵ Jim Hoagland, "The Post-Racial Election," *The Washington Post*, November 2, 2008, accessed May 6, 2015, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/10/31/AR2008103103360.html>.

⁶ Hua Hsu, "The End of White America?," *The Atlantic*, January/February 2009, accessed May 6, 2015, <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2009/01/the-end-of-white-america/307208/>.

⁷ See, for example: Carle Hulse, "Senator Apologizes to Student for Remark," *The New York Times*, August 24, 2006, accessed May 6, 2015,

<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9505E2DD133EF937A1575BC0A9609C8B63>.

⁸ Institutional racism refers to discrimination against racial minorities from the part of the institutions (e.g., government, corporations, schools, etc.), resulting from their policies that are disadvantageous to or discriminatory of racial minorities. It is opposed to individual racism that emphasizes rather the individuals and their individual decisions to discriminate.

Concepts of new racism emerged during the 1980s in France which in the post-World War II period experienced an influx of third-world nationals. According to Balibar, category of immigrant served as a substitute for race because different cultures can also function like a nature that is "immutable and intangible in its origin."⁹ Defining these immigrants culturally allowed speakers to express their prejudice without referring to the race which was becoming more and more unacceptable.

Taguieff similarly asserts that in contemporary France, "immigration has become a name for race par excellence."¹⁰ Both authors draw on Barker who was the first scholar to introduce the distinction between the old and the new racism.¹¹ Taguieff's "differentialist racism" builds on the postulate of irreducibility of different cultures that translates into the notion of unassimilability of certain (immigrant) groups. This consequently leads to a certain hierarchization of these groups according to their cultural and national origin.

Unlike the old racist ideology which categorized races on biological grounds, the new racism does not explicitly put forth the white race as superior but underlines the harmfulness of eliminating borders that divide inherently incompatible life styles and traditions of different cultures.¹² According to Doty, the new racism theory suggests that conflict is inevitable "if human beings of different cultures are mixed in inappropriate numbers."¹³ She joins the aforementioned scholars in emphasizing the role the post-World War II migrations played. The new racism is for her closely linked to the crisis of the nation-state as immigration to a great extent eroded the nation-state unity and brought about desire for order stemming from this perceived nation-state crisis.¹⁴

In the United States, the first concept of "neo-racism," albeit not yet as thoroughly worked-out as the French concept, appeared already in the 1970s: in 1972, van Berghe published an article in which he was downplaying the traditional biological interpretation of race, claiming instead that ethnicity had always been understood rather

⁹ Etienne Balibar, "Is There A 'Neo-Racism'?", in *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings*, ed. Tania das Gupta et al. (Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc., 2007), 84–85.

¹⁰ Pierre-André Taguieff, "Politisation de l'immigration et racisme: lectures," *Mots* 18 (1989): 100. Accessed October 17, 2014, doi: 10.3406/mots.1989.1451.

¹¹ Martin Reisiigl and Ruth Wodak, *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism* (London, New York: Routledge, 2001), 9.

¹² Taguieff, "Politisation de l'immigration et racisme," 98–100.

¹³ Roxanne Lynn Doty, "Racism, Desire, and the Politics of Immigration," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 28, No. 3 (1999): 589.

as an underclass status or "failure to enter the middle class."¹⁵ This can be connected to the French, cultural, understanding, for example, through blaming cultural traits such as work ethic or simply laziness for inevitably leading to poverty. Poverty can be thus also understood with regards to certain "cultures" as being inherent, not subject to change.

1.2 Key Terms in New Racism

In order to understand what the theory of the new racism is really about, one must understand several concepts it works with: *racism*, *race*, and *racial structure*. The term *prejudice* is at the heart of every kind of racism. It was described by Allport as an "antipathy based on a faulty or inflexible generalization."¹⁶ This prejudice can further translate, but not necessarily, into discriminatory behavior.¹⁷ Memmi understands racism as a form "of discriminatory judgement that encompasses the evaluation of both real or fictitious biological differences."¹⁸ In the case of the new racism, Memmi's definition is not fully appropriate. Most people now genuinely disbelieve the basic presumption of the old racism – that is, the inherent biological inferiority of Afro-Americans, Asians, Latinos, etc. There could hardly be an Afro-American president elected if they still did. The ongoing relevance of racism, the new racism, is instead given by reconceptualization of the notion of race despite its abandonment of the biologically determined races.

Scholars now almost universally understand race as a social construct. Race is constructed differently in different contexts, such as geographical, political, social, and so forth, which also means that there is a plurality of racisms rather than one global racism with one given racial structure based on a universal understanding of races and hierarchy among them. For Americans, a certain culture can be understood as inherently inferior because it is, for example, less individualistic than their own culture, and is therefore subject to prejudice or perceived as threat. Yet, another predominantly white

¹⁴ Ibid., 586–593. (This crisis of the nation-state is according to Doty closely linked to post-World War II migration that has put the cohesion of the nation-state in question and eroded sovereignty of these nation-states.)

¹⁵ Pierre L. van den Berghe, "Neo-racism in the USA," *Transition*, No. 41 (1972): 17–18.

¹⁶ Gordon Willarf Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954), quoted from Lincoln Quillian, "New Approaches to Understanding Racial Prejudice and Discrimination," *Annual Review of Sociology* 32 (2006): 300.

¹⁷ Ibid., 300.

¹⁸ Reisigl and Wodak, *Discourse and Discrimination*, 5.

nations do not necessarily have to evaluate this particular trait as a threat but might be prejudiced against another trait supposedly possessed by this same out-group.

Bonilla-Silva states, nevertheless, that there is indeed a common macroracial discourse present in the Western countries that can be explained by "common historical ideological root, the significant presence of the Other through immigration, and by the impact of global 'Western' culture often conceived of as 'American' that binds Western nations in an 'informal imperialism' which defends the cultural distinctiveness of Western nations over peripheral nations."¹⁹ It could be thus assumed that in different Western countries, the significance of being white as explained further below to a great extent overlaps.

Racism or racial prejudice can be understood as either resulting from individual prejudices (psychological predispositions within an individual) or resulting from a structure of power that aims at reinforcing superiority of the dominant racial group.²⁰ Racism in the United States can be definitely understood as being *systemic* which means that it is firmly entrenched in the U.S. institutions that contribute to the maintenance of the dominant racist ideology.²¹

Despite the fact that racism manifests itself on individual level in different ways, it is at all times reflective of the *systemic* ideology, that is, privileged position of the whites in the society. This ideology affects and at the same time is reproduced by the white majority or in-group. The new racism will be thus understood in this work as a rather systemic phenomenon which means that both the group of people who are individually prejudiced (that is, feel hatred against minorities) along with the group of people who sincerely perceive themselves as anti-racists are affected by this systemic racial ideology, and therefore participate, consciously or unconsciously, in maintaining the racial status quo. The people that express and reproduce the prejudice consciously might be more harmful to non-white minorities that are discriminated against. Unconscious prejudice is not from its very nature expressed with the intention to harm, but its effect can, nevertheless, be similar as in the former case.

¹⁹ Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, "This is a White Country': The Racial Ideology of the Western Nations of the World-System," *Sociological Inquiry* 70 (2000):194.

²⁰ Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003), 7–8.

²¹ Kristen A. Meyers and Passion Williamson, "Race Talk: The Perpetuation of Racism Through Private Discourse," *Race & Society* 4 (2001): 3.

An important implication of this claim is that the new racism that manifests itself on the individual level, in the everyday talk, should not be perceived as something pathological but rather as a result of the systemic racism. To cite an example, Gaudio and Bialostok examined discourse of a middle-class white woman married to a working-class Latino in which she tries to explain the unequal socioeconomic status and achievements of her own and his families. They found out that the woman uses a reasoning based on the culture in a way consistent with the new racist prejudice to account for the differences. The culture is according to the authors said "to be 'in their [Latinos'] blood' or attributed to centuries of tradition,"²² hence, understood as their permanent attribute.

On the other hand, people that are systematically portraying the out-group (a group that the in-group opposes itself to) as a threat perpetuate the racist ideology intentionally. They usually expect a certain exclusionary behavior to be brought about by their prejudiced discourse. Yet, even the new racism that is reproduced by the speakers unintentionally should be pointed out by scholars as it perpetuates the same inequality between races as the old racism used to.

Finally, *racial structure*, both the "old" and the "new," in the Western countries is best explained as a system of white supremacy that entails social relations reinforcing this supremacy. It can be argued that this structure from the era of the old racism has stayed in place but nowadays needs to rely on a differently phrased out ideology. This ideology can consist of frameworks identified by Bonilla-Silva that are used to explain and justify the racial status quo.²³ The frameworks and how they are used will be elaborated on further ahead in this chapter.

In sum, the new racism in the United States is systemic and affects everyone in the white in-group that in turn tends to protect its privileges and is usually opposed to the out-group often perceived as a threat to the in-group. On the other hand, some individuals or groups within society might deliberately present a group as non-white and therefore a threat knowing it would elicit negative response hurting the out-group. The new racism is actually not that different from the old racism in these concrete outcomes. What it differs in is the conceptual understanding of the white and the non-white races and the covert way of expressing the prejudice that was not such a big

²² Rudolf P. Gaudio and Steve Bialostok, "The Trouble With Culture: Everyday Racism in White Middle-Class Discourse," *Critical Discourse Studies* 2, No. 1 (2005): 63.

issue for the old racism. This conceptual understanding of race that is typical of the new racism will be explained in detail further below.

1.3 Constructing Race in the United States

As has been already explained, in the new racism theory, race is understood as socially constructed. According to Bonilla-Silva, the white West was created by Europeans as a means to dominate the "new world." The West was thus constructed by the colonial powers as human, developed, civilized, rational, Christian, superior, and clean, whereas the new territories as subhuman, underdeveloped, barbarian, instinctive, heathen, and unclean.²⁴

System of the white superiority was established in the United States, too, where indigenous and black people were understood basically in the aforementioned terms. Whiteness, on the other hand, has always served as a synonym for citizenship. The Naturalization Act of 1790 stated that citizenship could be granted to white persons only. This proved problematic in many cases when courts had to decide whether a person could be determined as white which further underlines the persuasiveness of the constructionist theory of race as it shows that one cannot scientifically define who is white and who is not with an absolute certainty.²⁵

Despite the fact that the racial composition of the United States has become much more diverse throughout the history, the white-black dichotomy still seems to be valid as both the "white" and the "black" designations are not necessarily tied to color of the skin but work rather as constructed concepts. Afro-Americans represent, in this sense, a prototype of *otherness* rather than a distinctive biological category of black race per se. In order to establish their own race, and therefore social status as white, Latinos often try to distinguish themselves from Afro-Americans – the prototype of "blackness." At the same time, within Latinos, Mexicans sometimes further present themselves in opposition to Puerto Ricans who can be perceived as being closer to the "black" category than Mexicans and therefore inferior to Mexicans.²⁶

²³ Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists*, 9.

²⁴ Bonilla-Silva, "'This is a White Country'," 191–192.

²⁵ Kitty Calavita, "Immigration Law, Race, and Identity," *The Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 3 (2007):2–7. Accessed October 28, 2014, doi: 10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.3.081806.112745.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 10–13.

As a consequence, rather abstract and highly flexible content of the notion of race allows for racialization of groups whose phenotype and color of the skin can hardly be categorized as black. Typical example are Mexicans who used to be considered rather white. According to Calavita, there was one very practical reason behind it – the conquest of the territories inhabited by Mexicans in 1848. The inhabitants were consequently designated as white and therefore eligible to become U.S. citizens.²⁷ In this way, it was ensured that the southern part of the country remained racially white and thus made the annexation of the foreign territories more palatable.

Kretsedemas claims that "Mexican-Latino immigrants are not deemed undesirable due to the fact that they are not white, but because it is feared that they will not become white."²⁸ The notion of a Mexican immigrant has usually very similar connotations the notion of the "black" race has. He is, for example, often depicted as someone subhuman.

Santa Ana notices in his study of metaphors of Latinos in the American public discourse that one of the most abundant metaphors is one that likens Mexican immigrant to an animal. According to him, there is a same relationship between the notions of "immigrants" and "citizens" as between the notions of "animals" and "humans."²⁹ This means that immigrants are suddenly understood in the same terms as Afro-Americans were by the old racism.

Kil examines how nativist discourse produces an image of "a white national body in danger from the *criminal immigrant* who represents dirt, disgust, abjection and disorder"³⁰ which again corresponds to devaluation of these immigrants into something below humanity. Humanity, for that matter, roughly corresponds to the concept of whiteness.

It is important to note that the imagery of a criminal immigrant and its derivatives that Kil puts forth usually apply to illegal immigrants only. Yet, the prejudices and daily discriminatory practices resulting from this discourse usually affect the whole group of Mexicans or Latinos. This connection of immigration, Mexicans, and illegality is not accidental and will be elaborated on in the third chapter. Despite the fact that nationals

²⁷ Ibid., 8.

²⁸ Philip Kretsedemas, "Redefining 'Race' in North America," *Current Sociology* 56, No. 6 (2008): 833. Accessed October 18, 2014, doi: 10.1177/0011392108095341.

²⁹ Otto Santa Ana, *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003), 273–286.

³⁰ Sang Hea Kil, "A Diseased Body Politic: Nativist Discourse and the Imagined Whiteness of the USA," *Cultural Studies* 28, No. 2 (2014): 178. Accessed October 17, 2014, doi: 10.1080/09502386.2013.789068.

of many other countries apart from Mexico comprise illegal immigrants in the United States, most of the U.S. resources aiming at preventing illegal immigration is located on the U.S.-Mexican border which contributes to the conflation of Mexicans, who comprise majority of the unauthorized border-crossers, with the notion of *illegal* immigration.

De Genova points out the visibility of these immigrants who are "swirling enigmatically around the stunning invisibility of the law."³¹ By saying this, he tries to emphasize how the illegality is constructed by the immigration law that itself is practically invisible. As a consequence, illegal immigrants are blamed for illegally crossing the border, but the critical role of the law which provides few ways of legal immigration for Mexicans is ignored. De Genova explains that the law's "relative invisibility in producing 'illegality,' requires the spectacle of 'enforcement' at the U.S.-Mexico border that renders a racialized migrant 'illegality' visible and lends it the commonsensical air of a 'natural' fact."³² The border is further understood as the main theater of something called the 'border spectacle' that is eagerly picked up by the media which further contributes to the conflation of Mexicans with the notion of 'illegal immigration.'

As a consequence, Mexicans are often depicted as criminals or in more abstract term as invaders, disease infecting the white body, or natural forces causing harm to the United States.³³ This rhetoric creates a false impression of being racially neutral while relying on the law that is supposed to be "unquestionably rational" and the border-crossers can thus be easily condemned as "morally inferior others who should be blocked from crossing 'the border.'"³⁴ The most serious outcome of this seemingly innocent, racially neutral language, typical of the anti-immigration discourse, is the frequent treatment of illegal Mexican immigrants as if they were below humanity and deserved no respect and dignity, similarly as the slaves in the past.

To sum up, Mexicans who have been in the U.S. history most often understood as white and thus eligible for citizenship are nowadays commonly associated with illegal

³¹ Nicolas P. De Genova, "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 3 (2002): 432. Accessed October 28, 2014, doi: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085432.

³² *Ibid.*, 436.

³³ Kil, "A Diseased Body Politic," 191–93.

³⁴ Katrina Rebecca Bloch, "'Anyone Can Be An Illegal': Color-Blind Ideology and Maintaining Latino/Citizen Border," *Critical Sociology* 40, No. 1 (2013): 55. Accessed October 4, 2014, doi: 10.1177/0896920512466274.

immigration and categories such as a criminal, an animal or a disease – categories that are traditionally associated with being black/non-white and therefore subhuman, unclean, underdeveloped, and so forth. To these categories, a plethora of negative stereotypes adds up which contribute to the construction of Mexicans as being antithetical to whites and therefore subject to the new racist prejudice and discrimination.

1.4 Frames

Unlike the old racism, the new racism is a more subtle and covert form of racism. It is called "racism without racists" because you cannot easily point to and condemn people who actively participate in the reproduction of the new racist ideology. Moreover, people who use the rhetoric of the new racism are in many cases unaware of it. The ideology and grammar that accompany the new racist ideology are learned socially and unconsciously.³⁵ In addition, speakers are deliberately avoiding making blatant racist statements or any statements that could be perceived as biased or negative but at the same time slip into usage of the frames that have for its goal to justify racial status quo in favor of the white in-group. These frames help interpret racial matters in a way that supports dominant racial ideology while creating an impression of being racially neutral. Bonilla-Silva identified four frames that are most commonly used: abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and minimization of racism.

Abstract liberalism builds mainly upon political liberalism with its ideas of equal opportunity and economic liberalism emphasizing individualism. More specifically, people who use this frame might argue for the individual choice of white people to live in segregation from black people or against affirmative action because it goes against the aforementioned values. Yet, they are at the same time ignoring the institutional obstacles preventing black people or other minorities from attaining equal status with the white people.³⁶ This is why the new racism is called by some scholars "laissez-faire" racism.³⁷ Donald Kinder and David Sears came up with a concept of symbolic racism which is partly in line with the abstract liberalism. They speak of a new form of

³⁵ Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists*, 54.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 28.

³⁷ The concept of laissez-faire racism was introduced by Bobo, Kluegel, and Smith. Bonilla-Silva, "This is a White Country," 190.

prejudice which links moral character, individualism and blaming the black people for not trying hard enough.³⁸

Naturalization serves as a means of explaining racial inequalities as something natural. It can be said, for example, that just as white people tend to live in white neighborhoods because it is simply natural for them, "colored minorities" have the same tendency because it is "the way things are."³⁹ This helps displace the blame for the racial inequalities from the white in-group (e.g., from the institutional racism that clearly goes against the naturalization hypothesis).

Cultural racism is a frame that finds a lot of use nowadays with regards to Mexican or Latino immigrants and the attempts of numerous pundits and politicians to depict them as unassimilable or even a threat to the white, Anglo-Saxon society because of the alleged cultural traits that they are believed to possess. Different groups can thus be described as lazy or simply immoral because of their shared cultural background.⁴⁰

Samuel Huntington might have been one of the most prominent scholars to apply this reasoning. He claimed that in the long run, the American, Anglo-Protestant identity was endangered by the distinct and unassimilable cultural group of Mexicans.⁴¹ Another scholar whose beliefs received a lot of attention in this respect is Peter Brimelow who summarized his ideas about the consequences of recent immigration in his book *Alien Nation*. In this study, he puts forth his conviction about the harmful effects of the contemporary immigration which he roughly associates with Mexican immigrants. More specifically, Brimelow emphasizes their lack of cultural predisposition toward economic success and cites crime and spread of diseases as possible consequences of their immigration.⁴² This translates into conviction that these immigrants are inherently prone to poverty and crime and will thus always be a burden and even a threat to the society.

³⁸ Donald R. Kinder and Lynn M. Sanders, *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*, (London, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 105–6.

³⁹ Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists*, 28.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 28–29.

⁴¹ Samuel P. Huntington, "The Hispanic Challenge," *Foreign Policy*, March/April 2004.

⁴² Peter Brimelow, *Alien Nation: Common Sense About America's Immigration Disaster* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1996).

Finally, *minimization of racism* suggests that racism is not so much relevant nowadays, just the minorities themselves are trying to use racism to their own advantage.⁴³

1.5 Relevance and Critique of the New Racism Theory

Virtanen and Huddy pose themselves a question whether the new racism qualifies as a new form of prejudice or whether it is just an endorsement of negative racial stereotypes. They assert that the new racism "is not a new form of prejudice but rather an existing form of prejudice with a new relevance to considerations of racial policy."⁴⁴ This is important because it shows that while the new racism might be almost invisible in the society, it is equally harmful as the old one as it is based on a similar prejudice.

Quillian criticized the theory, blaming the new racism researchers for confusing race with other beliefs as many surveys dealing with racism are in fact designed in a way that does not allow to distinguish between a person's opposition to welfare or affirmative action because he or she is a conservative in these matters or rather because he or she is prejudiced against "colored-minorities" who disproportionately tend to be beneficiaries of these programs.⁴⁵ Some people might also seem prejudiced when they in fact only stereotype certain group. This distinction is important because stereotypes, unlike prejudice, can be abandoned by the people if they are exposed to new information refuting the stereotype. Prejudice is a belief that, in this respect, is much stronger and new pieces of information that expose its untruthfulness are not usually enough for the people to get rid of it.

These claims are probably the most relevant critique the new racism theory must face. To counter the methodological problems of surveys discussed above, Quillian proposes to work with the notion of implicit attitude instead of the explicit one that is traditionally examined by the surveys. The implicit attitude is based on the idea that "past associations toward racial group members, viewed as a set of stereotypical beliefs

⁴³ Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists*, 29.

⁴⁴ Simo V. Virtanen and Leonie Huddy, "Old-Fashioned Racism and New Forms of Racial Prejudice," *The Journal of Politics* 60, No. 2 (1998): 313–314.

⁴⁵ Lincoln Quillian, "New Approaches to Understanding Racial Prejudice and Discrimination," *Annual Review of Sociology* 32 (2006): 313. Accessed October 28, 2014, doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.32.061604.123132.

associated with a racial category, exist in the mind and influence future judgements and action."

Quillian discusses a number of psychological experiments that are capable of exposing the implicit racial attitude in people's behavior. They show a low correlation between explicit and implicit racial attitudes. This indicates that "individuals can be sincerely nonprejudiced in their conscious thought but still have their judgements and actions influenced by a subtle racial bias."⁴⁶ This further reinforces the previous claim that even people who in no way consider themselves racists might be affected by the systemic racism that manifests itself in the implicit attitude Quillian examines.

The new racism theory usually gives special attention to black people as they were the primary victim of the old racism, but since the new racism often helps to racialize non-white groups (e.g., immigrant groups such as Mexicans), too, these would definitely deserve more attention in the theory. Moreover, relations among the non-white groups in the light of the new racism theory would be also worth examining.

1.6 Conclusion

The new racism has not necessarily come up with a whole new kind of prejudice. On the other hand, it is certainly new in its abandonment of the biological understanding of race. Race has been redefined in rather abstract terms which allow for racialization of groups without explicitly referring to their race in its traditional sense (that is roughly understood as the color of their skin). This new categorization of groups is usually taken as given and not subject to change and that is why it can be argued that it constitutes prejudice, not just stereotype. These groups (usually defined by their culture) can therefore function as "new races." In addition, Sniderman, singles out *traditional* values such as work ethic or individualism, mentioned in the part on the frames, that are helping legitimize new racist claims as something that is new compared to the old racism.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Ibid., 323.

⁴⁷ Paul M. Sniderman et al., "The New Racism," *American Journal of Political Science* 35, No. 2 (1991): 424.

2 Critical Discourse Analysis

2.1 Basic Characteristics of CDA and Its Goals

The aim of this paper is to find out whether there is some kind of the new racism present in the discourse of the minutemen movement. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) therefore seems to be an appropriate theory as it is well-equipped for dealing with prejudice in texts and talk because, as van Dijk puts it, "both racism and ideology are prominently reproduced by social practices and especially by discourse."⁴⁸ CDA was intentionally called a theory and not a method as it is, indeed, a theory in the first place which only serves as a starting point to different methods, yet, does not offer one universal methodology. The goal of this chapter is to introduce the theory of the CDA, explain the theoretical assumptions it rests upon and its methods. It should shed more light on why CDA is especially suitable for analyzing prejudice in discourse.

CDA is primarily concerned with the relation between language and power as is the discourse analysis (DA), too. Yet, what makes it *critical* and thus distinguishable from the discourse analysis is the explicit political stance it adopts and the distance it takes from the examined data.⁴⁹ CDA has come into existence by merging ideas from several fields such as social theory, discourse analysis, linguistics, and interactional sociolinguistics.⁵⁰ It was also influenced by Marxist thinking (it is, for example, very explicit about its stance against exploitation) and by Gramsci's concept of hegemony that contributed with a notion of non-repressive coercion by the persuasive potential of discourse. Habermas's thinking is also present in the CDA with the idea of a strategic use of language.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Teun A. van Dijk, "Ideologies, Racism, Discourse: Debates on Immigration and Ethnic Issues," in *Comparative Perspectives on Racism*, eds. Jessika Ter Wal and Maykel Verkuyten (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 92.

⁴⁹ Ruth Wodak, "What CDA Is About – A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and its Developments," in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. Ruth Wodak and Michal Meyer (London: SAGE Publications, 2001), 9.

⁵⁰ Encarnacion Hidalgo Tenorio, "Critical Discourse Analysis, An Overview," *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 10, No. 1 (2011): 188. Accessed January 24, 2015, <http://ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/njes/article/view/658>.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 188–189.

CDA draws heavily on critical linguistics (CL) – a field that developed in the course of the 1970s and rests in particular upon the Hallidayan linguistics and its systemic functional grammar.⁵² The systemic functional grammar is a theory designed by Michael Halliday in which he emphasizes the social function of language/grammar.⁵³ CDA thus places special emphasis on the relation between forms and functions of language. The language use is understood as always being social and the analysis of the discourse takes place above the unit of a sentence.⁵⁴

From a broader perspective, CDA originates in the Frankfurt school of critical theory. It rejects neutrality in social sciences and aims at exposing "opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language."⁵⁵ Its ultimate goal is to "understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality."⁵⁶ In its critical approach, CDA goes against supposedly value-free science and acknowledges its own role instead.⁵⁷

2.2 Main Tenets of CDA

There are numerous strands within the CDA which may differ to a lesser or greater extent but all of them share a basic set of ideas. Fairclough and Wodak identified the following features as the central tenets of CDA:

1. CDA addresses social problems
2. discourse is a form of social action
3. discourse produces ideological work
4. power relations are discursive
5. discourse constitutes society and culture
6. discourse is historical

⁵² Teun A. van Dijk, "Critical Discourse Analysis," in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton (Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 2001).

⁵³ Michal Meyer, "Between Theory, Method, and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches to CDA," in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. Ruth Wodak and Michal Meyer (London: SAGE Publications, 2001), 22.

⁵⁴ Rebecca Rogers, "An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education," in *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Studies in Education*, ed. Rebecca Rogers (Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 2004): 5.

⁵⁵ Ibid.,3; Wodak, "What CDA Is About," 2.

⁵⁶ Van Dijk, "Critical Discourse Analysis," 352.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 352.

7. the link between text and society is mediated⁵⁸

According to van Dijk, CDA attempts to bridge a gap between micro- and macrolevel of analysis where language use is the microlevel, while power, dominance, and inequality are the macrolevel.⁵⁹ The power is basically defined in terms of control. The dominant groups hold control over discourse and can thus influence minds (that is, knowledge or opinions) of members of the dominated groups. This often happens "in the myriad of taken-for-granted actions of everyday life, as is typically the case in the many forms of everyday sexism or racism."⁶⁰ A previously mentioned research by Gaudio and Bialostok of the white middle-class discourse is a great example of this van Dijk's claim.

Discourse is to be understood in CDA as an instrument of power and of the social construction of reality.⁶¹ The discourse thus serves to mediate ideology through specific social representations organized into systems that are based on a dominant ideology in a given society.⁶² The notion of *ideology* is crucial in CDA as it enables to sustain the inequalities CDA scholars aim to eradicate.⁶³

It is important to note that discourse is not just a reflection of reality nor ideology. Discourses are, instead, material realities as they themselves help to determine reality and create subjects.⁶⁴ Relationship between discourse and reality is therefore dialectical. The notion of discourse in CDA builds on Foucault's understanding of it as a flow of knowledge or rather as a stored societal knowledge. Discourse therefore "creates the conditions for the formation of subjects and the structuring and shaping of societies."⁶⁵

The discourse should be understood as historical which means that it is always grounded in a specific context. In other words, it is "socially, politically, racially, and economically loaded."⁶⁶ This points out the importance of extralinguistic factors such as

⁵⁸ Ibid., 353.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 354.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 354–355.

⁶¹ Wodak, "What CDA Is About," 9.

⁶² Chris Barker and Dariusz Galasiński, *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity* (London: SAGE Publications, 2001): 65–66.

⁶³ Wodak, "What CDA Is About," 10.

⁶⁴ Siegfried Jäger, "Discourse and Knowledge: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of a Critical Discourse and Dispositive Analysis," in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. Ruth Wodak and Michal Meyer (London: SAGE Publications, 2001), 35–36.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 35.

⁶⁶ Rebecca Rogers, "An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education," 6.

culture and society in the examination of discourse.⁶⁷ The context is essential in influencing recipients' mind (that is, knowledge, opinions, and so forth).

2.3 Dominant Approaches within CDA

CDA cannot, in fact, be described as one single theory but rather as several theories which share conceptual framework and a critical perspective.⁶⁸ Each theoretical approach has, at the same time, its own methodology. This subchapter will aim at briefly introducing the most influential approaches within CDA.

Norman Fairclough is one of the most important scholars within CDA. As the name of his approach, *Dialectical-Relational Approach*, indicates, it draws heavily on Marxist thinking. In his approach, Fairclough focuses on the semiotic imprint of social conflict in discourses. His procedure consists not only of an analysis of semiotic dimension of a given social problem but also of looking into how colonization of dominant discourses can be resisted. Final step in his analysis comprises structural analysis of the context.⁶⁹

Authors such as Fairclough, Fowler et al., or Hodge and Kress draw significantly on the systemic functional grammar developed by Halliday. In this strand of CDA, there is a focus on different text types as representatives of different social practices.⁷⁰

Wodak would be the main representative of what is called the *Discourse-Historical Approach* which deals with the semiotic practices in the service of maintaining domination of those in power. Special emphasis is placed on trying to connect the textual and contextual level of analysis where context is closely tied to historical knowledge.⁷¹

Socio-Cognitive Approach is associated with van Dijk who emphasizes interaction between cognition, discourse, and society. This approach will be elaborated on in the following subchapter and it will serve as the main approach used in this thesis. The approach elaborated by Christopher Hart will be also taken into account as it serves as an important follow-up to the cognitive aspects of the van Dijk's approach with its special emphasis on the cognitive linguistics.

⁶⁷ Michal Meyer, "Between Theory, Method, and Politics," 15.

⁶⁸ Christopher Hart, *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010): 3.

⁶⁹ Hidalgo Tenorio, "Critical Discourse Analysis, An Overview," 190.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 193.

⁷¹ Ibid., 191.

2.4 Socio-Cognitive Approach

Teun van Dijk is one of the leading scholars of the Critical Discourse Analysis. He has been publishing works related to discourse studies since the 1970s and is still a prolific author in the field. His research in the discourse studies is especially focused on cognitive aspects of discourse processing. He specializes in the discourse that concerns the media, ethnic minorities, and racism. Since the main topics he deals with are racism and prejudice, his approach seems especially convenient for the purpose of this work. As this work deals with the new racism and therefore prejudice, the role of the society is crucial because racism is understood here as a social, systemic phenomenon in the first place. The processing of ethnic prejudice, however, takes place on the individual, cognitive level. In his work, van Dijk examines exactly this relationship between society, discourse, and cognition.

2.4.1 Study of Prejudice in Discourse

Van Dijk's monograph called *Prejudice in Discourse: An Analysis of Ethnic Prejudice in Cognition and Conversation* was used as a basis for the approach used in this thesis. Van Dijk's main premise is that the people who want to express negative opinions or prejudice against minorities feel the urge not to be seen as racists and therefore have to *strategically* solve this tension on both cognitive and interactional level.⁷²

In the previous chapter, it was argued that prejudice (or racism) is a social phenomenon. Van Dijk also believes that prejudice is a "shared form of social representation in group members, acquired during processes of socialization and transformed and enacted in social communication and interaction."⁷³ This representation obviously reflects the interests of the dominant group, the in-group, in the society.

The cognitive aspect in van Dijk's approach is based on the notion of the *group schema* that is an "organized set of beliefs and opinions about minority groups" and works as the "cognitive basis of all our information processing about members of such groups."⁷⁴ According to van Dijk, people have to deal with a lot of information in the social situations and that is why there are strategies to process and interpret all the

⁷² Teun A. van Dijk, *Prejudice in Discourse: An Analysis of Ethnic Prejudice in Cognition and Conversation* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1984), 3.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 23.

information in a more efficient manner. In accordance with the group schemata about minorities, people interpret actions involving minorities with a proto-schema already in mind and consequently build models that are in line with how the actions of minority members are interpreted. These models are stored in the *semantic memory* (which basically stores concepts about the world, common knowledge, and is not based on personal experiences) and can be retrieved when people interpret situations, even without having gained the needed information from a personal experience.⁷⁵

As follows from the previous paragraphs, the dominant in-group in the society usually tries to protect its interests through prejudice against minorities that are seen as potentially endangering the privileges of the dominant group. Yet, there are certain social norms ruling what can be expressed in certain situations. The members of the in-group therefore use strategies in order to "maintain a positive self-image of tolerant, understanding, cooperative citizen."⁷⁶ These strategies applied in talk are usually referred to as strategies of *self-presentation* and *persuasion* as the speakers want to maintain positive image of themselves, mark themselves as the members of the in-group who share the same values but also need to persuade the listener of the validity of their claims. The persuasive strategy usually appeals to members of the in-group by expressing the experiences of an individual in a way that creates impression that it affects the whole group.⁷⁷ Therefore, the speaker can present certain prejudiced pieces of information as a common truth rather than his own experience, and so forth.

2.5 Hart's Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis

In his approach, Hart builds on van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach as he works closely with the notion of social cognition that mediates text and social relations.⁷⁸ Apart from building on van Dijk, he believes that CDA approaches lack biologically based explanation and that is why he applies a cognitive-evolutionary explanation as to why certain strategies used by speakers are so effective. He further examines how these

⁷⁵ Ibid., 30–32.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 46.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 48–50.

⁷⁸ Hart, *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science*, 15.

discursive strategies are expressed by certain linguistic structures and manifest themselves in individuals' cognition.⁷⁹

2.5.1 Evolutionary Psychology in CDA

In its evolutionary-psychological aspect, Hart's approach sees the Darwinian evolutionary adaptiveness in play as far as prejudice and social cognitions stemming from the prejudice are concerned. Thanks to the evolutionary adaptiveness, different modules of social intelligence have evolved. People are, for example, capable of attributing beliefs, emotions, and intentions to other people and are consequently able to predict their behavior accordingly. These modules account for something called *tactical deception* or *Machiavellian intelligence*.⁸⁰ This means that one can make another person falsely believe in something which can further the interests of the former person. According to Hart, "where CDA is concerned with strategic discourse, this is precisely tactical deception involving Machiavellian intelligence."⁸¹ Other modules Hart works with are *cheater-detection module* and *logico-rhetorical module* whose use in the discourse will be explained later.

2.5.2 Cognitive Linguistic Aspect

In accordance with the critical linguistic aspect, Hart puts forward the idea that communication is based on the same conceptual system as acting and thinking. The core idea of the cognitive linguistics is that the way we construct reality is always ideologically motivated. From the evolutionary point of view, communication might serve to represent and therefore help mark group identities but also to cooperate, for example, through exchange of information which allows for anticipatory planning but also manipulation.⁸²

⁷⁹ Ibid., 19.

⁸⁰ The term Machiavellian Intelligence refers exactly to the capability of humans to resort to tactical deception, lying for instance can be used strategically to deceive someone. It is commonly called social intelligence as well.

⁸¹ Ibid., 21.

⁸² Ibid., 23–26.

2.6 Methodology of CDA

As mentioned above, CDA methodology is very diverse and every approach has basically designed its own methodology. This subchapter will provide some examples in order to show how certain aspects of text or talk can be analyzed, especially with regards to text and talk possibly prejudiced against minorities. It will combine both van Dijk's and Hart's methodological approaches which to a great extent overlap.

2.6.1 Referential and Predication Strategies

Referential strategies occur when speakers refer to other people. Especially in a prejudiced discourse, people are usually referred to in terms of belonging to either in-group or out-group. The importance of referring to groups can be explained in the evolutionary psychology by the simple fact that living in groups was a means of surviving. Therefore, negative representation of a member of the out-group could be seen as leading to discriminatory behavior aimed at protection of the in-group. To give a few examples of this strategy, a group can be labeled by its nationality (strategy of *nationalization*, e.g., Mexicans) or simply as immigrants/foreigners which suggests that they are from a different place than the in-group (*de-spatialization*). Referential strategy of *dissimilation* marks the out-group as different or unfamiliar (e.g., aliens, strangers) and strategy of *collectivization* subsume groups, for example, under the pronouns such as "we" or "they."⁸³

Predication strategies, too, find frequent use in a prejudiced discourse as they usually aim to attribute positive traits to in-groups and negative or threat-connoting ones to out-groups. Hart believes that this strategy is especially effective as it can induce emotion of fear in the listener which can consequently influence his or her actions. Most importantly for the discourse on immigrants, members of the out-group are usually defined in accordance with one of the several *topoi*. Hart defines *topoi* as "standard argumentation schemes which represent the common-sense reasoning typical for specific issues." The *topos* does not even have to be even expressed explicitly for the hearer to understand it.

The most typical *topoi* associated with immigrants are burden, crime, culture, danger, disadvantage, disease, displacement, or exploitation. These *topoi* might trigger the so-

⁸³ Ibid., 49–59.

called *cheater-detection module* in the listener which means that he or she will interpret the group referred to in the discourse as a social-cheat, a threat to his social in-group, or the social contract in more general terms. This might lead to activation of emotions of anger, fear, or contempt which can further translate into avoidance behavior. Bearing in mind the strategic use of discourse emphasized by Hart, the speaker might communicate a threat in a Machiavellian way, therefore *constructing* a threat in order to elicit exactly these reactions, while there might be no real threat.⁸⁴

In more concrete terms, members of the out-group may be labeled as social-cheats by being described as uneducated, unqualified burdens. But they can be also described as *different* in terms of culture and therefore unassimilable which can be also understood as an undesired cost to the in-group, and hence a threat. In the topos of crime, they would be typically referred to as *illegal* immigrants. In many cases, they are associated with natural disasters such as flood. Hart shows that these connotations are not significant simply because they ascribe negative qualities to immigrants but exactly because they trigger the cheater-detection module that is responsible for emotions of fear and anger that can translate into exclusionary actions against members of the out-group.⁸⁵

Proximitation strategies can be also linked to predication strategies. They typically work with spatial and temporal dimensions whose main goal is to emphasize proximity or imminence of a potential threat.⁸⁶

The main conclusions to draw from Hart regarding the prejudice is that prejudice can be linked to existence of prehistoric dangers, yet, according to Hart, it is not biologically deterministic but rather formed by the cultural environment. The previously mentioned modules may, however, be "utilized in discourse in order to strategically enact social inequality."⁸⁷ This means that by means of the above-mentioned strategies, one can actually use the discourse as an input that can trigger responses such as fear and anger that are responsible for exclusionary and discriminatory behavior.

Only a few examples of the strategies used in the discourse that can help to construct a perceived threat from the out-group were mentioned here. It should be born in mind, nevertheless, that the speaker is not free to make any claims without constraints as

⁸⁴ Ibid., 60–81.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 73–81.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 84–86.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 22.

something called *logico-rhetorical module* has evolved in humans that has for its goal to disclose the strategic nature of discourse by checking its coherence.⁸⁸ On the other hand, on the part of the speaker, there is a number of legitimization strategies designed to make the discourse persuasive.

2.6.2 Coherence and Legitimization in Discourse

The notion of coherence in a discourse is important because it often rests upon ideological assumptions. That is, the logical connections between sentences and clauses (cohesive devices), for example, always indicate certain ideological assumptions. Hart distinguishes between external and internal coherence. The internal coherence mainly concerns the lexical and grammatical cohesion. The external coherence can be further expressed in terms of evidentiality and epistemic modality. In a nutshell, the *evidentiality* concerns the sources of information and the authority they have (something can be general knowledge or it can be just a perception, etc.), and *epistemic modality* refers to the commitment the speaker makes to his or her assertion or, in other words, to the belief in a proposition he puts forth.⁸⁹

In terms of legitimization, van Dijk focuses to a much greater extent than Hart on the conversational strategies people use to make negative assertions about minorities (immigrants) while maintaining positive image of themselves. They might start with a positive topic and only then turn to a negative one, using strategies of *contrast* or *comparison* to mitigate the negative opinion they express, or make generalizations about minorities.⁹⁰

The speakers van Dijk analyzed frequently resorted to assumptions about what the minorities themselves wanted in order to divert attention from their own attitudes. They would also often mention negative consequences of the presence of minorities but omit the causal link between the negative consequences and minorities. Van Dijk also identified numerous semantic moves that have for its goal positive self-presentation of the speakers. Typical example often to be found in the prejudiced talk is the *apparent denial* strategy (e.g., disclaimers such as "I have nothing against foreigners, but...").⁹¹

⁸⁸ Ibid., 89.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 91–92.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 110, 62–64.

⁹¹ Ibid., 110–115.

Van Dijk especially closely studies how stories about minorities are constructed. These stories usually draw from situational models that exist in people's memory and are usually already prejudiced. Van Dijk breaks these stories down into specific schemata each of which has a particular function. The presence of members of minorities in the stories is usually described as an event that is "deviant, weird, strange, criminal, or otherwise unexpected." Typical of the minority stories is the lack of resolution.⁹² Apart from the schemata, frames come to use frequently which are defined as "open-ended, encyclopedic knowledge structures which represent experience in cultural domains."⁹³

In a speech, many additional features such as repeating or emphasizing certain claims, even the fact whether the speaker feels the need to give examples, avoids certain topics, etc., might play a significant role in trying to convey a particular idea without being identified as racist. Furthermore, strategies such as *vagueness*, *indirectness*, or *mitigation* (words such as a bit, somewhat, etc.) or *implications* can work in the same way.⁹⁴

Finally, van Dijk includes even style and rhetoric in his analysis. He finds that each speaker's style is influenced by his emotional state, his social role, but also the social context such as various rules and norms he or she is constrained by. Some of the stylistic features van Dijk identifies could be often easily overlooked such as incomplete sentences, repairs, hesitations, and so forth.⁹⁵

2.6.3 Metaphors in Discourse

The first chapter of this work briefly touched upon metaphors and their use in the immigration discourse. Metaphors can function as a part of both referential and predication strategies. Use of metaphors is strategic because metaphors can have highlighting and hiding effects as they can "keep us from focusing on other aspects of the concept that are inconsistent with that metaphor."⁹⁶ Secondly, metaphors are necessarily ideological as they put forth one particular understanding over alternative

⁹² Van Dijk, *Prejudice in Discourse*, 80–87.

⁹³ Hart, *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science*, 108.

⁹⁴ Van Dijk, *Prejudice in Discourse*, 121–138.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 134–135.

⁹⁶ Hart, *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science*, 126.

understandings. More importantly, they can activate the previously mentioned emotion modules.⁹⁷

Santa Ana has examined the use of metaphors extensively in his work *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse*. The success of metaphors in the discourse lies, according to him, in its power to disguise the ideology behind it.⁹⁸ In his understanding of metaphors, Santa Ana heavily draws on Lakoff and Johnson and their *Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. In this theory, metaphor is a "conceptual mapping from a semantic source domain to a different semantic target domain." The target domain is usually something conceptual, unable to be scrutinized with one's senses, whereas the source domain is usually something much more familiar.⁹⁹

In his work, Santa Ana identifies the following metaphors as the most pervasive ones in the U.S. immigration discourse: IMMIGRANT as DISEASE or INTRUDER, NATION as HOUSE, and NATION as BODY. The immigration can be accordingly characterized as a cancer to the U.S. body, immigrants can be seen as intruders to the house, or even dangerous waters endangering the country, etc.¹⁰⁰

An important function of metaphors is that using a simple metaphor such as IMMIGRANT as ANIMAL is not just a matter of rhetoric but it has real consequences or, as Santa Ana puts it, it becomes a "lived reality for many Latinos." Being a U.S. citizen means "to be fully vested in humanity, while not being a citizen means not being fully human."¹⁰¹ Hart comes to the same conclusion, claiming that using metaphors of war "makes it conceivable to treat defenseless human beings as dangerous enemies and seems to justify a war-like reaction to them."¹⁰²

2.6.4 Force-Dynamic

Another category that emerged from the field of cognitive linguistics and can be made use of especially in the immigration discourse is the force-dynamic. According to Hart, the force-dynamic schemata come from one's experience of pressure and motion. It can be thus applied to objects and different kinds of exertion of or resistance to force. It

⁹⁷ Ibid., 125–128.

⁹⁸ Santa Ana, *Brown Tide Rising*, 54.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 26.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 253–260.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 276.

does not have to necessarily concern just the movement of immigration itself but also legal and political processes, as is also pointed out by Hart. On the other hand, the immigration in the discourse can be also constructed without implying any force and that is why "any force-dynamic representation in discourse on immigration is therefore inherently ideological."¹⁰³ The two participants in the force-dynamic system are called Agonist (Ago) and Antagonist (Ant). Agonists have an intrinsic force tendency, whereas Antagonists hinder the movement.¹⁰⁴

2.7 Critique of CDA

CDA is a relatively new field and probably also due to this fact meets with many critical voices. Widdowson is one of the most prominent critics of the CDA. To start with, he disputes the notion of discourse altogether as he feels that "discourse is something everybody is talking about but without knowing with any certainty just what it is."¹⁰⁵ Moreover, Widdowson claims that CDA is an ideological interpretation, not analysis. That means that exactly what is put forth by the CDA scholars as an asset of CDA, that is, its advocacy of oppressed groups by exposing the discriminatory and exclusionary practices in discourse, might be seen by others as biased and prejudiced.

Chilton comes up with an even harsher critique claiming that there might be no use for CDA as people are themselves perfectly capable of disclosing ideologies in the text. CDA, according to him, could only outdo this human capability by sophisticated linguistic analysis. Hart would probably agree that most analyses should not count as real discourse analyses and therefore, calls for a more comprehensive way of applying the critical linguistics in CDA, instead of adopting just a few categories from it. The CDA scholars should be, however, capable of identifying ideologies not easily noticeable to common observers. Moreover, Hart believes that the operation of the logico-rhetorical module might be hindered under certain circumstances which means that the human critical instinct would not have to be always working in the way Chilton claims it is.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰² Hart, *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science*, 146.

¹⁰³ Christopher Hart, "Force-interactive Patterns in Immigration Discourse: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to CDA," *Discourse & Society* 22, No. 3 (2011): 273–274.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 275.

¹⁰⁵ Michal Meyer, "Between Theory, Method, and Politics," 17.

¹⁰⁶ Hart, *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science*, 46.

Hart is persuaded that CDA can do away with the critique if "theories are applied systematically rather than selecting certain aspects of them while conveniently ignoring others" and if "theories are brought together in a coherent, integrated framework."¹⁰⁷ Wodak, for that matter, suggests that CDA should make choices but should also make them transparent at each stage of the research.¹⁰⁸ This work reflects this critique especially by including Hart's cognitive linguistic approach that expands the tools offered by the linguistics and thus allow to examine the discourse in a more comprehensive way.

2.8 Conclusion

This chapter introduced the Critical Discourse Analysis and showed that the socio-cognitive approach is especially suitable for the analysis of a prejudiced discourse. Hart's approach proves especially useful in understanding the function of prejudice for a dominant group in a society and in showing how prejudice, understood from an evolutionary perspective, can be used strategically in language. For the purpose of examining the new racism in discourse, strategies of positive self-representation, explored especially by van Dijk, are of crucial importance as explicit prejudiced attitudes are not socially acceptable. It could be expected that these strategies will be heavily exploited in the discourse of the minutemen. In addition, among other features, referential and predication strategies in particular might expose potentially prejudiced attitudes against immigrants and will be therefore subject to special focus in the analysis.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 5.

¹⁰⁸ Ruth Wodak, "The Discourse-Historical Approach," in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. Ruth Wodak and Michal Meyer (London: SAGE Publications, 2001), 65.

3 Mexican Immigration and Its Construction as a Threat

For decades now, the immigration has been a highly contentious issue in the U.S. politics that is frequently taken up by politicians – often to exploit fears of the U.S. population in order to advance their political goals or to lure Hispanic voters. The issue of immigration is also heavily present in the public discourses on issues such as citizenship, U.S. identity, or national security.

When the notion of immigration comes up, what is usually meant is not the phenomenon covering immigrants coming into the United States both legally and illegally, temporarily and permanently, but it often refers almost automatically to the specific issue of *illegal* and *Mexican* immigration. This chapter aims to briefly introduce the evolution of the notion of illegal immigration from Mexico and its construction as a threat in the U.S. public discourse.

3.1 Mexican Presence from the Historical Perspective

A significant number of Mexicans have always been present in the states bordering Mexico. This was partly a result of the U.S. victory over Mexico in the war of 1846–1848 which resulted in the annexation of vast territories previously part of Mexico. Mexicans who suddenly found themselves living in the U.S. territory were granted U.S. citizenship but it did not bring much difference for many of them as they simply continued to cross the border in both directions as they did before, which was not illegal until the late 1920s.¹⁰⁹ In the following century, Mexicans kept coming as a result of the demand for cheap labor, yet, few of them stayed in the United States permanently.

The demand for labor increased dramatically during the World War II when Mexican workers were admitted on the basis of the famous Bracero Program initiated in 1942. The program basically recruited guest workers of Mexican origin for the U.S. employers with the help of the federal government. Yet, since it involved certain standards to abide

¹⁰⁹ Bill Ong Hing, *Defining America Through Immigration Policy* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994), 117–118.

by, soon after, a phenomenon of undocumented, much more easily exploitable workers followed.¹¹⁰ The Mexican worker was valued as a cheap workforce, disposable when no longer needed but he was not understood as a potential permanent member of the community.¹¹¹ After the program had been canceled in 1964, many of the Mexican workers stayed in the country and settled there without papers.¹¹² This has, effectively, introduced the issue of undocumented immigration from Mexico.

In the period from the 1960s to the 1980s, the number of *undocumented* immigrants from Mexico significantly increased as there were few legal ways of coming into the United States to either work or live.¹¹³ The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 abolished the national origins quota system introduced in the 1920s but the number of legal immigrants from the Western Hemisphere was for the very first time capped at 120,000 immigrant visas a year and was further limited to 20,000 visas per country in 1976.¹¹⁴ Both Hing and Payan see the roots of the undocumented Mexican immigration exactly in the inadequate (labor) immigration policy.¹¹⁵

The 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act granted amnesty to approximately 3 million undocumented immigrants. Besides the amnesty, it focused mainly on preventing the U.S. employers from hiring illegal immigrants, yet, it did little for allowing Mexican workers to come to work to the country legally.¹¹⁶

At that time, the Mexican undocumented immigration started to be understood as an economic threat for the U.S. workers as Mexican workers with their willingness to work for the little money they were offered were believed to be taking away their jobs. These undocumented immigrants were also perceived as an undue strain on the states' social benefits. States along the border which were disproportionately affected by this immigration, especially Texas and California, were raising the alarm about demographic changes which they believed were irreversibly changing the character of their states.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 127.

¹¹¹ In 1954, more than a million of undocumented Mexicans were deported, for example. (Hing, *Defining America Through Immigration Policy*, 122–130).

¹¹² Tony Payan, *The Three U.S.-Mexico Border Wars: Drugs, Immigration and Homeland Security* (Westport: Praeger Security International, 2006), 55.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 55.

¹¹⁴ Hing, *Defining America Through Immigration Policy*, 97–98.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 133; Payan, *The Three U.S.-Mexico Border Wars*, 56.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ Peter Andreas, *Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), 86.

3.2 "Loss of Control" and "Latino Threat" Narratives

The above-mentioned sentiments eventually contributed to the emergence of two major, considerably flawed narratives that have been fueling the anti-immigration rhetoric ever since. The first one introduced the notion of the "loss of control" over the border. This narrative is according to Andreas largely manipulative as it obscures the fact that "there actually never was a time when the border was effectively controlled," and he further claims that illegal crossings "have been a defining feature of the border ever since it was established."¹¹⁸ The "Loss of Control" narrative has had real consequences in amassing resources on the border to try to prevent illegal border crossings and drug trafficking, that is another major problem commonly associated with the border, instead of tackling underlying causes of these phenomena such as drug consumption at home or illegal hiring of undocumented immigrants.¹¹⁹

Secondly, the "Latino Threat" Narrative described by Chavez successfully equated Latinos with the issue of illegal immigration. Chavez understands this illegality as being a product of states that basically confer this illegal status "upon the bodies of the migrants themselves."¹²⁰ In constructing the illegality of Latinos, objective conditions leading to this illegal immigration such as demand for cheap labor, low fertility rates in the United States, or inadequate immigration policy are disregarded.¹²¹

The number of illegal immigrants coming or believed to be coming into the United States has helped to create a threat of invasion with an alleged goal of reconquering the Southwestern portion of the United States. Moreover, according to the narrative, the Latino immigrants differ from previous immigrants in their inability and unwillingness to integrate in the society. The effect of these narratives is according to Chavez especially powerful because they have been repeated so many times that they acquired a completely taken-for-granted nature.¹²²

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 7–8.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 8.

¹²⁰ Leo R. Chavez, *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013). 28.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Ibid., 29.

3.3 (Unintended) Consequences of "Prevention through Deterrence"?

The real effect of these narratives was especially pronounced during the 1990s when a series of border enforcement policies was implemented in order to "reclaim control" over the border. Andreas talks about ceremonial practices in this respect that represented not a means but rather an end in itself.¹²³ These gestures were given by the perceived need of politicians to cater to public fears partly caused by the aforementioned powerful narratives. As Andreas puts it, abandoning these policies might be costly for politicians who, "fearful of the reputational costs of appearing lax on border controls..., became trapped in the escalating symbolic performance."¹²⁴

The policies of the 1990s that are commonly referred to as "prevention through deterrence" were largely unsuccessful because they attempted to respond to public fears in the first place but did not tackle the long-term structural problems that are pushing and pulling immigrants to keep crossing the border. The myriad of resources and policies centered on the border have thus been largely symbolical.

The federal government has been constructing a system of fences accompanied by a surveillance program on the border but it is a well-known fact that the efforts at discouraging immigrants from crossing the border in the large cities such as El Paso (Operation Blockade initiated in 1993) or San Diego (Operation Gatekeeper, 1994) only achieved to divert the immigrants to more remote and less populated areas mainly in New Mexico and Arizona.¹²⁵

This strategy of "prevention through deterrence" led to, as Andreas points out, a higher number of smugglers arrested which did satisfy the statistics but did not necessarily mean that smugglers gave up. Instead, the smuggling practices just adapted to new conditions and became more sophisticated on one hand and more dangerous and costly for immigrants on the other.¹²⁶

¹²³ Andreas, *Border Games*, 11.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹²⁵ Josiah McC. Heyman, "Constructing a Virtual Wall: Race and Citizenship in U.S.-Mexico Border Policing," in *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*, eds. Julie A. Dowling and Jonathan Xavier Inda (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013), 102.

¹²⁶ Andreas, *Border Games*, 95–99.

One collateral consequence of this major strategy initiated in the 1990s was a rising number of deaths along the border. Doty claims that just in the first fifteen years after the strategy of "prevention through deterrence" was introduced, at least 5,000 migrants attempting to cross the border have lost their lives.¹²⁷ She is persuaded that the government is complicit in these deaths despite the fact that the "geographic space has made it possible to suggest that the consequences in the form of migrant deaths result from 'natural causes.'"¹²⁸ Whereas Payan describes these deaths as a sort of an unintended consequence, other scholars such as Cornelius or Johnson suggest that this tragic consequence might have been deliberate.¹²⁹ Doty went on to describe how illegal immigrants have been essentially reduced to "bare bodies," stripped of their identities to such an extent that their deaths do not have to be in any way justified.¹³⁰

3.4 The Flawed Focus on the Border

The narrative of the border as a place of danger and hostility¹³¹ was further enforced by the events of 9/11 due to the fact that persons complicit in the attacks were staying in the country illegally despite the fact that none of them was proved to have come through the border with Mexico. Another issue that is understood as being inseparable from the border and is thus indirectly associated with the problem of illegal immigration is drug trafficking which helps justify the militarized approach on the border as it is understood as a real threat for the United States.

Despite the fact that the illegal immigration into the United States and its scope are to a great extent given by the inadequate immigration policy that does not leave much space for legal immigration and by the need of the U.S. employers to hire cheap illegal labor, the bulk of the resources and energy are still concentrated on the U.S.-Mexican border in a false hope that sealing the border would do away with the whole issue of illegal immigration. In reality, many of the undocumented immigrants come legally but

¹²⁷ Roxanne Lynn Doty, "Bare Life: Border-Crossing Deaths and Spaces of Moral Alibi," in *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*, eds. Julie A. Dowling and Jonathan Xavier Inda (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013), 131.

¹²⁸ Doty, "Bare Life: Border-Crossing Deaths and Spaces of Moral Alibi," 138.

¹²⁹ Payan, *The Three U.S.-Mexico Border Wars*, 68.

¹³⁰ Doty, "Bare Life: Border-Crossing Deaths and Spaces of Moral Alibi," 131.

¹³¹ Marouf Hasian Jr. and George F. McHendry Jr., "The Attempted Legitimation of the Vigilante Civil Border Patrols, the Militarization of the Mexican-US Border, and the Law of Unintended Consequences," in *Border Rhetorics: Citizenship and Identity on the US-Mexico Frontier*, ed. Robert DeChaine (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2012), 107.

overstay their visa.¹³² Moreover, sealing the border is impossible given the flow of people and goods in both directions that is so vital to healthy functioning of the trade between the two countries. Nevertheless, the aforementioned aspects have helped establish a construct of the border as a clear-cut divide between "rightness, orderliness, and self" on the one hand and "badness, disorderliness and others" on the other¹³³ that has been driving the immigration discourse up to now.

3.5 Conclusion

It should follow from this chapter that immigrants crossing the southern border have been successfully constructed as a threat. Moreover, their illegality is seen as if it was something inseparable from their own identities, determining who they are and will be for the rest of their lives. As distinguishing between legal and illegal immigrants is in the most situations in the day-to-day life next to impossible, the negative consequences of this prevailing discourse affect the legal immigrants and citizens of the United States, too. To recall De Genova once more, the illegal immigrants are thus made visible on the border, whereas structural problems mentioned above and the immigration law itself stay invisible. This has proved convenient for both many politicians and the minutemen whose rhetoric is centered on the notion of the "broken" border but harbors negative sentiment against "the Other" crossing it.

¹³² Sara Murray, "Many in U.S. Illegally Overstayed Their Visas," *The Wall Street Journal*, April 7, 2013, accessed May 8, 2015,

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424127887323916304578404960101110032>.

¹³³ Heyman, "Constructing a Virtual Wall," 106.

4 The Minutemen Movement

4.1 Arizona: The Anti-Immigration Laboratory

It is no coincidence that the minutemen movement emerged in the state of Arizona. Apart from the previously mentioned immigration policies at the border that diverted most immigrants to scarcely populated areas in the Arizonan deserts and therefore made the whole immigration problem much more acute for Arizonans, there have been other reasons such as economic problems the state was experiencing, but also a tradition of vigilantism along the border to build on.

Arizona has been dubbed the nation's anti-immigration laboratory. Even though it is not the only border state experiencing problems with undocumented immigration, other reasons have predestined Arizona to take lead in the anti-immigration activities. Arizona has been hit especially hard by the burst of the housing bubble since its poorly diversified economy to a great extent depended on the housing market.¹³⁴ Arizona is one of the relatively poorer states in the country, its education system ranks among the worst, too.¹³⁵

In 2006, Hispanic population, disproportionately Mexican, comprised 29% of the total population. Fifteen percent of the whole population has been estimated to be foreign born and between 6.9–7.7% unauthorized. Its Hispanic population rose by 39% since 2000.¹³⁶ Furthermore, there is a huge age and cultural gap between the older, white population and the younger, Hispanic, predominantly Mexican, population.¹³⁷

Despite considerable Hispanic presence in the state, their electoral participation is still quite low which plays into the hands of Republicans who are much more prone to

¹³⁴ Tom Barry, *Border Wars* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011), 118–119.

¹³⁵ Mary Jo Pitzl, "Arizona Still One Of The Worst States To Be A Kid," *AZ Central*, July 22, 2014, accessed April 5, 2015, <http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona/2014/07/22/arizona-lags-child-well-being/12980673/>.

¹³⁶ "Arizona: Population and Labor Force Characteristics, 2000-2006," Pew Research Center, January 23, 2008, accessed April 5, 2015, <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2008/01/23/arizona-population-and-labor-force-characteristics-2000-2006/>.

¹³⁷ Barry, *Border Wars*, 122.

enact anti-immigration legislation than democratic legislatures.¹³⁸ In the course of the last decade, Arizona has enacted a number of laws that could be labeled anti-immigration. Doty understands the goal of these laws to be to make it "as difficult as possible for an illegal immigrant to live a normal life."¹³⁹

In 2004, Proposition 200 forbade voting and access to public benefits to undocumented persons.¹⁴⁰ This ballot initiative gained 56% of the vote and was financially supported by the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), widely known for its anti-immigration stance.¹⁴¹ Shortly, more laws of this kind followed suit. In 2006, Proposition 100 made it impossible for undocumented immigrants to be bailed when they were charged for certain felonies. Proposition 102 deprived the same group of the right to seek punitive damages in civil lawsuits in the state.¹⁴² They were also banned from enrolling in public universities under Proposition 300. In the same year, 74% of voters supported Proposition 103 and thus established English as the state's official language.¹⁴³

In 2005, prosecutors in Arizona were given power to prosecute those who smuggle people into the state. Maricopa County's Sheriff Joe Arpaio later took advantage of the law to jail dozens of migrants for conspiring with human smugglers to come into the country.¹⁴⁴ "Business Death Penalty" served as a nickname for another controversial law passed two years later that imposed harsh penalties on businesses that were intentionally employing undocumented immigrants and could even revoke their business licenses.¹⁴⁵

Yet, the nation's toughest anti-immigration law was not introduced until 2010 when SB 1070 was passed in Arizona. Killing of an Arizonan rancher Robert Krentz who was shot death allegedly by an illegal immigrant is believed to be one of the impetuses for

¹³⁸ Mark Hugo Lopez et al., "Latino Voters and the 2014 Midterm Elections," Pew Research Center, October 16, 2014, accessed April 5, 2015, <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2014/10/16/latino-voters-and-the-2014-midterm-elections/>.

¹³⁹ Roxanne Lynn Doty, *The Law Into Their Own Hands: Immigration and the Politics of Exceptionalism* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009), 83.

¹⁴⁰ Kristina M. Campbell, "The Road to S.B. 1070: How Arizona Became Ground Zero For The Immigrant's Rights Movement and the Continuing Struggle For Latino Civil Rights in America," *Harvard Latino Law Review* 14 (2011), 4.

¹⁴¹ Roxanne Lynn Doty, "States of Exception on the Mexico/U.S. Border: Exceptions, Enemies, and Decisions on Undocumented Immigration," *International Political Sociology* 1, No. 2 (2007), 125-126.

¹⁴² Campbell, "The Road to S.B. 1070," 5-7.

¹⁴³ Armando Navarro, *The Immigration Crisis: Nativism, Armed Vigilantism, and the Rise of a Countervailing Movement* (Lanham, MD, AltaMira Press, 2008), 286

¹⁴⁴ Doty, "States of Exception on the Mexico/U.S. Border," 126.

¹⁴⁵ Campbell, "The Road to S.B. 1070," 1-12.

the law to be introduced.¹⁴⁶ The most controversial provision of the law, known also as "show me your papers" provision required law enforcement officials to verify citizenship status of individuals if there was a reasonable suspicion that they might be undocumented. This provision was upheld by the SCOTUS with a provision that it is applied only when enforcing other laws.¹⁴⁷

4.2 Vigilantes on the Border

The Minuteman Project (MMP) was founded in October 2004 by Jim Gilchrist and Chris Simcox. Its main activity has not started until April 1, 2005, when a month-long operation on the Arizonan border with Mexico was launched whose goal was to observe the border and report illegal crossings to Border Patrol.¹⁴⁸ As should follow from the previous subchapter, the emergence of this one and other civilian border patrols was rather in line with the state's anti-immigration policies than representing any significant deviation from the anti-immigration political climate in the state.

It should be noted that the Minuteman Project was not the first project of this kind. On the contrary, it could build upon a long tradition of vigilantism and activism on the border in the whole Southwestern region. The term *neovigilantism* is usually employed referring to this group that designates civil activism targeting specific groups such as, in this case, Mexican illegal immigrants. This is different from the older type, *classic vigilantism*, which was directed rather at individuals.¹⁴⁹

Lyall, among other scholars, points out the long history the anti-Latino vigilantism has in the United States. He estimates that at least six hundred Mexicans were lynched between the years 1848 and 1928.¹⁵⁰ In Arizona, there has been a number of ranchers acting on their own against Latinos – one of the famous cases took place in 1976 when a

¹⁴⁶ William La Jeunesse, "Illegal Immigrant Suspected in Murder of Arizona Rancher," *Fox News*, March 30, 2010, accessed April 5, 2015, <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2010/03/30/illegal-immigrant-suspected-murder-arizona-rancher/>.

Terry Greene Sterling, "Who Was the Real Arizona Killer?," *The Daily Beast*, July 7, 2010, accessed April 5, 2015, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2010/07/08/arizona-immigration-laws-origin-who-killed-robert-krentz.html>.

¹⁴⁷ Carmen R. Lugo-Lugo and Mary K. Bloodsworth-Lugo, "Containing (Un)American Bodies in Arizona," *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice* 26, No. 2 (2014), 266.

¹⁴⁸ Doty, *The Law Into Their Own Hands*, 3–4.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 24.

¹⁵⁰ James D. Lyall, "Vigilante State: Reframing the Minutemen Project in American Politics and Culture," *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal* 23 (2009), 274.

rancher Hanigan and his sons beat and humiliated a group of three Mexicans.¹⁵¹ The following year, the *Klan Border Watch* was established in San Ysidro, California, by David Duke and Tom Metzger from Ku Klux Klan whose goal was to "halt the flow of illegal aliens streaming across the border."¹⁵² California gave birth to other vigilante initiatives in the course of the 1990s such as the "airport posse" project whose participants were questioning Latinos at the San Diego airport on their legal status¹⁵³ or "Light Up the Border" initiative whose supporters were illuminating part of the border to discourage immigrants from crossing it.¹⁵⁴

Apart from the Minuteman Project, other influential groups operated along the border, the most influential one being the *Ranch Rescue* which was established already in the 1990s. In line with the MMP's rationale, it expressed concern over the federal government's failure to protect the border and was concerned mainly with the protection of private property of local ranchers by the means of "armed interdiction and detention of individuals they suspected were in the nation illegally."¹⁵⁵ *Barnett Boys* patrolled the border on the horseback and claimed that they had detained thousands of migrants.¹⁵⁶ In 2002, *American Borden Patrol* was started by Glenn Spencer in Arizona which focuses mainly on the video surveillance of the border that is being posted online.¹⁵⁷

4.3 The Minuteman Project

The Minuteman Project came into being as a common project of Chris Simcox and Jim Gilchrist. Chris Simcox was a former teacher in a private Los Angeles kindergarten who happened to have lost his job and family shortly after 9/11. This made him move to Tombstone, Arizona, where he started Tombstone Militia out of his concern over undocumented immigration. In 2002, he bought a local paper *Tombstone Tumbleweed* which he also used for recruiting volunteers for the previously mentioned Tombstone

¹⁵¹ Matthew Ward, "They Say Bad Things Come in Threes: How Economic, Political and Cultural Shifts Facilitated Contemporary Anti-Immigration Activism in the United States," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 27, No. 2 (2014), 7–8.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 8; Lyall, "Vigilante State," 274.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 274.

¹⁵⁴ Christopher J. Walker, "Border Vigilantism and Comprehensive Immigration Reform," *Harvard Latino Law Review* 10 (2007), 147.

¹⁵⁵ Robert F. Castro, "Busting the Bandito Boyz: Militarism, Masculinity, and the Hunting of Undocumented Persons in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands," *Journal of Hate Studies* 6, No. 7 (2007/08), 13. Walker, "Border Vigilantism and Comprehensive Immigration Reform," 150.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 150.

¹⁵⁷ Doty, *The Law Into Their Own Hands*, 29.

Militia, later transformed into *Civil Homeland Defense*.¹⁵⁸ Jim Gilchrist was a Vietnam veteran from Orange County who used to work as an accountant.¹⁵⁹ He was greatly concerned with illegal immigration, too, and was introduced to Simcox through radio where he heard him talking in the fall of 2004.¹⁶⁰ It soon led to a deal between the two of them to establish a nationwide project called the Minuteman Project.¹⁶¹

4.3.1 A Job the Federal Government Won't Do

The stated goal of the MMP was, as mentioned above, to stop the illegal immigration into the country. On their web page, the leaders of the movement were trying to lure volunteers for their month-long operation on the border where they would be "part of a blocking force against entry into the U.S. by illegal aliens" and "to protect our country from a 40-year-long invasion."¹⁶² Corsi claims in his book *The Minutemen: The Battle to Secure America's Border* that was co-authored by Gilchrist that the minutemen "sought to raise national awareness that America's open borders are an ongoing invitation for enemies to destroy us with bombs..., or to destroy us from within by admitting an uncontrolled invasion of millions of people who hold no allegiance whatsoever to the United States."¹⁶³

The minutemen typically claim that they are only doing the job the federal government will not do.¹⁶⁴ The rule of law is typically called for in the leaders' statements. They emphasize that *illegal* immigration "involves breaking the law," and immigrants are therefore "by definition, criminals from the moment they cross the U.S. border."¹⁶⁵ An important implication stemming from this understanding of illegal immigration is conflation between illegal immigrants, criminals, and even terrorists.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 32.

¹⁵⁹ Navarro, *The Immigration Crisis*, 177.

Gilchrist ran for a Congressional seat in 2005. In the primaries, he ended up third with 14.8% (Walker, "Border Vigilantism and Comprehensive Immigration Reform," 149.).

¹⁶⁰ Doty, *The Law Into Their Own Hands*, 33.

¹⁶¹ Navarro, *The Immigration Crisis*, 178.

¹⁶² "Homepage: The U.S. Wants You!: The Minuteman Project Seeks Volunteers," official web page of the Minuteman Project, November 22, 2004, cached on November 26, 2004, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://web.archive.org/web/20041126131958/http://minutemanproject.com/>.

¹⁶³ Jim Gilchrist and Jerome R. Corsi, *Minutemen: The Battle to Secure America's Borders* (World Ahead Publishing, 2006), 7.

¹⁶⁴ Navarro, *The Immigration Crisis*, 177.

¹⁶⁵ Gilchrist and Corsi, *Minutemen: The Battle to Secure America's Borders*, 47.

This was partly enabled by the events of 9/11 which contributed to the linkage between terrorism and illegal immigration.¹⁶⁶

The law-and-order mantra on which the movement's rhetoric largely rests was repeatedly criticized as hypocritical by some of the scholars who point out a number of irregularities that plagued the movement. Chris Simcox himself was convicted in 2004 for carrying a sidearm in a federal forest.¹⁶⁷ Furthermore, he was accused of child molestation in 2013. Simcox denied the charges, but the case has dragged up to now.¹⁶⁸ Financial irregularities were also reported that eventually contributed to the group's splitting into two entities.

In their book on the minutemen, Gilchrist and Corsi are far from limiting themselves on the aspect of illegality when it comes to immigration. Apart from speaking of crimes some immigrants supposedly engage in such as "rape or murder, as well as crimes of identity fraud, welfare fraud, and tax evasion,"¹⁶⁹ they also speak of diseases such as "drug-resistant tuberculosis, malaria, leprosy, polio, dengus fever, and Chagas disease"¹⁷⁰ that the immigrants are supposed to be carrying. They clearly try to enhance the perception of a threat by mentioning violent gang MS-13 that they link to common Hispanics by claiming that the Hispanic youth reveres the "gangsta rap" music that celebrates these gangs.¹⁷¹

The fact that Mexicans can hold dual citizenship shows according to the authors that they hold allegiance to this "foreign nation"¹⁷² in the first place. They even raise the issue of *reconquista* that is supposedly the ultimate goal of the illegal immigrants who plan to "get citizenship for themselves and their children so that they can eventually vote to return to Mexico large sections of the American Southwest."¹⁷³ The book thus clearly shows how Mexicans are constructed as a first-grade threat to both security and identity of the United States while these claims are strikingly misleading, often lacking any sources or evidence to support them.

¹⁶⁶ Amanda Rose, *Showdown in the Sonoran Desert* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 116.

¹⁶⁷ Castro, "Busting the Bandito Boyz", 21.

¹⁶⁸ "Phoenix trial set for Minuteman movement founder," AZ Central, March 1, 2014, accessed May 8, 2015, <http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/2014/03/01/phoenix-trial-set-for-minuteman-movement-founder/5924373/>.

¹⁶⁹ Gilchrist and Corsi, *Minutemen: The Battle to Secure America's Borders*, 47.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 69.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 135.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 197.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 246–247.

In terms of the group's ideology, Navarro further describes the minutemen movement centered on Gilchrist and Simcox as "conservative, libertarian and capitalist, adhering to a laissez-faire free-market economy."¹⁷⁴ The minutemen were, however, strongly opposed to trade liberalization and NAFTA which they believed had negative effects on the U.S. sovereignty and was driving immigrants from Mexico into the United States.¹⁷⁵ According to Shapira, there is a critique present in the minutemen's thinking that the government "is selling out to big business"¹⁷⁶ which is seen in their criticism of the U.S. employers and their hiring of illegal workforce while the federal government is seen as complicit, in this respect, for not enforcing appropriate laws.¹⁷⁷

4.3.2 Spectacle on the Border and the Role of the Media

The fact that the whole minutemen rhetoric and their activities focused so heavily on the border served as a powerful symbolics worthy of the media attention. Chávez identifies the attraction of the media attention as the primary goal of the movement. He notices the fact that the "spectacle" the minutemen were creating did not lack costumes as they typically wore military fatigues and were equipped with a wide array of equipment such as binoculars, bulletproof vests, or guns.¹⁷⁸ This might certainly seem shady given the emphasis the minutemen were placing on the passive observation of the border and the strict no-contact policy with the immigrants.¹⁷⁹ Drawing on Foucault, Chávez highlights two aspects of this "spectacle" the minutemen were performing, and that is, the demarcation of power positions and the public way of doing so. The spectacle focused on the privileges of citizenship which were allegedly challenged by illegal immigrants who were subject of this "spectacle." Another Foucauldian aspect present in the actions

¹⁷⁴ Navarro, *The Immigration Crisis*, 194.

¹⁷⁵ Luis Cabrera and Sonya Glavac, "Minutemen and Desert Samaritans: Mapping the Attitudes of Activists of the United States' Immigration Front Lines," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36, No. 4 (2010), 686–690.

¹⁷⁶ Harel Shapira, *Waiting for José: The Minutemen's Pursuit of America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 18.

¹⁷⁷ Gilchrist and Corsi, *Minutemen: The Battle to Secure America's Borders*, 55–66.

¹⁷⁸ Leo R. Chavez, "Spectacle in the Desert: The Minuteman Project on the U.S.-Mexico Border," in *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*, ed. Julie A. Dowling and Jonathan Xavier Inda (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013), 115.

¹⁷⁹ Chris Simcox, "Standard Operating Procedure," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on February 7, 2005, accessed April 16, 2015, <http://web.archive.org/web/20050207151807/http://www.minutemanproject.com/SOP.html>.

of the minutemen was the surveillance of the border. Finding illegal immigrants was, in this respect, "part of the 'show.'"¹⁸⁰

The aspect of the "spectacle" did bring to the movement an enormous media coverage. During the pilot project of the MMP in April 2005, more reporters were supposedly present on the border than activists.¹⁸¹ In the course of the year 2005, the Minuteman Project was allegedly covered by more than 1,750 news articles.¹⁸² Apart from major media outlets, the minutemen affected the U.S. culture, too, since they appeared in an episode of TV shows *West Wing* and *Law and Order*.¹⁸³ The minutemen themselves were very much media savvy and took advantage of the Internet in spreading their message and to recruit their volunteers.¹⁸⁴

4.3.3 Militarism and Masculinity

When discussing what the real concerns behind the activities of the MMP were, look at the demographic make-up of the group can be helpful. Members of the minutemen were mostly white males, old, often retired, and many of them ex-military.¹⁸⁵ Gilchrist, however, claimed that more than half of the volunteers were actually women.¹⁸⁶ Gilchrist himself is a proud Vietnam War veteran and his involvement in the Minuteman Project has been likened to his participation in this war by Corsi who wrote that "Gilchrist knew that his nation needed him, and he chose to answer the call – just as he had as a teenager fighting the Viet Cong in the jungles of Vietnam."¹⁸⁷

Many of the volunteers shared a liking for guns and even carried arms while patrolling the border that were allegedly only to be used for self-defense. Yet, just the fact that they had the arms entailed a possibility of violence and indeed, a number of incidents have been reported that included use of arms and violent intimidation of undocumented immigrants.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁰ Chavez, "Spectacle in the Desert," 116.

¹⁸¹ Doty, *The Law Into Their Own Hands*, 65.

¹⁸² Walker, "Border Vigilantism and Comprehensive Immigration Reform", 149.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 138.

¹⁸⁴ Doty, *The Law Into Their Own Hands*, 72.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁸⁶ Jim Gilchrist, speech delivered at 35th annual Eagle Forum Leadership Conference, September 23, 2006, video available at C-SPAN, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.c-span.org/video/?194563-2/author-panel>.

¹⁸⁷ Gilchrist and Corsi, *Minutemen: The Battle to Secure America's Borders*, 4.

¹⁸⁸ Adalgiza A. Nunez, "Civilian Border Patrols: Activists, Vigilantes, or Agents of Government?," *Rutgers Law Review* 60, No. 3 (2008), 798.

Walker looked into possibilities which ordinary citizens have to legally use arms drawing on a historic right of citizens to arrest persons for committing certain crimes. Under the so called *majority rule* that applies among other states in Arizona, a citizen can arrest a person when he or she witnesses certain crimes – either felonies or misdemeanors that amount to a breach of peace. Unlawful entry is a felony provided the migrant was previously convicted of it but since citizens have no right to arrest undocumented citizens on a probable cause but have to know for sure that the person is committing a crime, it is not very likely that they could arrest undocumented immigrants on these grounds. As for the use of arms, when arresting this person, they could theoretically use force if it was absolutely necessary but should hand him or her over to law enforcement officials without any unnecessary delay.¹⁸⁹

Even though there are few legal ways of arresting undocumented citizens by persons who are not law enforcement officials and the minutemen themselves are explicitly condemning any use of force unless in self-defense, the arms played a significant role in framing "undocumented immigrants as criminal and violent and the nation and its citizens as both threatened and powerfully inured to border assaults."¹⁹⁰ Nunez argues that by carrying weapons and military fatigue, the minutemen could be easily confused with the Border Patrol and were in this way intimidating the immigrants.¹⁹¹

Many scholars identify an aspect of masculinity that is tightly linked to the minutemen's militarism as one of the central features of the ideology of the movement. According to Castro, masculinity was equated in the eyes of the minutemen with the notion of "white manhood" which they needed to protect on the border against the world of savagery – the *Mestizo* immigrant whose presence would eventually destroy the American culture and the white men.¹⁹²

More scholars actually argue that in the heart of the current anti-immigration climate lies exactly this fear of a stranger that can endanger the American way of life.¹⁹³ On the other hand, Shapira, for example, claims that the minutemen cannot be fully understood in terms of any ideology they supposedly hold, but rather in terms of a sense of losing their past lives that used to be truly meaningful to them. He believes that the minutemen

¹⁸⁹ Walker, "Border Vigilantism and Comprehensive Immigration Reform," 153–162.

¹⁹⁰ Katie E. Oliviero, "Sensational Nation and the Minutemen: Gendered Citizenship and Moral Vulnerabilities," *Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 36, No. 3 (2011), 681–682.

¹⁹¹ Nunez, "Civilian Border Patrols," 811.

¹⁹² Castro, "Busting the Bandito Boyz", 9.

¹⁹³ Rose, *Showdown in the Sonoran Desert*, 115.

are not really looking for an illegal immigrant in the desert "but a lost feeling of respect and self-worth."¹⁹⁴ Yet, if an illegal immigrant is claimed to be just a scapegoat by Shapira, he still fails to explain why specifically illegal immigrants are scapegoated by the minutemen and not any other group within the society.

4.3.4 Racism

Most scholars believe that the minutemen's focus on the illegal immigrant harbors racism. Navarro claims that "both MP and MCDC as nativist militias were xenophobic, nativist, and racist, especially toward Mexicanos."¹⁹⁵ Castro explains that the movement's leaders were quite successful in concealing these sentiments by assigning the blame for the problems they were trying to tackle on the abstract notions of terrorism and crime on the border but insists that this discourse at the same time "stigmatizes undocumented persons in ways that are consistent with racially driven animus."¹⁹⁶

Doty, for that matter, shows that the whole anti-immigration movement has racist connections. She mentions, for example, that many slogans on the web pages of anti-immigration groups are identical to those used by white supremacist groups. Doty builds on Carol Swain that has called this whole movement the "new white nationalism" which typically puts forth one's right to "distinct cultural, political, and genetic identity as white Europeans."¹⁹⁷

Castro believes that predominantly white members of the minutemen fear that "immigrants will disrupt age-old ascriptive hierarchies that have ruled American society from its earliest days."¹⁹⁸ This fear can be partially linked to increasing economic globalization embodied in the first place by NAFTA. DeChaine further suggests that, in this respect, with the loosening of economic borders, "sociocultural border tightens."¹⁹⁹

The group's focus on the border further suggests that some kind of racist ideology could be present in the group's thinking. As DeChaine points out, the whole immigration problem "is not framed predominantly in terms of the migrants themselves"

¹⁹⁴ Shapira, *Waiting for José*, 22.

¹⁹⁵ Navarro, *The Immigration Crisis*, 194.

¹⁹⁶ Castro, "Busting the Bandito Boyz," 8.

¹⁹⁷ Doty, *The Law Into Their Own Hands*, 59–63.

¹⁹⁸ Castro, "Busting the Bandito Boyz," 16.

¹⁹⁹ D. Robert DeChaine, "Bordering the Civic Imaginary: Alienization, Fence Logic, and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, No. 1 (2009), 49–50.

but rather "in terms of a lack of border integrity."²⁰⁰ This is important because if the speakers were prejudiced against these immigrants, exactly this would allow them to avoid accusations of racism because instead of speaking of concrete people, they speak just about the border which might be seemingly racially neutral. On the other hand, when they speak of the border and the problems associated with it, the audience might infer itself that the speaker is actually talking about the illegal immigrants or Mexicans.

DeChaine works with the notion of *alienization* which explains how groups are rendered unassimilable. It mainly consists of *fixing* immigrants' identities as "un-Americans" which is to some extent consistent with their racialization. He says that out of alienization, a figure of an illegal immigrant or alien, a perfect enemy, emerges that is blamed for problems within the society and is commonly conflated with Mexicans who are automatically understood to be both immigrants and illegal.²⁰¹

In his study of the MCDC, DeChaine finds that the group adheres exactly to what he understands as the alienization that helps them avoid overt racism by focusing on the geographical borders rather than immigrants.²⁰² The inconsistency in denouncing *illegal* immigration can be documented also by the movement's overemphasis on the southern border in comparison with the northern border.²⁰³

4.3.5 Success or Failure?

The primary, explicitly stated goal of the minutemen movement was to prevent illegal immigrants from crossing the border. While complete halt of immigration can hardly be imagined, a quick look at the statistics shows that there has been a considerable drop in apprehensions on the Southwestern border. In 2004, more than 1,139,000 apprehensions were reported by the Border Patrol, whereas in 2009, they dropped to little over 500,000 and were on the decline till 2012.²⁰⁴ The MMP itself claimed that in the area they were

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 44.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 45–51.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 53.

²⁰³ Cabrera and Glavac, "Minutemen and Desert Samaritans," 681.

²⁰⁴ "United States Border Patrol, Southwest Border Sectors: Total Illegal Alien Apprehensions By Fiscal Year," U.S. Customs and Border Protection, accessed April 5, 2015, http://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/documents/BP%20Southwest%20Border%20Sector%20Apps%20FY1960%20-%20FY2014_0.pdf.

patrolling, the border-crossings considerably dropped. Already on April 18, 2005, Gilchrist was claiming credit for the 94% decrease in apprehensions.²⁰⁵

In fact, the Border Patrol was reinforced in Arizona shortly before the minutemen launched their operation, in the midst of their media campaign but not necessarily in the wake of the minutemen's efforts. Yet, the data do not really tell us how big a part of unauthorized border-crossers was apprehended. Furthermore, this drop is not given only by the increasing efficiency of enforcement measures on the border but also by the changing dynamics in the immigration into the United States itself – in 2012, it was reported that the *net* migration from Mexico fell to zero which was mainly linked to the poor state of the U.S. economy, but also to dropping birth rates in Mexico, and without any doubt also to the increasing difficulty of crossing the border.²⁰⁶

The minutemen were definitely successful in getting their message out whether this was their primary goal or not, and it is more than probable that despite the lukewarm or outright disapproving reactions, the politicians in the D.C. felt compelled to step up their efforts to at least allocate more funding for the border in order to temper the voices alarmed over the alleged failure of the federal government to deal with the situation.

As for the movement's other "successes," Lyall emphasizes the history of the U.S. (anti-)immigration law that according to him created a state ideology that legitimizes, among other, the minutemen and vigilante actions. Yet, he further believes that vigilante actions, on the other hand, often serve as an indicator of future state actions, and holds that the MMP in fact preceded rise in ICE raids and deportations.²⁰⁷

The minutemen movement, nevertheless, was not able to transform itself into a stable component of the U.S. anti-immigration movement. At the beginning, the movement successfully fueled the whole nativist extremist movement (as was labeled by the Southern Poverty Law Center) that was reflected in the increasing number of nativist extremist groups reported by the SPLC. In 2010, 319 of these groups were reported, a significant rise from 144 identified as of 2007. Yet, after 2010, the number of these

²⁰⁵ Jim Gilchrist, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, April 18, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

²⁰⁶ Jeffrey S. Passel, D'Vera Cohn and Ana Gonzales-Barrera, "Net Migration from Mexico Falls to Zero—and Perhaps Less," Pew Research Center, April 23, 2012, accessed April 5, 2015, <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/04/23/net-migration-from-mexico-falls-to-zero-and-perhaps-less/>.

²⁰⁷ Lyall, "Vigilante State," 284, 290.

groups dropped to 185.²⁰⁸ SPLC states that this was caused mainly by the negative media coverage, organizational problems, and by the fact that the movement's agenda was co-opted by state legislatures which incorporated the anti-immigration sentiment into their legislation.²⁰⁹ Moreover, despite identifying itself with the rich history of the civil protest groups, the movement was not able to persuade the political elites and public about its broader legitimacy and was seen as too extremist, if not racist. Organizations such as ACLU and SPLC were among those who feared possible violent confrontations with illegal immigrants.²¹⁰ George Bush was also critical of the movement saying that he opposed vigilantes but was for "enforcing the law in a rational way."²¹¹

From the above-stated facts, it could be claimed that the movement has withered away because it fulfilled its mission and was no longer needed. On the contrary, it could be suggested that the minutemen movement was not likely to last for too long as it was too centered on just the two big personalities of Gilchrist and Simcox who have, however, parted their ways mainly because of disputes over finances.

Simcox continued similar activities with his own organization called Minutemen Civil Defense Corps (MCDC) which functioned until 2010 when it dissolved also because it was unwilling to assume responsibility for actions conducted by some of their more extreme volunteers.²¹² Gilchrist was fired from the Minuteman Project in 2007 by its board of directors over allegations of embezzlement and fraud.²¹³

Yet, quite recently, Gilchrist has revived the Minuteman Project and has called for a new initiative on the border to take place in May 2015 which suggests that the sentiments and concerns connected with the MMP have not faded away along with the

²⁰⁸ Heidi Beirich, "Nativism Movement Collapses Amid Fighting," Southern Poverty Law Center – Intelligence Report, No. 145 (Spring 2012), accessed April 5, 2015, <http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-report/browse-all-issues/2012/spring/the-year-in-nativism>.

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ Mimi Hall and Patrick O'Driscoll, "Border Patrols Growing in Arizona," *USA Today*, March 29, 2005, accessed May 8, 2015, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/2005-03-29-borders_x.htm.

²¹¹ "Bush Decries Border Project," *Washington Times*, March 24, 2005, accessed May 8, 2015, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2005/mar/24/20050324-122200-6209r/?page=all>.

²¹² Sonia Scherr, "Top Minuteman Group Announces Breakup," Southern Poverty Law Center – Intelligence Report, No. 138 (Summer 2010), accessed April 5, 2015, <http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-report/browse-all-issues/2010/summer/lock-and-unload>.

²¹³ David Holthouse, "Jim Gilchrist Fired By Minuteman Project," Southern Poverty Law Center – Intelligence Report, No. 126 (Summer 2007), accessed April 5, 2015, <http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-report/browse-all-issues/2007/summer/minute-mess>.

whole movement.²¹⁴ Yet, as of May 8, 2015, no activity on the border has been reported neither by the media, nor on the Minuteman Project's web pages.

²¹⁴ David Neiwert, "Jim Gilchrist Announces Grand Vision for New Minuteman Border Patrols in 2015," Southern Poverty Law Center, July 22, 2014, accessed April 5, 2015, <http://www.splcenter.org/blog/2014/07/22/jim-gilchrist-announces-grand-vision-for-new-minuteman-border-patrols-in-2015/>.

5 Critical Discourse Analysis of the Minutemen Discourse

5.1 Research Objectives and Strategy

This study has for its goal to examine the discourse of the minutemen movement asking whether a new racist prejudice manifests itself behind their conspicuously anti-racist rhetoric vis-à-vis the illegal immigrants. Just the fact that this group centered its activities on the southern border may hint to possible prejudice as the border itself represents a symbolic line between the "We" and the "Other."

As suggested in the previous chapters, it could be expected that if the minutemen or the leaders of the movement who are examined in this study were prejudiced against immigrants (predominantly of Mexican origin since they were operating on the southern border), they would try to conceal their prejudiced attitude by trying to present themselves as the good, law-abiding citizens, supportive of ethnic diversity and legal migration in order not to lose legitimacy with the Americans they were appealing to. In theory, their possible prejudice could be still disclosed with the help of the Critical Discourse Analysis. In order to evaluate the minutemen discourse in terms of a possible prejudice, following features were especially focused on:

- 1) *referential and predication strategies* applied with respect to (positive) in-group and (negative) out-group representation (Who constitutes the in-group/out-group and what traits are ascribed to these groups? Are they understood in binary terms, as necessarily opposed to each other?)
- 2) *force-dynamic* (How is the "spatial" movement of immigrants depicted in terms of the lexical choice, is there any counterforce against their movement expressed in the discourse?)
- 3) *legitimization and coherence* (How consistent and coherent are speakers in their discourse? Are there any inconsistencies that could hint to a prejudiced attitude toward immigrants? How do speakers legitimize their claims in terms of

evidentiality and epistemic modality? What strategies do they use to achieve a coherence of their discourse?)

- 4) what is the bigger picture that the speakers try to convey to the audience and what *narrative* or *ideology* are they trying to sell, serving to what goals?

5.2 Data Collection

The minutemen movement was basically driven by its two leaders Jim Gilchrist and Chris Simcox who were therefore considered as the most relevant speakers for the examination of the minutemen's discourse. In the first place, the analyzed data were gathered from the interviews conducted with them in the period of 2005–2007. Several interviews conducted with Chris Simcox prior 2005 were added as he had been already working on his Civil Defense Homeland Project that made part of the latter Minuteman Project.

The interviews with both speakers constituted the main base of the examined data – they were obtained from major cable TV shows that affect a significant part of the U.S. population. Most of the interviews available appeared on Fox News (18), followed by CNN (4) and MSNBC (2).²¹⁵ Transcripts of these shows were found at the database Factiva and CNN web pages. Interviews represent a very valuable genre for the CDA trying to disclose possible prejudice as the speakers are usually confronted with an anchor or another guest who might react to their claims and the speakers might be therefore forced to use strategies to refute possible accusations of their prejudice or inconsistencies in their discourse.

In these interviews, the role of anchors is important because they usually set a certain climate in which the whole discussion takes place. Anchors like Sean Hannity or Lou Dobbs are well known for their opposition to illegal immigration and in many cases, it is obvious that they are sympathetic to the minutemen's stance and their activities and are even advocating for them openly and supporting their claims.²¹⁶ In other instances,

²¹⁵ The Lou Dobbs's show, for example, aired on CNN had an average of 631,000 viewers in October 2009. (Brian Stelter and Bill Carter, "Lou Dobbs Abruptly Quits CNN," *The New York Times*, November 11, 2009, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/12/business/media/12dobbs.html>.) Fox News has consistently had the biggest prime-time viewership, in 2005 it topped 1,600,000 viewers at average. ("Cable TV: Prime-Time Viewership, by Channel," Pew Research Center, accessed May 8, 2015, <http://www.journalism.org/media-indicators/cable-news-prime-time-viewership/>.)

²¹⁶ Julie Hollar, "Dropping Dobbs: A Victory for Media Activism, and the Challenge Ahead," *Media Accuracy on Latin America*, NACLA Report on the Americas (January/February 2010).

however, especially as far as Colmes and Hannity are concerned, they were also able to press the speakers, especially when inquiring about a possible use of violence against immigrants. Still, in most cases, these anchors cannot be considered in any way neutral.

One possible disadvantage of examining discourse from the TV interviews is the very limited time slots the speakers usually have which might force them to simplify the ideas they are trying to send to the viewer. This was partially offset by inclusion of the material collected at the old versions of the web pages of both the Minuteman Project and the MCDC run by Simcox. The web pages were accessed through the web page archive.org which archives old versions of web pages that are no longer accessible.

This material comprised various kinds of documents such as general information about the group, a mission statement, or a standard operating procedure. Some of the documents were explicitly signed by either Gilchrist or Simcox, some of them could not be directly assigned to them but were still representative of the movement's ideology and were therefore included in the analysis. This kind of documents allowed the speakers to express their ideas in a more comprehensive way than in the TV interviews. They could also present their claims in a different way as it could be expected that people supposed to be reading these materials already had some sympathies for the movement which made them to click their way through to these particular documents.

Finally, the data set was completed with three public appearances of the minutemen leaders aired by C-SPAN. These were deemed useful because they were considerably long and thus provided for a more comprehensive presentation of the two leaders' ideas. Concretely, it was the joint conference of Gilchrist and Simcox followed by a Q&A session at the Press Club in D.C. in April 2006 shortly before meeting with the Congressional Immigration Reform Caucus. The other two appearances featured Jim Gilchrist answering questions of the C-SPAN viewers related to immigration in the first one and presenting and elaborating on his ideas presented in the book on the minutemen he co-authored with Jerome Corsi in the second one.

5.3 Referential and Predication Strategies

5.3.1 "We," the Law-Abiding American Citizens Versus "Them," the Illegal Immigrants

In terms of the referential strategies, the speakers always present themselves as part of the deictic center²¹⁷ – the "We." The "We" or the in-group constitutes the American citizens, the speakers therefore aim to speak on behalf of all Americans. In most cases, this is expressed as an entailed presupposition with the deictic "We" referring to Americans with the consideration of the context. Interestingly, as in (1), the deictic "We" sometimes implicitly means "we, the members of the minutemen," but the minutemen are also considered to be prototypes of the exemplary U.S. citizens, and so being a minuteman automatically means to be a U.S. citizen.

- 1) **We** [the minutemen] sit and watch. **We** [the minutemen] create a presence, and no one has been coming across the border. That's a good thing. It's like golf, Alan, you know, low score wins. No one crosses, **we** [Americans/American citizens] have security.²¹⁸

Referring to the minutemen as being part of American citizens clearly serves as a legitimization strategy for their claims. The speakers even draw on the U.S. Constitution as something inherently legitimate, referring to them as "we, the people"²¹⁹ repeatedly to create an impression that they are acting on behalf of all Americans and possibly with their implicit consent. In one instance, Gilchrist explicitly calls himself "your average Joe Citizen,"²²⁰ constituting himself as an inextricable part of the American citizens, being one of them.

Looking at the predication strategies underlines how much effort the minutemen put into representing themselves in positive terms as the good, law-abiding citizens as in

²¹⁷ The deictic center refers to the point of space or time that basically define the speaker's perspective. The words like "here," "we," or "them" are deictic and can be understood only in context, usually by knowing what constitutes the deictic center. The deictic center might be often identified also with a certainty (epistemic truth) and morality (deontic right), therefore what is described as close to the deictic center is also more certain and morally right.

²¹⁸ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, April 26, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

²¹⁹ Ibid.

²²⁰ Jim Gilchrist, interview by Tucker Carlson, *The Situation With Tucker Carlson*, MSNBC, April 3, 2006 (transcript available at Factiva).

(2). Moreover, in the excerpt (3), they are trying to create an impression that they are part of the civil protest movement and therefore passive and non-violent and that they are only trying to attain their goals by being exemplary citizens. This is most probably given by a specific goal of refuting potential critique of their malicious intentions against immigrants that the public and the media were suspicious of.

- 2) But they [our people] also have proven themselves to be the most law-abiding citizens in this country.²²¹
- 3) ...one of the most important, socially responsible, and peaceful movements for justice since the civil rights movement of the 1960s.²²²

The above-mentioned quotes also document the strategy of exaggeration the minutemen use to further highlight that they are not only law-abiding citizens, but even "the most law-abiding citizens in this country." Similarly, since the minutemen were often blamed for racism, they probably felt compelled to explicitly state in many instances such as in (4) that they are not racists but, quite on the contrary, are sympathetic to immigrants, humane, and compassionate as in (5) and (6), and even supportive of legal immigration. In (7), they also point out their members' composition to show that their group consists of responsible citizens.

- 4) We are not a racist group... We are a multiethnic immigration law enforcement advocacy group, 22 percent of members are nonwhite, 55 percent are women.²²³
- 5) This is a humane endeavor. Certainly, it's tragic some of the things we've seen in the last almost a year that we've been doing this.²²⁴
- 6) ...I mean, that's the kind of people we are. We understand these are human beings, and we want to assist them when they're in need. And you know, but there are people that are on a witch hunt.

²²¹ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, August 16, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

²²² Chris Simcox, "Standard Operating Procedure," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on February 7, 2005, accessed April 16, 2015, <http://web.archive.org/web/20050207151807/http://www.minutemanproject.com/SOP.html>.

²²³ Jim Gilchrist, speech delivered at 35th annual Eagle Forum Leadership Conference, September 23, 2006, video available at C-SPAN, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.c-span.org/video/?194563-2/author-panel>.

²²⁴ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, January 7, 2003 (transcript available at Factiva).

- 7) The roster of volunteers currently includes 12 PhDs, three professors from state universities, several dozen current and former members of law enforcement, free-lance journalists, teachers, engineers...

The out-group, as constructed by the discourse, comprise in general *illegal* immigrants. An important aspect of the discourse indicating some kind of a prejudice is the rigid understanding of the in-group and the out-group. Since "We," the deictic center is understood as good and law-abiding citizens, then "the Other" is "our" antithesis, by crossing the border illegally, they are inherently pitted against "us" – the law-abiding citizens.

The binary understanding of the "We" and "Them" is also expressed by the specific referential strategies of *de-spatialization* (illegal immigrants) or strategies of *dissimilation* (illegal aliens, people on the other side). Interestingly, they are almost never explicitly referred to by their origin. The country of their origin is thus only presupposed, for example, when they are referred to as the "people on the other side" or when the country of their origin, Mexico, is explicitly blamed for the whole problem of illegal immigration.

When examining the referential strategies, what is striking is the abundance of the use of the deictic "them," while concrete content of this pronoun is completely implicit, meaning that the speakers presuppose that the audience or the listener will infer themselves who that is. In (8), for example, the pronoun "them" refers to illegal immigrants but the last concrete mention in the text that the pronoun refers to is the following, "if anyone wants to choose to come through there...."

This is when the semantic memory activates itself, allowing the listener to draw from the shared (world) knowledge to fill in the gaps so when he or she hears the "them" or the "people that cross the border," they usually automatically think of illegal immigrants even without a necessary context and it could be argued that they often think of those of specifically Mexican origin. In (9), the speaker's use of the pronoun "them" referring to illegal immigrants becomes illogical as the deictic "them" in the sentence already refers to Border Patrol.

- 8) We confront **them** in that we tell **them** this is American territory. **They** cannot come through this area.²²⁵
- 9) And when we call **them** [the Border Patrol] – by the time we call **them** [the Border Patrol], **they're** [the illegal immigrants] in the mountains on the interior.²²⁶

It seems that the minutemen deliberately avoid talking about concrete people that immigrate because they might think that they will avoid accusations of being prejudiced more easily when they do not talk about illegal immigrants but focus, for example, on the problem of the "porous" or "broken" border instead. The strategies that are used to make these people almost invisible in the discourse and therefore prevent possible accusations of racism include *nominalization*, *backgrounding*, and *suppression*. Their use is so frequent and at the same time detrimental to the clarity of their expression that it almost excludes any possibility of being used unintentionally by the speakers.

The *nominalization* refers to instances when speakers try to sideline an agent of certain activity by referring to them, for example, by the result of the process they engage in rather than speaking of the process itself.²²⁷ In the discourse of the minutemen, there is often no mention of immigrants or people immigrating but they would be typically referred to as "(illegal) activity" or subsumed under nouns such as "border crossings" or "sightings" as in (10) or (11).

Similarly, strategies of *backgrounding* and *suppression* might aim to de-emphasize or leave out completely certain actors.²²⁸ In (12) and (13), the agents of the process are not explicitly mentioned, therefore, the speakers cannot be easily condemned as racists. The actors might be made invisible but still be thought of implicitly so they can be connected with certain illegal activities without having to refer to these persons explicitly.

- 10) ...citizens are more than willing to help out and to expose where **criminal activity is taking place**.²²⁹
- 11) ...we have had essentially **no activity coming across this border, no illegal activity**.²³⁰

²²⁵ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, November 19, 2002 (transcript available at Factiva).

²²⁶ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, April 19, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

²²⁷ Paul Baker and Sibonile Ellece, *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis* (London: Continuum, 2011), 76.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, 11, 145.

²²⁹ Chris Simcox, interview by John Gibson, *The Big Story w/ John Gibson*, Fox News, December 12, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

12) **They're getting hammered** [the citizens] in those areas...²³¹

13) These paths are **highways that are carved** into the desert... So the – **the trash** – you should see the trash from the air. I mean, you can actually follow the trails from the border up to 100 miles north by following the bottles of water and the trash of the backpacks.²³²

When immigrants are not backgrounded or suppressed in the discourse they are, as stated above, often referred to as *illegal* immigrants or sometimes just as illegals which further implies that they are understood in the strict opposition to the legal migrants or the law-abiding U.S. citizens, and the only aspect defining them worth mentioning is their illegality. This understanding of them clearly perceives the immigrants themselves as responsible for coming into the United States because they are the ones who have willingly and, more importantly, illegally, crossed the border. Yet, in order to show their compassion with the immigrants, the speakers sometimes contradictorily call these same immigrants "economic refugees" who are described as basically being victims exploited by the "21st century slave-traders."²³³ Those slave-traders can be U.S. employers who make use of the cheap migrant labor or anyone who profits from the illegal immigration such as human smugglers.

Calling these immigrants victims or economic refugees, however, presents a different narrative. If they are described as being lured by the employers or benefits offered in the United States, it implies that these immigrants are not personally responsible for their *illegal* entry, at least not to such an extent as in the first case. This serves for the minutemen to present themselves as human and compassionate by sympathizing with the immigrants' situation but at the same time allows them to present themselves as being superior to these immigrants, as the ones who will take care of them, and decide on their behalf what is best for them in order to protect them. The comparison with the slave trade is thus symptomatic of this attitude as slaves were also treated as children who do not know what is best for them.

Nevertheless, whether the minutemen understand immigrants as illegals or victims, the solution that would do away with this perceived "problem" amounts to "securing the border" in both instances. This is due to the fact that the border is always understood as

²³⁰ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 19, 2005.

²³¹ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, May 6, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

²³² Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 26, 2005.

being the primary cause of the illegal immigration, not the reasons "pushing" or "pulling" the immigrants crossing the border.

In general, there is a tendency in the minutemen's discourse to suppress the concrete people, the illegal immigrants, under the notion of the "porous" or "broken" border whose product they supposedly are. By speaking of the border, the speakers make the people crossing the border invisible and might thus gain justification for deploying more resources on this "broken" border more easily which, nevertheless, have a tangible effect on these very same people who are made invisible in their discourse.

5.4 Topoi

5.4.1 Topoi of Threat and Crime

The minutemen usually claim that the only thing bothering them about the immigrants is their illegality, the fact that they cross the border *illegally*. In their discourse, they both explicitly and more often implicitly associate immigrants with the topos of threat – concretely, they conflate them with a number of threats on the border such as smuggling of drugs or other more serious crimes. The topos of crime is also commonly brought up when speaking of immigrants and is often interconnected with the topos of burden and the topos of threat.

Often, what starts as a discussion on illegal immigration turns to discussion about serious crimes that are thus conflated with illegal immigrants in general. The speakers talk about the "crime wave coming into this country"²³⁴ or "illegal immigrants who enter this country illegally and continue a life of crime."²³⁵ In this way they often implicitly equate illegal immigrants who are in other places understood as economic refugees with criminal activities such as drug smuggling or even cases of murder of U.S. citizens committed by illegal immigrants.

Moreover, the immigrants are also *explicitly* assigned several crimes such as the unauthorized entry that itself makes out of them criminals in the eyes of the minutemen.

²³³ Jim Gilchrist, interview by David Asman, *Your World w/ Neil Cavuto*, Fox News, April 10, 2006 (transcript available at Factiva).

²³⁴ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, April 3, 2006 (transcript available at Factiva).

²³⁵ Chris Simcox, interview by Mike Barnicle, *HARDBALL*, MSNBC, August 22, 2007 (transcript available at Factiva).

In other instances, as in (14), the immigrants are blamed for Social Security fraud and ID theft, but these crimes are also conflated with such serious crimes as murders. In extreme cases, as in (15), it is suggested that the problem of illegal immigration may threaten the security of the country in the same way the terrorism and 9/11 did.

- 14) It's not about immigrants. It is about illegal immigrants who enter this country illegally and continue a life of crime. I mean, Social Security fraud, ID theft, this is a rampant problem in communities across the country. And you cannot deny the 90% of Americans who have said, enough is enough. And tell that to the families [of the victims of serious crimes such as murders committed by illegal aliens].²³⁶
- 15) America does not need another reminder, as we had on 9/11, that lax immigration law enforcement opens the door to our enemies... Many of the hijackers obtained fake IDs from illegal aliens.²³⁷

The minutemen try to depict a high number of migrants coming into the country as a threat to the survival of the nation. They achieve that by using a myriad of strategies. Typically, as in (16-19), they use IMMIGRATION as WATER metaphor which equates illegal immigration with this natural force. The water metaphor in its numerous forms (wave, tidal wave, flood) achieves the goal of appealing to listeners' emotions because these natural phenomena are universally understood as something to be feared that must be prevented from hitting the country. It can also contribute to the creation of imagery of inhuman mass of people coming into the country while encountering no resistance or a just a weak one, that is easily overcome. This particular language also serves as a good example of the *proximization* strategy as it presents the immigration as an actual, imminent threat approaching the country.

- 16) We have certainly a serious problem with **porous borders**.²³⁸
- 17) If the **flow of illegals** continues...²³⁹
- 18) We're seeing the **wave of illegals** returning with Border Patrol nowhere to be found.²⁴⁰
- 19) It's a virtual **human tidal wave** coming across...²⁴¹

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ "Positions: Illegal Immigration," *MCDC PAC*, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.mcpcpac.com/positions.php>.

²³⁸ Jim Gilchrist, interview by John Gibson, *The Big Story With John Gibson*, Fox News, August 23, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

²³⁹ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 19, 2005.

²⁴⁰ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, May 13, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

5.4.2 Topos of Burden

The illegal immigrants are depicted as a threat to the society also by being associated with the topos of burden. In this respect, they are depicted as undesirable, unwanted (20), drain on resources, and so forth. It is presented in such a way to convey an impression that even if the Americans wanted to, there is no way to provide for such a huge number of immigrants in a responsible way (21). This rhetoric might, as was described in the second chapter, trigger the cheater-detection module in the listener who identifies the immigrants as social-cheats that can further trigger emotions such as anger or contempt that can lead to exclusionary attitude toward these immigrants. In (22), for example, the illegal immigrants are presented as being always poor and therefore burden to the country, even the word cannibalism is used which implies almost inhuman parasitizing on the United States.

20) ...they are **not needed** in this nation.²⁴²

21) ...**we cannot possibly carry that load** by having an open invitation to hundreds of millions of illegal aliens who want to come to the United States to take up shop, some of them, ten percent, criminal mentalities, who want to come here...²⁴³

22) ...90% of the population that's impoverished **because of the cannibalism of illegal aliens coming in and taking jobs** from either other illegal aliens who took the jobs from American citizens before and we essentially have a mirror reflection of Mexico, and it can happen very quick.²⁴⁴

The language of the minutemen also skillfully constructs a powerful imagery that conveys an impression of infinite numbers of immigrants, also with the help of the WATER metaphor, as in (23) and (24). The opposition to illegal immigration might therefore seem reasonable and logical because the sheer number of immigrants is not only impossible to accommodate but presents a threat to the survival of the nation as suggested in (25).

²⁴¹ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 3, 2006.

²⁴² Jim Gilchrist, interview by David Asman, April 10, 2006.

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Jim Gilchrist, interview by Robb Harleston, *Washington Journal*, C-SPAN, May 13, 2006, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.c-span.org/video/?192507-2/immigration-laws>.

23) ...**an endless stream of invading forces** now numbering 3 million per year...²⁴⁵

24) **Lines and lines** of them.²⁴⁶

25) We have **six and a half billion people in this, in the world now**. Do we have six billion visitors to the U.S., it's how we feed them, how we provide water, housing, at what point will our resources be depleted.²⁴⁷

5.4.3 Topos of Culture

When giving interviews, both Gilchrist and Simcox seem to be very careful not to refer to illegal immigrants as Mexicans, nor to evaluate them in terms of their culture and possible incompatibility with the U.S. culture which could refer to legal immigrants of the same origin, too. Yet, on their web pages, their language gets much more explicit in demonstrating how the immigration might translate into a direct threat to the U.S. nation and its culture. There, they relate much more often the illegal immigration to the invasion which might invoke fears of the *reconquista* that haunts many U.S. politicians and scholars such as Peter Brimelow.

Excerpts (26) and (27) are examples of the frequent use of the future tense to picture an apocalyptic future of the U.S. that will, in the minutemen's discourse, surely come if the problem of illegal immigration persists. Even though the speakers try to speak of various cultures and not to single out any of them, in (28), they suggest that Mexico is the culture in question both explicitly by referring to Mexican flags and implicitly by speaking of not respecting the English language. It could be therefore inferred that when they are speaking of the "wholesale attack by those who do not love America and wish to see her destroyed or irremediably altered from a nation of liberty, equality, and justice, and a bastion of western civilization,"²⁴⁸ they hint to Mexico as well.

²⁴⁵ "About the Minuteman Project," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on November 26, 2004, accessed April 30, 2005,

<http://web.archive.org/web/20041126221924/http://minutemanproject.com/AboutMMP.html>.

²⁴⁶ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 19, 2005.

²⁴⁷ Jim Gilchrist, Press Conference at National Press Club, April 26, 2005, video at C-SPAN, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.c-span.org/video/?186482-1/minuteman-project>.

²⁴⁸ "About," MCDPAC, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.mcdcpac.com/positions.php>.

- 26) ... [illegal aliens] will have made such inroads into the political and social systems that they will have more influence than the U.S. Constitution over how the U.S. is governed.²⁴⁹
- 27) Future generations will inherit a tangle of rancorous, unassimilated, squabbling cultures with no common bond to hold them together, and a certain guarantee of the death of this nation as a harmonious "melting pot."²⁵⁰
- 28) If you investigate your local or adjacent communities, you will not find one community in the United States where there is not a foreign enclave, in other words, where the U.S. flag is neither flown nor respected nor wanted but plenty of Mexican flags are available. Where the U.S. language, the official language, English, is neither wanted, it's not spoken, nor is it respected.²⁵¹

5.5 Force-Dynamic

One could suppose that the minutemen's discourse would constitute, in terms of the force-dynamic, a powerful force of Agonist that is coming to the United States with little or no hindrance in order to emphasize the threat the Agonist is representing. Studying the role of the Antagonist in the discourse is important, too, because minutemen repeatedly tried to present themselves as passive observers, for example, as in (29) and (30), and should be therefore constituting themselves as force-neutral. Yet, they can still assign the role of Antagonist to the federal government or Border Patrol when they are talking about illegal immigration in general and the need to stop it and not about their own activities.

- 29) And **we strictly observe and report** to Border Patrol and sometimes local sheriff's departments any suspected criminal activity.²⁵²
- 30) **We sit and we watch.** We create a presence, and no one has been coming across the border.²⁵³

²⁴⁹ "Homepage: The U.S. Wants You!: The Minuteman Project Seeks Volunteers," official web page of the Minuteman Project, November 22, 2004, cached on November 26, 2004, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://web.archive.org/web/20041126131958/http://minutemanproject.com/>.

²⁵⁰ "About the Minuteman Project," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on March 30, 2005, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://web.archive.org/web/20050330003153/http://www.minutemanproject.com/AboutMMP.html>.

²⁵¹ Jim Gilchrist, speech delivered at 35th annual Eagle Forum Leadership Conference, September 23, 2006.

²⁵² Jim Gilchrist, interview by Tucker Carlson, April 3, 2006.

²⁵³ Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 26, 2005.

As already discussed, immigrants are in some cases constructed as being drawn to the United States by various benefits, U.S. employers offering them jobs, and so forth. Yet, in the discourse, they are depicted, by contrast, as a force that is moving independently without necessarily being attracted by any force (benefits). In fact, any push or pull factors that can account for the migrants' movement are strikingly absent. In general, the movement of migrants (the Agonist) is constructed as unfettered, mass, and often violent force that is enabled by not enforcing the immigration laws and because of not having the border secured. If one looks at the verbs constituting their movement, the migrants are usually "coming through," "coming across," or "entering the country" which suggests that they have a free passage with no obstacle hindering their movement perhaps because the federal government is not enforcing the laws and is thus *letting* these people come in.

Often, the movement of the Agonist is not depicted just as unfettered or unhindered but especially as violent which presupposes that there might be a counterforce exerted by the Antagonist (law enforcement) but it is basically of no use since the force of the Agonist is stronger as in (31) and (32). The WATER metaphor in (33) that was already mentioned is often used to create an imagery of a natural force hitting the country that has an important consequence of effectively constructing a tangible threat that needs to be stopped by all means.

31) these persons who are **piercing our borders**²⁵⁴

32) those who **violate our borders**²⁵⁵

33) the human flood **breaching our Homeland Defense**²⁵⁶

These metaphors are made even more powerful combined with the IMMIGRATION as WAR metaphor as can be seen in the excerpt (34) that likens illegal immigration to invasion. Ideologically, these metaphors have an important function of raising fear that can lead to calls for and justification of violent, military solutions. It can equally justify the need of the minutemen to carry arms despite claiming that they are only going to sit,

²⁵⁴ Jim Gilchrist, interview by Tucker Carlson, April 3, 2006.

²⁵⁵ "The Minuteman Pledge," official web page of the MCDC, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.minutemanhq.com/hq/mmpledge.php>.

²⁵⁶ "About Us: Mission Statement," official web page of the MCDC, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.minutemanhq.com/hq/mmpledge.php>.

and watch, and observe as they are constructed as vulnerable and threatened by this danger.

34) I have phone calls from people in those areas who say that they are being, 48 hours after the Minuteman Project withdrew on April 30, **they were being deluged with invasion** all over again.²⁵⁷

35) And again, **we're at a time of alert and alarm against enemies**, foreign and domestic.²⁵⁸

Moreover, the citizens are represented as vulnerable and exposed because "anyone who wants to come into the United States, just come on through and have your way with our households."²⁵⁹ This assertion draws on the HOUSE as NATION metaphor and implies that illegal immigrants are raping the U.S. nation if they come uninvited. The HOUSE metaphor is useful for the minutemen's discourse because if we understand the nation as a house, we also believe that we can actually have a control over who enters. Moreover, house has always a limited capacity and to accommodate people over that capacity is deemed irresponsible.

Metaphor of the IMMIGRATION POLICY as DOOR is consistent with the previously mentioned metaphor. The minutemen speak of the current immigration policy as of an open door as in (36). People coming illegally are understood as intruders and trespassers as in (37) which logically elicit an impression that "we need to *stop* people from breaking into the country."²⁶⁰

This metaphor discloses an important incoherence in the minutemen's discourse. They want to point out the failure of the federal government to enforce the immigration law, hence the metaphor of the immigration policy as an open door. On the other hand, they also try to construct the immigrants as a threat so instead of seeing them as just entering the open door, they also depict them as "breaking in" or "violating the borders" which shows the incoherence of the minutemen's goals of criticizing both the federal government and the illegal immigrants in their discourse.

²⁵⁷ Jim Gilchrist, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, May 13, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

²⁵⁸ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, November 19, 2002.

²⁵⁹ Jim Gilchrist, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, January 26, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

²⁶⁰ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 26, 2005.

36) ...we've gone for 40 years disregarding what our political leaders have set forth for us. And what they have set forth for us is a **no-door policy**.²⁶¹

37) **...trespassing over our international border** into the United States...²⁶²

Interestingly, the minutemen describe their actions as strictly passive: they sit, watch, report, and in no way confront the immigrants, but in their discourse, quite paradoxically, they speak of themselves as a "*blocking force* against entry into the U.S. by illegal aliens"²⁶³ or "a visible deterrent, where if anyone wants to choose to come through there, then they're choosing *to take on the American people*."²⁶⁴ These quotes clearly presuppose at least a threat of violence against the immigrants that the minutemen supposedly also want to protect from exploitation. Sometimes, the minutemen openly contradict themselves, for example, when saying that "we need border guards so that we don't have to *catch* people," while calling for a strict no-contact policy.²⁶⁵

Generally, the examination of the force-dynamic either identifies a force of the Agonist that has an inherent tendency to move into the United States and is either let in by an implicit absence of any counterforce (law enforcement) or gets through because it is stronger or violent as apparent in (38) and (39).

38) ...how many people that we've documented that **have slipped through the Border Patrol's fingers**.²⁶⁶

39) **The overrun of refugees** across the border is not acceptable anymore.²⁶⁷

Again, the concrete people who constitute the Agonist are always understood as being the product of the "broken" border which allows the speaker not to reflect on concrete reasons or motives for their immigration. The proposed solution that is often called for is thus simply engaging the military because "nothing short of military

²⁶¹ Jim Gilchrist, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, January 26, 2005.

²⁶² Jim Gilchrist, interview by Tucker Carlson, April 3, 2006.

²⁶³ "Homepage: The U.S. Wants You!: The Minuteman Project Seeks Volunteers," official web page of the Minuteman Project, November 22, 2004.

²⁶⁴ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, November 19, 2002.

²⁶⁵ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, May 13, 2005.

²⁶⁶ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 26, 2005.

²⁶⁷ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, November 19, 2002.

intervention will cease the flow."²⁶⁸ The people coming into the country need to be stopped simply because they are coming illegally, they are unwanted or uninvited guests, and the country cannot possibly accommodate all the people who want to come. The minutemen thus grasp complex issue of illegal immigration in simplistic terms and therefore believe that just shutting down or sealing the border as in (40) and (41) will do away with the whole issue of illegal immigration.

40) We feel that **the borders need to be sealed**.²⁶⁹

41) We have **shut it down**. There are no aliens coming across.²⁷⁰

The image of a sealed border also implies a strict binary understanding of the "We" and "Them" on opposing sides of the border and an idea that "We" are better off cutting "ourselves" off from the people on the other side.

5.6 "We" Are the Law

The main, overarching idea in the minutemen's discourse that follows from the previous findings is the binary understanding of "We" versus "Them" in terms of the notion of the law versus the notion of the illegality. This is important because, again, it oversimplifies the reality and makes anyone outside the law, such as illegal immigrants, undesirable and possibly subject to exclusionary behavior.

The main contradiction present in this rhetoric is the simplistic understanding of the law. Law, in the minutemen's discourse, is something given, highly abstract, and almost untouchable. This encourages labeling of people crossing the border as "illegals" simply because they have committed something technically against the law usually with no mitigating factors such as push and pull factors taken into account. The adequacy of the current immigration law is never questioned.

The law-and-order aspect of the discourse is so important that it basically embodies the in-group. If one looks at the demarcation of the "We" in the discourse and the law on the other hand, it is apparent that the two entities overlap. Moreover, both are

²⁶⁸ Chris Simcox, "Standard Operating Procedure," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on February 7, 2005, accessed April 16, 2015, <http://web.archive.org/web/20050207151807/http://www.minutemanproject.com/SOP.html>.

²⁶⁹ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, November 19, 2002.

²⁷⁰ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, April 7, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

understood, in terms of spatiality, as the deictic center. In this sense, exactly as the border represents a clear dividing line between the "We" and "Them," it also represents a line between the law and the people prone to come illegally, hence the negation of the law. Therefore, in their discourse, the minutemen are not only "the most law-abiding citizens in the country," but in terms of spatiality, they often emphasize that they operate *within* the law, stay *within* the boundaries of the law and will suffer irreparable damage to their reputation, if one single individual "steps over the line."²⁷¹ Gilchrist explicitly comes to the conclusion that "we're – the rule of law."²⁷²

Immigrants in this rhetoric are, on the other hand, *illegal* at the very moment they step across the border as in (42). Both explicit and implicit connection with crime and in many cases serious crimes have been already described in the paragraph about topoi.

42) If they're coming across the border, they're illegal immigrants, OK?²⁷³

Among several consequences that are mentioned as brought about by or connected with illegal immigration (such as the economic burden to the society, crime, or terrorism) the minutemen's discourse claims that the rule of the law itself is in danger. The speakers further envision almost apocalyptic future where there "will be the green light to open the flood gates that we are no longer a nation governed by the rule of law."²⁷⁴ This vision entails illegal immigrants taking part in an insurrection (43). A new racist prejudice against Mexicans might be present in this narrative that points out that "about 70 million of that 280 million, maybe 80 million [illegal immigrants], will be from Mexico alone,"²⁷⁵ while the above-stated "un-American" activities they are expected to engage in imply their unwillingness to assimilate as described by Chavez's "Latino Threat Narrative."

43) When you have 200 million illegal aliens by the year 2025 threatening to engage in insurrection or march on the streets on their foreign flags if they don't get immediate

²⁷¹ Chris Simcox, "Standard Operating Procedure," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on February 7, 2005, accessed April 16, 2015, <http://web.archive.org/web/20050207151807/http://www.minutemanproject.com/SOP.html>.

²⁷² Jim Gilchrist, speech delivered at 35th annual Eagle Forum Leadership Conference, September 23, 2006.

²⁷³ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, November 19, 2002.

²⁷⁴ Jim Gilchrist, speech delivered at 35th annual Eagle Forum Leadership Conference, September 23, 2006.

²⁷⁵ Ibid.

amnesty and citizenship and of course along with that comes dual voting rights in their homeland as well as in the United States...²⁷⁶

The minutemen thus present a very simplistic narrative saying that if you do not enforce laws, in this case the immigration law, it will inevitably lead to the outright loss of the rule of law. Country no longer governed by the rule of law or, in other words, country that lets illegal immigrants come, is in their view an uncivilized country because "a nation that has no respect for the rule of law is no longer a civilized nation,"²⁷⁷ and in addition, a country plagued with chaos and anarchy as evident in (44) and (45). The illegal immigrants who are seen as the cause of this potential decay of the nation are at the same time defined by being mostly of Mexican origin and inherently "un-American" while no evidence for their culture's potential hostility to the U.S. culture and values is stated.

44) ...illegal alien invasion crisis currently threatening the sovereignty, prosperity, and governance by the rule of law of the United States.²⁷⁸

45) The final result: political and social mayhem.²⁷⁹

The only alternative to illegal immigration the minutemen offer is to immigrate legally or, as they often put it, simply "get in line, come legally"²⁸⁰ which obviously overlooks how difficult the law they worship so much has made it for Mexicans to immigrate legally. The illegal immigration should be tackled by putting the military and the National Guard on the border as suggested in (46) and only then is a discussion on immigration reform possible.

46) ...we don't need legislation. We need our military and National Guard on our border to support Homeland Security, and we need to enforce our laws. While we do that, then we can negotiate how to come up with immigration reform.²⁸¹

²⁷⁶ Ibid.

²⁷⁷ Ibid.

²⁷⁸ "News Media and L.E.O.," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on April 3, 2005, accessed April 30, 2015,

<http://web.archive.org/web/20050403024229/http://www.minutemanproject.com/LEO.html>.

²⁷⁹ "About the Minuteman Project," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on March 30, 2005.

²⁸⁰ Chris Simcox, interview by Mike Barnicle, August 22, 2007.

²⁸¹ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 3, 2006.

Employing the military might seem justified in the discourse that presents a chaotic lawlessness as the natural consequence of the illegal immigration. Also, this rhetoric, again, overlooks significant part of illegal immigrants who, for example, overstay their visa rather than cross the border illegally.

In this rhetoric, the reasoning of the minutemen could be put in the following way: if we seal the border, we will prevent these people from entering illegally and therefore prevent our nation from falling into decline; in addition, we will still be seen as humane because we will also ensure that these people, the would-be illegal immigrants, will not be exploited by the human smugglers or U.S. employers, and we will not have them dying of dehydration in our backyards because "when we force people to come through the orderly queue, they're protected."²⁸²

5.7 Coherence and Legitimization

The speakers representing the minutemen movement are apparently well aware that they might be easily accused of being biased against the people coming across the border, who are represented mainly by Mexicans, and therefore use a number of strategies to establish their authority as of good, human, and compassionate citizens. Secondly, they try to present their claims as a common truth not to be disputed. As already stated, they were not quite successful in doing that, for instance when they talked about immigrants as the victims on the one hand and criminals on the other.

The coherence of a given discourse can be examined in terms of *evidentiality* and *epistemic modality*. In terms of the former, the minutemen intentionally describe themselves as the good, law-abiding citizens and more importantly, as a voice of all American citizens and thereby increasing their authority as the speakers. As in (47), they typically speak of themselves as the ones who know the truth and are therefore obliged to enlighten the ignorant majority. The way they do that was already described by the predication strategies referring to the in-group.

47) It's about time we get the truth out. That's all we're trying to do.²⁸³

²⁸² Chris Simcox, Press Conference at National Press Club, April 26, 2005, video at C-SPAN, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.c-span.org/video/?186482-1/minuteman-project>.

²⁸³ Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, January 7, 2003.

The speakers also commonly draw on history to show the obvious truthfulness of their claims. They refer to, for example, the civil protest movement of the 1960s that they believe is justifying what they are doing, or 9/11 with which they aim at people's emotions and which contributes to the construction of the seriousness of the threat they are trying to convey. Not surprisingly, as the whole movement's name draw on the American Revolution, the Constitution is frequently appealed to as showed in (48-50).

48) **We, the people**, are going to hopefully put enough pressure on the government now to get them to relieve us from duty...²⁸⁴

49) You must read our Constitution, sir. You're not too clear about our rights as citizens.²⁸⁵

50) This is our constitutional right to protect our borders.²⁸⁶

Another means of legitimization of their claims is a reliance on numbers and statistics as in (51) whose source is, however, never stated. Furthermore, these numbers often seem exaggerated and the minutemen thus create a powerful imagery by inflating the size of the threat.

51) Eighty percent of your illegal alien population from Mexico are economic refugees. Ten percent are criminal fugitives. Another ten percent become criminals after they enter the United States. About 4 million illegal aliens coming to the United States from Mexico alone per year and they are unapprehended and no one knows who they are, where they are or what they're doing here...²⁸⁷

In terms of *epistemic modality*, the speakers try to present their claims as obvious and common sense to enhance their persuasiveness, so what they do is "*simply* observe,"²⁸⁸ and the situation on the border is "*clearly* unacceptable."²⁸⁹ A common way to present controversial claims is through the IF-THEN sentences which help to establish their claims as a common sense while often leaving out important pieces of information as they did, for instance, in (52) or (53).

²⁸⁴ Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 26, 2005.

²⁸⁵ Ibid.

²⁸⁶ Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, November 19, 2002.

²⁸⁷ Gilchrist, interview by Robb Harleston, May 13, 2006.

²⁸⁸ Gilchrist, interview by Tucker Carlson, April 3, 2006.

²⁸⁹ Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 26, 2005.

52) Well, if they are here illegally, they are certainly here in violation of U.S. law. And if we are going to maintain our – our governance, under the rule of law, we actually have to enforce that law or those laws.²⁹⁰

53) No one crosses, we have security.²⁹¹

Use of clichés ("It's too little, too late"²⁹² or "when the going gets tough, the tough get going"²⁹³) may also help achieve the same goal as it creates an impression of common truth. The speakers also commonly exaggerate the threat they are constructing. Partially already described was the appeal to emotions they achieve in numerous ways: they might present a threat as exaggerated, use certain adjectives such as "the *chaotic* neglect by members of our local, state and federal governments"²⁹⁴ or "*cavalier and reckless* lack of enforcement of U.S. immigration law"²⁹⁵ which have both for its goal to point out the irresponsibility on the part of the government.

Strategies such as *backgrounding* were already mentioned with regards to illegal immigrants whose explicit presence in the discourse might lead to accusations of racism. The speakers are therefore often vague about them and do not say explicitly who exactly is the agent of the actions that are "happening" across the borders, speaking of "porous" borders instead.

Strategies of *displacement* are typically used in the discourse of the minutemen to displace the blame that is imposed on their movement on other groups instead, that they deem as opposed to them. In (54), they are trying to refute the claim that their alleged racism is a threat by claiming that the illegal immigrants, on the contrary, are a threat. They would also mention the minutemen's presence on the Canadian border to deny potential racism that follows from their disproportionate focus on the southern border without being asked about it, yet, are able to offer only few details about what plans they exactly have for the northern border. When Simcox is confronted with the claim that they are getting in the way of the Border Patrol by setting off sensors by mistake, he

²⁹⁰ Jim Gilchrist, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, April 10, 2006 (transcript available at Factiva).

²⁹¹ Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 26, 2005.

²⁹² Ibid.

²⁹³ Chris Simcox, "Standard Operating Procedure," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on February 7, 2005, accessed April 16, 2015,

<http://web.archive.org/web/20050207151807/http://www.minutemanproject.com/SOP.html>.

²⁹⁴ "About the Minuteman Project," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on March 30, 2005.

²⁹⁵ Jim Gilchrist, Interview by Lou Dobbs, *Lou Dobbs Tonight*, CNN, December 7, 2005, transcript accessed April 30, 2015, <http://edition.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0512/07/ldt.01.html>.

accuses the anchor of conforming to what the D.C. says and promptly shifts the blame on the minutemen's enemy, the American Civil Liberties Union (55).

54) Yes, we're on the Canadian border. And still people are playing the race card. You're racist. You're a threat to society. Come on. The people coming in are a threat to our society.²⁹⁶

55) And you're getting the party line down from Washington... The sensors are being set off by the media and ACLU observers who are traipsing up and down the road all the time.²⁹⁷

These were just a few examples of the means the minutemen use to legitimize their claims. They might seem irrelevant for finding out whether they are prejudiced against illegal immigrants coming from the south of the border. Yet, they help understand what kind of claims the minutemen think need to be backed with special legitimization strategies as otherwise, the audience would not necessarily accept them. This is especially done with the strategy of positive self-representation with which they often exaggerate their positive traits and at the same time downplay the reliability of their de facto internal enemies such as ACLU (56) or the federal government (57, 58).

56) I have an issue with the ACLU and that's not the ACLU that I remember twenty years ago. It's an anarchist, communist organization and I have no use for it and you can quote me on that.²⁹⁸

57) I cannot accept the weak excuse from our government that the problem is unsolvable. That mindset is un-American.²⁹⁹

58) ...chaotic neglect by members of our local, state and federal governments charged with applying U.S. immigration law.³⁰⁰

5.8 Main Conclusions

It can be possibly claimed that if the minutemen were themselves persuaded about the rightness and consistency of their claims and goals, there would be no need to

²⁹⁶ Chris Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News, October 17, 2005 (transcript available at Factiva).

²⁹⁷ Simcox, interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes, April 7, 2005.

²⁹⁸ Jim Gilchrist, Press Conference at National Press Club, April 26, 2005, video at C-SPAN, accessed April 30, 2015, <http://www.c-span.org/video/?186482-1/minuteman-project>.

²⁹⁹ Chris Simcox, "Standard Operating Procedure," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on February 7, 2005, accessed April 16, 2015, <http://web.archive.org/web/20050207151807/http://www.minutemanproject.com/SOP.html>.

³⁰⁰ "About the Minuteman Project," official web page of the Minuteman Project, cached on March 30, 2005.

emphasize that they are the most law-abiding citizens. Similarly, if the threat of the illegal immigration was so acute, a simple enumeration of the problems it is causing supported with numbers and statistics by respectable organizations would be sufficient. Instead, they are often vague about who exactly these illegal immigrants are or exaggerate the threat by equating them with natural disasters such as flood, tidal wave, or with an outright invasion. This understanding has at the same time important consequences because if you have a threat of this size, you are trying to tackle it even with the use of the military instead of looking at underlying causes of why this threat in the first place exists.

Moreover, the coherence of the minutemen's claims seems at least dubious given the inconsistencies in their discourse. Firstly, the object of their efforts, the notion of illegal immigration, is very vague in their discourse. They speak of both economic refugees who logically need protection and do not know what is best for them but also about criminals who are personally responsible for their illegal crossings.

The immigrants are sometimes constructed as criminals simply because of their unauthorized entry or relatively minor crimes they commit consequently such as having a fake ID, sometimes they are conflated with criminal activities as serious as murders. Especially on the minutemen's web pages, hints at the cultural threat from the illegal immigrants to the cultural identity of the United States are not uncommon, yet, what this identity entails, is left unanswered. The law whose breach is condemned is simply given and never understood as created by concrete people in a given time and context which could have possibly changed.

The disproportionate focus on the southern border is also contradictory to the broader goal of tackling illegal immigration because border crossings do not account for all the illegal immigrants in the country. The calls for sealing or securing the border create a false impression that the border has ever been secured in the way that there was absolute control over who comes in.

The minutemen's discourse thus largely rests on the assumption that the illegal immigration is driven in the first place by the immigrants' decision to immigrate and they themselves are therefore responsible for it. They hardly admit any complicity from the part of the U.S. citizens. In a few instances, they talk about the "unscrupulous" U.S. employers or businesses that exploit the cheap labor force but nowhere, they speak of

how this cheap labor is profited by Americans, especially in the services they all use where the illegal immigrants' workforce is common.

An alternative discourse to this one would be a one that admits some U.S. complicity. Its proponents might blame NAFTA that increased the structural inequality between the United States and Mexico, or cite the U.S. need for cheap labor as one of the main reasons for illegal immigration. What they have in common is, nevertheless, the conviction that the immigration is a result of push and pull forces that they emphasize rather than the immigrants' own decision, and therefore personal responsibility for their illegality. They often claim that these immigrants should be in the first place treated as human beings.

The former discourse usually aims at securing the border in order to do away with the illegal immigration, the latter calls for comprehensive immigration reform that would offer more ways to immigrate legally or programs aimed at reducing poverty in countries such as Mexico. The latter group is in the discourse of the minutemen represented especially by the federal government and the ACLU which are very obviously not considered a part of the "We," the law-abiding citizens. They are more often seen as the ones aiding the illegal activity the minutemen are opposed to in the first place.

5.9 Prejudice in the Discourse

This study was trying to answer whether a new racist prejudice could be identified in the minutemen's discourse and is therefore driving their efforts on the border. The following features of the discourse specifically point to presence of some kind of a new racist prejudice:

1. Firstly, the immigrants are always defined by their illegality in such a way that it is understood as an inherent part of their identity, almost like the color of the skin was understood as given in the case of the old racism. Nowhere, there is any indication that they could get rid of this illegality, rather, they are said to be continuing the life of crime after committing their first crime of unauthorized entry. The difference between a murder and a fake ID is blurred in the discourse as they both fall under the simple notion of illegality. This phenomenon was partly examined by De Genova who speaks of the invisibility of the immigration

law in opposition to the visibility of the illegal immigrants.³⁰¹ Yet, in the discourse of the minutemen, even the migrants are often made invisible as described further below. Ackerman in this respect suggests that the notion of illegality in the immigration discourse emerged as a consequence of the "erasure of overtly racialized language from mainstream politics."³⁰²

2. The immigrants are understood as being necessarily a burden to the society in a similar way they are presented as inherently criminal. They are seen as defined by their poverty and therefore always prone to exploit the social system in the country. There is no supposition that they can also work, pay taxes, or in other words, be deserving members of the society, nor there is any sign of a possibility of social mobility on their part. This corresponds to the previously mentioned understanding of the (new) race as an underclass status or a "failure to enter the middle class" as van den Berghe put it.³⁰³
3. The cultural new racism is staunchly avoided when the minutemen leaders give interviews on a national TV. Yet, in the statements on their official web pages or, for example, in the Gilchrist's public presentation of his book, the cultural threat to the United States is explicitly expressed. The unassimilability of their culture is expressed by the apocalyptic envisioning of the future America which will not only lose its face due to the Mexican illegal immigration but will also fall into chaos and anarchy because it will be no longer governed by the rule of law. This cultural racism was described by Bonilla-Silva, yet, in the case of the minutemen, concrete traits of immigrants' culture deemed inferior and incompatible with the dominant culture were probably intentionally left out as the speakers could be seen as prejudiced if they singled them out explicitly.³⁰⁴
4. The illegal immigrants are also dehumanized in many ways, for example, when they are referred to by using the strategy of nominalization or equated with natural forces. This is basically consistent with the findings of Santa Ana who

³⁰¹ Nicolas P. De Genova, "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 3 (2002): 432. Accessed October 28, 2014, doi: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085432.

³⁰² Edwin Ackerman, "'What Part of Illegal Don't You Understand?': Bureaucracy and Civil Society in the Shaping of Illegality," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37, No. 2 (2012): 190–191.

³⁰³ Pierre L. van den Berghe, "Neo-racism in the USA," *Transition*, No. 41 (1972): 17–18.

³⁰⁴ Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists*, 28–29.

identified the metaphor of IMMIGRANT as ANIMAL, that is, being inhuman, as the most pervasive one in the immigration discourse.³⁰⁵

5. The minutemen leaders conspicuously try to avoid speaking of who exactly the illegal immigrants are, where they come from, or why they are coming into the country. In a few instances, however, they speak of complicity of Mexico, Mexican flags, etc., which implies that they are speaking of immigrants from Mexico. Moreover, their disproportionate concern with the southern border presupposes what kind of immigrants they are concerned with. Even when Simcox speaks about the need to secure the northern border, he immediately goes on to speak about the practice of Mexicans flying to Canada from where they cross the border into the United States.³⁰⁶ In this respect, DeChaine, for example, emphasizes the role the notion of geographical borders plays in avoiding racism.³⁰⁷

These features show that a new racist prejudice is certainly driving the minutemen's understanding of immigration. All previous features may elicit, as Hart suggests, the exclusionary and discriminatory behavior against immigrants if they are presented as a national security threat, criminal threat, cultural threat, and undeserving social cheats. This shows that the minutemen's conspicuously anti-racist, "migrant-friendly" rhetoric is deceptive. It is rather driven by the prejudiced attitude that might further trigger irrational fears of irreversibly changing America that might consequently justify exclusionary behavior against those deemed as bringing about these changes, the members of the out-group.

This faulty, simplistic discourse surely deserves to be exposed and criticized on the one hand as it is clearly a means of reproduction of the hegemonic power of the white majority that can lead to discrimination of a non-white minority. The negative sentiment against illegal immigrants might affect legal immigrants, too, as one cannot distinguish between them simply by looking at them. The simplicity of the discourse should be pointed out also because it hinders creation of a national consensus regarding possible solutions to the issue of the illegal immigration such as a comprehensive immigration

³⁰⁵ Otto Santa Ana, *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003), 273–286.

³⁰⁶ Chris Simcox, Press Conference at National Press Club, April 26, 2005.

³⁰⁷ D. Robert DeChaine, "Bordering the Civic Imaginary: Alienization, Fence Logic, and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, No. 1 (2009): 53.

reform. On the other hand, it does not mean that all the claims of the minutemen should be automatically rebuffed as some of them echo real concerns, especially of the citizens living along the border that still need to be dealt with.

Conclusion

This study had for its goal to assess whether the new racism was a driving force behind the minutemen movement that operated along the Arizonan part of the U.S.-Mexico border starting in 2005. At the first sight, the group's rhetoric was strikingly anti-racist, trying to establish the members of the group as patriotic, responsible, and law-abiding citizens who were only carrying out the duty of enforcing laws in the absence of the federal government. In addition, they claimed that they were actually sympathetic to immigration and were only opposed to the *illegal* immigration.

The fact that they focused so heavily on the southern border hinted at a potential prejudice against predominantly *Mexican* immigrants who cross this border. Moreover, the focus on the border itself implies a powerful symbolism of the dichotomy between the "We" and the "Other."

This work builds upon the assumption of the unacceptability of the old racism. The new racism theories assume that the old blatant racism has become inadmissible in the wake of the civil rights movement in the 1960s. Despite the fact that the old racism cannot be called dead and manifests itself every now and then, its proponents are always condemned by the society and any movement that would openly advocate the old racism will inevitably fail to establish itself as a meaningful player within the civil society.

New racism does not put forth the race understood biologically, yet, this does not mean that the white-black dichotomy is no longer existent. Rather, the races keep on living as concepts. White race still works as a synonym for citizenship. Bearers of white race are therefore understood as those being more human, civilized, rational, or clean. Black race, on the other hand, is identified with groups that are understood as being antithetical to the white race. They are thus inherently uncivilized, irrational, and dirty. These notions might further translate into the notions of poverty, crime (illegality), or supposedly inferior culture of the non-white races that is deemed inherently incompatible with the dominant, white one.

These new races are therefore understood as constructs, but they work, in fact, in the same way as the races in the old racism did as they are understood as simply given and not subject to change in the course of time. Conceptually, the new racism is thus based

on the same prejudice that posits the superiority of the dominant white race in the society, but it is deemed more legitimate since the prejudice does not manifest itself explicitly. The existence of this prejudice is significant because it can further translate into discriminatory and exclusionary behavior toward the non-white groups, just as the old racism often did.

In order to answer the question of whether the minutemen movement harbored new racism in its activities, its discourse was examined working on the assumption that every discourse is ideological and prejudice can thus be reproduced by the discourse, too. The Critical Discourse Analysis was used as the tool of the analysis as it is especially suitable for studying prejudice in the discourse. Specifically, van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach, combined with Hart's approach resting to a great extent on the findings from the field of cognitive linguistics and evolutionary psychology were used.

The analysis of the discourse concluded that the new racist prejudice can be, indeed, found in the minutemen's discourse based on the following findings. Most importantly, the immigrants are in the first place defined by their illegality that is understood as something given and inherent to this out-group just as the old race was seen as permanent. They are therefore usually referred to as *illegal immigrants* or *illegals*. They are rarely explicitly labeled as Mexicans, but the context indicates that the group does entail Mexicans in the first place (e.g., there is a mention of Mexican flags, the speakers complain about *Mexican* complicity in the problem of illegal immigration, etc.).

The notion of illegality is said to be driving the immigrants' behavior even after they have crossed into the United States, in the minutemen's words, "they continue life of crime." The in-group, on the other hand, that comprises both the minutemen and the U.S. citizens that they aim to represent, consists of "the most *law-abiding* citizens." Ultimately, they embody the law itself. This is, however, hugely misleading as the law is understood as something objective and given, inherently right. A possible inadequacy of the current immigration law is completely disregarded.

In a similar way, immigrants are associated with poverty that defines who they are and how they can be expected to behave for the rest of their lives. In the eyes of the minutemen, they will be therefore inevitably a burden to the society, exploit its social system, and ultimately impoverish the whole country as their numbers will grow. This envisioning of the apocalyptic future the U.S. will face because of the illegal immigration is also typical of the cultural threat that the immigrants are said to be

embodying. In this vision, their culture is inherently un-American and will ultimately bring about the end of the rule of law in the country accompanied by anarchy and chaos. Interestingly, the content of the culture assigned to both the in-group and the out-group is very vague.

Dehumanization of the members of the out-group is reminiscent of the old racism. Immigrants are commonly equated with natural forces such as *tidal wave* or *floods* that perceive immigrants as a mass force hitting the country. The force-dynamic analysis reveals how the immigrants' movement is constructed as being violent and stronger than any possible resistance. For example, the immigrants are said to be *violating* or *piercing* the borders. The dehumanization is an important aspect of a prejudiced discourse because it helps justify equally strong and violent response to stem the movement of the Agonist, the out-group, that is described as a mass, violent force.

The number of ways of how the immigrants are backgrounded or outright suppressed in the discourse is partially related to the previous feature of dehumanization. The content of who exactly comprises the out-group is often as vague as possible. The speakers might think that mentions of *illegal activities* or *problems* along the border are enough for the receiver of the message to infer that the illegal immigrants are being referred to.

Similarly, instead of speaking of concrete immigrants, the word *trash* is used once that is automatically associated with the movement of immigrants who leave this trash behind. This might be useful for the speakers to avoid talking about the out-group itself and thus avoid accusations of racism. They can also use it to justify the use of a counterforce, such as the military or National Guard against the immigrants without emphasizing that it will, in fact, target concrete people, not an abstract notion of *illegal activity* or "*porous*" border.

Apart from these features directly pointing out the new racist prejudice, other properties of the minutemen's discourse reinforce the previous findings. In terms of the discourse, it is obvious that the speakers use different strategies to establish themselves as responsible, law-abiding, and good citizens which serves to enhance their authority and therefore validity of their claims. On the other hand, groups not sympathetic to their efforts such as the ACLU or the federal government are criticized and ridiculed.

Moreover, the apparent tension between the need to present the minutemen in positive terms on the one hand and their prejudice on the other manifests itself in the

incoherence of the discourse where immigrants are understood as both victims of the illegal immigration and those who are personally responsible for it. Similarly, they are said to be *lured* by the U.S. employers but also described as *violating* and *piercing* the border in order to get to the country that itself is described with the help of the house metaphor as having its *door open*. This obviously raises a question, why are the immigrants seen as having to use violence in order to enter an open door?

Another incoherence becomes evident in the minutemen's declared physical passivity with regards to immigrants and the expressive language of their discourse where they are calling themselves a *blocking force* against the immigrants' entry or where they are warning that these immigrants will have to *take on the American people* if they cross illegally.

The discourse implies that the border itself is in the heart of the illegal immigration and therefore *sealing the border*, a highly simplistic idea, would solve all the problems associated with the phenomenon of illegal immigration. These problems can include the threat the immigrants present (e.g., to the U.S. economy, culture, and security), but also the threat to the immigrants themselves who would be, according to the discourse, equally protected by this sealed border as there would be no more deaths or exploitation by both human smugglers and the U.S. employers. Yet, the structural problems that cause illegal immigration are almost completely disregarded.

Overall, there is a difference between the discourse the minutemen produce when giving interviews on TV and in a more "private" setting such as their web pages where their audience is expected to consist mainly of their supporters or potential volunteers. The language they use on the TV is thus more restrictive, there is a greater tendency to be vague about the illegal immigrants and who they are. They are more often understood simply as being part of the problem with the border. The cultural threat, emphasized on their web pages, is never articulated in the interviews.

This demonstrates the usefulness of studying both the web pages and TV interviews because when examining only the discourse from the interviews, more tools need to be employed to disclose the prejudice that is much more easily concealed without referring to the cultural threat that is probably the most obvious feature of the new racism. The new racist prejudice thus often manifests itself in rather sophisticated ways that can be, however, examined by the critical discourse analysis. The Hart's cognitive-linguistic approach has, in this sense, a lot to offer for the analysis of the immigration discourse.

The previous studies of the minutemen's discourse that mainly focus on the web pages analyze also the images that can be found there, whereas this thesis focused on the texts only. Studying the images is important for understanding the minutemen's ideology but not so much to examine their prejudice as the pictures on their web pages usually point out mainly the patriotism of the group, which is part of the group's positive self-representation strategy and is thus only indirectly related to the issue of prejudice in the discourse.

The examination of the discourse also showed that many theories of the new racism are far from being comprehensive and accounting for all particular cases. Bonilla-Silva's frames, for instance, proved as only partially useful. The cultural racism he identifies, was, indeed, present in the discourse. But the rest of the frames, for example those that focus on using traditional values such as individualism to explain inequalities can be found in the discourse only indirectly. The poverty and illegality that are ascribed to immigrants could be, however, understood as similar to the lack of effort (that is usually seen as causing the economic inequalities by the *abstract liberalism* frame) because the immigrants are not expected to get rid of these attributes even after immigrating to the United States.

Yet, the Bonilla-Silva's theory clearly applies specifically to Afro-Americans who are already in the country and it thus cannot be fully transplanted onto immigrants who are yet to come. The new racism should be thus probably understood in more general terms – as a form of a prejudice that is similar to the old racist prejudice in its goal of maintaining the white dominance within society but whose content is understood rather conceptually, often as a flexible notion of culture that can include a broad range of traits and values such as poverty, illegality, or lack of certain values (such as individualism). The focus on the traditional values that often defines new racism seems as not fully comprehensive.

Secondly, the new racism is new in its conscious concealment of the prejudice as blatant expression of prejudice has become inadmissible. The use of the word *racism* in this theory might seem controversial since the notion of *race* is no longer explained biologically. Yet, as the minutemen's discourse has showed, fixing a group's identity even in cultural terms might be equally harmful and may result in the same exclusionary outcomes. That is why the continuous use of the word racism seems appropriate.

New racism is understood as being *systemic*, rather than emerging on the individual level. Prejudiced discourse of the minutemen therefore reflects the dominant ideology within the society that places the white majority in a privileged position. It could be argued that every member of the white, dominant in-group is to some extent instilled with this hegemonic ideology. In this light, all members of the white in-group could be accordingly seen as racists which certainly raises controversies. Yet, it could be argued that the word only signifies a presence of a systemic, but still harmful ideology, and should not be understood in any way as a property typical of pathological personalities. Also, despite the fact that the new racism is understood as systemic, it does not mean that the discourse of the minutemen can be extended to the whole society.

Quite contrarily, a significant part of the population rejects the discourse of the minutemen and other anti-immigration groups whose discourse is to a great extent similar to the minutemen's discourse. This part of the population claims instead that the illegal immigrants are human beings in the first place, while the U.S. is complicit in producing the illegal immigration. Still, it could be assumed that even this counterdiscourse can bear some traits deemed prejudiced, identical with the minutemen's discourse as they have already become naturalized even in the mainstream discourse and some of them might be product of the systemic prejudice in the society. For instance, speaking of *floods of immigrants* is in no way an exclusive property of the anti-immigration discourse.

Further research could thus look into different discourses on immigration with the aim to single out what particular features of the minutemen's discourse that were evaluated as prejudiced can be found within other discourses by more "immigrant-friendly" groups. It is possible that certain prejudiced expressions can be used unintentionally by both the minutemen and possibly other, rather mainstream groups that have something to say on the immigration issue. These would still be product of the systemic racism existent in the society and therefore serving to reproduce the hegemonic ideology of the white in-group no matter whether used deliberately or not as in both instances, speaking of the flood of immigrants helps create an impression of a threat and in both instances might result in a discriminatory behavior against these immigrants. The minutemen's discourse differs, however, in its apparent goal to *deliberately* construct the illegal immigrants as a threat and the prejudice is clearly not

expressed unintentionally in a way it can be expressed in the private, everyday talk by people who might even consider themselves anti-racist.

More generally speaking, the discourse of the minutemen is representative of a narrative shared by a broader anti-immigration movement. This narrative rests upon the rigid opposition to the previously mentioned notion of *illegal* immigration that is usually understood as the result of the immigrants' individual decision to come into the United States, while completely overlooking underlying structural problems that would point out also the U.S. complicity. The counterdiscourse, on the other hand, establishes the illegal immigration to a much greater extent as a natural consequence of the inequality between the United States and Mexico.

The rigidity of the former discourse has significant consequences because not only that it reproduces prejudice against (Mexican) immigrants but it also forestalls a creation of a national consensus on this matter which is an essential precursor to any meaningful solution such as a comprehensive immigration reform.

Resumé

Tato práce se zabývala hnutím minutemanů, které operovalo na americko-mexické hranici od roku 2005 s deklarovaným cílem zabránit vstupu ilegálních imigrantů na území Spojených států. Práce se pokoušela potvrdit hypotézu, že za nápadně „barvoslepu“, anti-rasistickou rétorikou se ve skutečnosti skrývá nový rasový předsudek.

V první kapitole práce představila teorie nového rasismu a pokusila se ukázat, že dichotomie mezi bílou a černou rasou v americké společnosti přetrvává navzdory tomu, že starý (zjevný) rasismus, který explicitně postuluje nadřazenost bílé rasy nad „nebílymi“ rasami za současného definování ras jako biologicky podmíněných, je především v důsledku občanskoprávního hnutí šedesátých let považován za společensky nepřijatelný. Rasa je však i nadále relevantní kategorie, třebaže je chápána spíše jako koncept, kde bílá rasa asociuje vlastnosti jako lidskost, civilizovanost, racionalitu a čistotu, zatímco „nebílé“ rasy jsou chápány jako symbol „nelidskosti“, necivilizovanosti, iracionality a nečistoty. Nový rasismus je často chápán také kulturně. Daná skupina tak může být vnímána jako determinovaná svou kulturou, která je navíc

dominantní (bílou) skupinou vnímána jako nevyhnutelně neslučitelná se svojí vlastní kulturou.

Druhá kapitola ukazuje výhody kritické analýzy diskurzu právě pro zkoumání potenciálně rasově zaujatých textů či projevů. Vychází přitom z předpokladu, že ideologie jako rasismus jsou udržovány také diskurzem. Tato část vysvětluje, že se mluvčí často obávají obvinění z rasismu, a pokouší se mu tak zabránit např. strategií pozitivní sebeprezentace, která je vykresluje jako zodpovědné a soucitné občany. Příslušníkům jiných skupin naopak často přisuzují výhradně negativní vlastnosti a konstruuji je jako hrozbu, kterou však ve skutečnosti nemusí být.

Následující kapitola poukázala na pnutí mezi potřebou levné mexické pracovní síly pro americkou ekonomiku na jedné straně a stále restriktivnější imigrační politikou vůči Mexičanům na straně druhé. I to přispělo k ustavení fenoménu mexické ilegální imigrace. Ta byla stále častěji asociována s pojmem „propustné“ hranice, který umně odváděl pozornost od neadekvátní imigrační politiky, ale přispěl také ke ztotožnění mexické a ilegální imigrace. Ta byla postupně propojována s dalšími problémy, jako je pašování drog a dokonce terorismus, což napomohlo chápání ilegální imigrace jako hrozby pro bezpečnost Spojených států. Disproporční důraz na hranici vedl v devadesátých letech k mnoha opatřením uskutečněným právě na hranici, která se ukázala jako nutně nedostačující, neboť nereflektovala strukturální problémy na obou stranách hranice, která ilegální imigraci způsobují.

Hnutí minutemanů navázalo na chápání jižní hranice jako zdroje nebezpečí, což samotné naznačovalo potenciální předsudek vůči Mexičanům, kteří tvoří významnou část ilegálních přechodů právě přes tuto hranici. Kritická analýza diskurzu tvořeného materiály z webových stránek hnutí a rozhovory s lídry hnutí Jimem Gilchristem a Chrisem Simcoxem ukázala, že nový rasismus je v rétorice hnutí skutečně přítomný.

Za prvé, ilegalita imigrantů je chápána jako něco daného, téměř jako „stará“ rasa, jako atribut, který se aktivuje nejpozději s ilegálním přechodem přes hranici a determinuje chování imigrantů po celý zbytek života. Podobně je chápána i jejich chudoba, diskurz vůbec nepočítá s možností sociální mobility, imigranti jsou proto chápáni nutně jako přítěž pro společnost. Jsou také často popisováni, jako by nebyli konkrétní lidé, ale pouze produkt „propustné“ hranice či „ilegální aktivita“. To mluvčím umožňuje vyhnout se obviněním z rasismu, neboť téměř nemluví o konkrétních lidech, ale o abstraktním konceptu „propustné“ hranice a jeho důsledcích.

V extrémních případech jsou imigranti přirovnáváni k přírodní katastrofě nebo invazi postihující zemi, která se této masové síle buď vůbec nebrání, anebo je touto silou hravě poražena. To poukazuje i na násilnost hrozby ilegální imigrace, což ospravedlňuje volání po potřebě vojska na hranici, které jediné může podle „minutemanů“ této nepřátelské hrozbě čelit. Podobného efektu dosahují mluvčí také binárním chápáním sebe jako občanů dbalých *zákona*, s kterým se v podstatě ztotožňují na jedné straně a na druhé straně imigrantů, kteří jsou negací *zákona*, neboť ho ilegálním aktem překročení hranice porušují. Zcela přitom opomínají neadekvátnost současného imigračního práva, či „push“ a „pull“ faktory, které tuto ilegální imigraci spoluvytvářejí.

Předsudek v diskurzu se odráží i v jeho nekonzistentnosti, kdy se lídři hnutí na jednu stranu snaží prezentovat jako soucitní, a proto imigranty na několika místech označují jako ekonomické uprchlíky, kteří jsou zneužívání americkými zaměstnavateli či pašeráky s lidmi, na druhé straně však označují imigranty jako osobně zodpovědné za jejich imigraci, tedy za svou ilegality, kterou často ztotožňují i se závažnými trestnými činy typu vraždy.

Analýza poukázala také na rozdíl mezi televizními rozhovory, kde se lídři snaží především zachovat si tvář jako lidští, soucitní a zodpovědní občané a jejich webovými stránkami, kde používají velmi expresivní prostředky na vykreslení vážnosti hrozby ilegální imigrace a daleko častěji poukazují na kulturní hrozbu ze strany Mexičanů, která povede až ke ztrátě vlády práva a americké identity.

Práce závěrem poukazuje na důsledek takto pojatého diskurzu, a to sice udržování hegemonické ideologie nového rasismu stále postaveného na dominanci bílé rasy, který nevyhnutelně vede k diskriminaci „nebílych ras“. Na konkrétnější úrovni odráží diskurz „minutemanů“ diskurz širší části anti-imigračního hnutí, přičemž jeho rigidita postavená na dichotomii mezi vládou práva a *ilegální* imigrací poukazuje na obtížnost najít styčné body s alternativním imigračním diskurzem, který vyzdvihuje především nutnost řešit strukturální problémy, z kterých ilegální imigrace vzniká. Důsledkem je přetrvávající, vyhrocený problém ilegální imigrace a neschopnost dobrat se k jeho řešení, např. prostřednictvím komplexní imigrační reformy.

Sources

Cited Primary Sources

- Gilchrist, Jim. Interview by David Asman. *Your World w/ Neil Cavuto*. Fox News, April 10, 2006. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by John Gibson. *The Big Story With John Gibson*. Fox News, August 23, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Lou Dobbs. *Lou Dobbs Tonight*. CNN, December 7, 2005. Transcript accessed April 30, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0512/07/ldt.01.html>.
- . Interview by Robb Harleston. *Washington Journal*. C-SPAN, May 13, 2006. Accessed April 30, 2015. <http://www.c-span.org/video/?192507-2/immigration-laws>.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, April 18, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, May 13, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, January 26, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News. April 10, 2006. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Tucker Carlson. *The Situation With Tucker Carlson*. MSNBC, April 3, 2006. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Press Conference at National Press Club, April 26, 2005. Video at C-SPAN. Accessed April 30, 2015. <http://www.c-span.org/video/?186482-1/minuteman-project>.
- . Speech delivered at 35th annual Eagle Forum Leadership Conference, September 23, 2006. Video available at C-SPAN. Accessed April 30, 2015. <http://www.c-span.org/video/?194563-2/author-panel>.
- MCDC. "About Us: Mission Statement." Accessed April 30, 2015. <http://www.minutemanhq.com/hq/mmpledge.php>.

- "The Minuteman Pledge." Accessed April 30, 2015.
<http://www.minutemanhq.com/hq/mmpledge.php>.
- MCDC PAC. "About." Accessed April 30, 2015.
<http://www.mcdepac.com/positions.php>.
- . "Positions: Illegal Immigration." Accessed April 30, 2015.
<http://www.mcdepac.com/positions.php>.
- Minuteman Project. "About the Minuteman Project." Cached on November 26, 2004.
 Accessed April 30, 2005.
<http://web.archive.org/web/20041126221924/http://minutemanproject.com/AboutMMP.html>.
- . "About the Minuteman Project." Cached on March 30, 2005. Accessed April 30, 2015.
<http://web.archive.org/web/20050330003153/http://www.minutemanproject.com/AboutMMP.html>.
- . "Homepage: The U.S. Wants You!: The Minuteman Project Seeks Volunteers." November 22, 2004. Cached on November 26, 2004. Accessed April 30, 2015.
<http://web.archive.org/web/20041126131958/http://minutemanproject.com/>.
- . "News Media and L.E.O." Cached on April 3, 2005. Accessed April 30, 2015.
<http://web.archive.org/web/20050403024229/http://www.minutemanproject.com/LEO.html>.
- Simcox, Chris. Interview by Mike Barnicle. *HARDBALL*. MSNBC, August 22, 2007.
 Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, November 19, 2002. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, January 7, 2003. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, April 7, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, April 19, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, April 26, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, May 6, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.

- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, May 13, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, August 16, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*. Fox News, October 17, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by Sean Hannity and Alan Colmes. *Hannity & Colmes*, Fox News. April 3, 2006. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Interview by John Gibson. *The Big Story w/ John Gibson*. Fox News, December 12, 2005. Transcript available at Factiva.
- . Press Conference at National Press Club, April 26, 2005. Video at C-SPAN. Accessed April 30, 2015. <http://www.c-span.org/video/?186482-1/minuteman-project>.
- . "Standard Operating Procedure." Official web page of the Minuteman Project. Cached on February 7, 2005. Accessed April 16, 2015. <http://web.archive.org/web/20050207151807/http://www.minutemanproject.com/SOP.html>.

Monographs

- Andreas, Peter. *Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.
- Baker, Paul and Sibonile Ellece. *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum, 2011.
- Barker, Chris and Dariusz Galasiński. *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. London: SAGE Publications, 2001.
- Barry, Tom. *Border Wars*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003.
- Chavez, Leo R. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.
- Doty, Roxanne Lynn. *The Law Into Their Own Hands: Immigration and the Politics of Exceptionalism*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009.

- Gilchrist, Jim and Jerome R. Corsi. *Minutemen: The Battle to Secure America's Borders*. World Ahead Publishing, 2006.
- Hart, Christopher. *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Hing, Bill Ong. *Defining America Through Immigration Policy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.
- Kinder, Donald R. and Lynn M. Sanders. *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. London, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Navarro, Armando. *The Immigration Crisis: Nativism, Armed Vigilantism, and the Rise of a Countervailing Movement*. Lanham, MD, AltaMira Press, 2008.
- Payan, Tony. *The Three U.S.-Mexico Border Wars: Drugs, Immigration and Homeland Security*. Westport: Prager Security International, 2006.
- Reisigl, Martin and Ruth Wodak. *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*. London, New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Rose, Amanda. *Showdown in the Sonoran Desert*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Santa Ana, Otto. *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003.
- Shapira, Harel. *Waiting for José: The Minutemen's Pursuit of America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. *Prejudice in Discourse: An Analysis of Ethnic Prejudice in Cognition and Conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1984.

Chapters in Collections

- Balibar, Etienne. "Is There A 'Neo-Racism'?" In *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings*, edited by Tania das Gupta et al., 83–88. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc., 2007.
- Chavez, Leo R. "Spectacle in the Desert: The Minuteman Project on the U.S.-Mexico Border." In *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*, edited by Julie A. Dowling and Jonathan Xavier Inda, 115–128. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.

- Doty, Roxanne Lynn. "Bare Life: Border-Crossing Deaths and Spaces of Moral Alibi." In *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*, edited by Julie A. Dowling and Jonathan Xavier Inda, 129–143. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.
- Hasian Jr., Marouf and George F. McHendry Jr. "The Attempted Legitimation of the Vigilante Civil Border Patrols, the Militarization of the Mexican-US Border, and the Law of Unintended Consequences." In *Border Rhetorics: Citizenship and Identity on the US-Mexico Frontier*, edited by Robert DeChaine, 103–116. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2012.
- Heyman, Josiah McC. "Constructing a Virtual Wall: Race and Citizenship in U.S.-Mexico Border Policing." In *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*, edited by Julie A. Dowling and Jonathan Xavier Inda, 99–113. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.
- Jäger, Siegfried. "Discourse and Knowledge: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of a Critical Discourse and Dispositive Analysis." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michal Meyer, 32–62. London: SAGE Publications, 2001.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. "Critical Discourse Analysis." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton, 352–371. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- . "Ideologies, Racism, Discourse: Debates on Immigration and Ethnic Issues." In *Comparative Perspectives on Racism*, edited by Jessika Ter Wal and Maykel Verkuyten, 90–115. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.
- Meyer, Michal. "Between Theory, Method, and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches to CDA." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michal Meyer, 14–31. London: SAGE Publications, 2001.
- Rogers, Rebecca. "An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education." In *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Studies in Education*, edited by Rebecca Rogers, 1–18. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 2004.
- Wodak, Ruth. "The Discourse-Historical Approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michal Meyer, 63–94. London: SAGE Publications, 2001.

- . "What CDA Is About – A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and its Developments." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michal Meyer, 1–13. London: SAGE Publications, 2001.

Journal Articles

- Ackerman, Edwin. "What Part of Illegal Don't You Understand?": Bureaucracy and Civil Society in the Shaping of Illegality." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37, No. 2 (2012): 181–203.
- Alim, H. Samy. "Complicating Race: Articulating Race Across Multiple Social Dimensions." *Discourse & Society* 22, No. 4 (2011): 379–384.
- Bloch, Katrina Rebecca. "Anyone Can Be An Illegal': Color-Blind Ideology and Maintaining Latino/Citizen Border." *Critical Sociology* 40, No. 1 (2013): 47–65. Accessed October 4, 2014. doi: 10.1177/0896920512466274.
- Brimelow, Peter. *Alien Nation: Common Sense About America's Immigration Disaster*. New York: HarperPerennial, 1996.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. "'This is a White Country': The Racial Ideology of the Western Nations of the World-System." *Sociological Inquiry* 70, No. 2 (2000): 188–214.
- Cabrera, Luis and Sonya Glavac. "Minutemen and Desert Samaritans: Mapping the Attitudes of Activists of the United States' Immigration Front Lines." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36, No. 4 (2010): 673–695.
- Calavita, Kitty. "Immigration Law, Race, and Identity." *The Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 3 (2007): 1-20. Accessed October 28, 2014. doi: 10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.3.081806.112745.
- Campbell, Kristina M. "The Road to S.B. 1070: How Arizona Became Ground Zero For The Immigrant's Rights Movement and the Continuing Struggle For Latino Civil Rights in America." *Harvard Latino Law Review* 14 (2011): 1–21.
- Castro, Robert F. "Busting the Bandito Boyz: Militarism, Masculinity, and the Hunting of Undocumented Persons in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands." *Journal of Hate Studies* 6, No. 7 (2007/08): 7–30.
- DeChaine, D. Robert. "Bordering the Civic Imaginary: Alienization, Fence Logic, and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, No. 1 (2009): 43–65.

- De Genova, Nicolas P. "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 3 (2002): 419–447. Accessed October 28, 2014, doi: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085432.
- Doty, Roxanne Lynn. "Racism, Desire, and the Politics of Immigration." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 28, No. 3 (1999): 585–606.
- . "States of Exception on the Mexico/U.S. Border: Exceptions, Enemies, and Decisions on Undocumented Immigration." *International Political Sociology* 1, No. 2 (2007): 113–137.
- Gaudio, Rudolf P. and Steve Bialostok. "The Trouble With Culture: Everyday Racism in White Middle-Class Discourse." *Critical Discourse Studies* 2, No. 1 (2005): 51–69.
- Hart, Christopher. "Force-Interactive Patterns in Immigration Discourse: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to CDA." *Discourse & Society* 22, No. 3 (2011): 269–286.
- Hidalgo Tenorio, Encarnacion. "Critical Discourse Analysis, An Overview." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 10, No. 1 (2011): 183–210. Available at <http://ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/njes/article/view/658>. Accessed January 24, 2015.
- Huntington, Samuel P. "The Hispanic Challenge." *Foreign Policy*, March/April 2004.
- Kil, Sang Hea. "A Diseased Body Politic: Nativist Discourse and the Imagined Whiteness of the USA." *Cultural Studies* 28, No. 2 (2014): 177–198. Accessed October 17, 2014, doi: 10.1080/09502386.2013.789068.
- Kretsedemas, Philip. "Redefining 'Race' in North America." *Current Sociology* 56, No. 6 (2008): 826–844. Accessed October 18, 2014. doi: 10.1177/0011392108095341.
- Lugo-Lugo, Carmen R. and Mary K. Bloodsworth-Lugo. "Containing (Un)American Bodies in Arizona," *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice* 26, No. 2 (2014): 265–272.
- Lyall, James D. "Vigilante State: Reframing the Minutemen Project in American Politics and Culture." *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal* 23 (2009): 257–291.
- Meyers, Kristen A. and Passion Williamson. "Race Talk: The Perpetuation of Racism Through Private Discourse." *Race & Society* 4 (2001): 3–26.
- Nunez, Adalgiza A. "Civilian Border Patrols: Activists, Vigilantes, or Agents of Government?." *Rutgers Law Review* 60, No. 3 (2008): 797–823.

- Oliviero, Katie E. "Sensational Nation and the Minutemen: Gendered Citizenship and Moral Vulnerabilities." *Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 36, No. 3 (2011): 679–706.
- Quillian, Lincoln. "New Approaches to Understanding Racial Prejudice and Discrimination." *Annual Review of Sociology* 32 (2006): 299–328. Accessed October 28, 2014. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.32.061604.123132.
- Sniderman, Paul M. et al. "The New Racism." *American Journal of Political Science* 35, No. 2 (1991): 423–447.
- Taguieff, Pierre-André. "Politisisation de l'immigration et racisme: lectures." *Mots* 18 (1989): 97–103. Accessed October 17, 2014. doi: 10.3406/mots.1989.1451.
- Van den Berghe, Pierre L. "Neo-racism in the USA." *Transition*, No. 41 (1972): 14–18.
- Virtanen, Simo V. and Leonie Huddy. "Old-Fashioned Racism and New Forms of Racial Prejudice." *The Journal of Politics* 60, No. 2 (1998): 311–332.
- Walker, Christopher J. "Border Vigilantism and Comprehensive Immigration Reform." *Harvard Latino Law Review* 10 (2007): 135–174.
- Ward, Matthew. "They Say Bad Things Come in Threes: How Economic, Political and Cultural Shifts Facilitated Contemporary Anti-Immigration Activism in the United States." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 27, No. 2 (2014): 263–292.

Internet Sources

- AZ Central. "Phoenix Trial Set for Minuteman Movement Founder." March 1, 2014. Accessed May 8, 2015.
<http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/2014/03/01/phoenix-trial-set-for-minuteman-movement-founder/5924373/>.
- Beirich, Heidi. "Nativism Movement Collapses Amid Fighting." Southern Poverty Law Center – Intelligence Report, No. 145 (Spring 2012). Accessed April 5, 2015.
<http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-report/browse-all-issues/2012/spring/the-year-in-nativism>.
- Greene Sterling, Terry. "Who Was the Real Arizona Killer?." *The Daily Beast*, July 7, 2010. Accessed April 5, 2015.
<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2010/07/08/arizona-immigration-laws-origin-who-killed-robert-krentz.html>.

- Hall, Mimi, and Patrick O'Driscoll. "Border patrols growing in Arizona." *USA Today*, March 29, 2005. Accessed May 8, 2015.
http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/2005-03-29-borders_x.htm.
- Hoagland, Jim. "The Post-Racial Election." *The Washington Post*. November 2, 2008. Accessed May 6, 2015. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/10/31/AR2008103103360.html>.
- Hollar, Julie. "Dropping Dobbs: A Victory for Media Activism, and the Challenge Ahead." *Media Accuracy on Latin America, NACLA Report on the Americas* (January/February 2010).
- Holthouse, David. "Jim Gilchrist Fired By Minuteman Project." *Southern Poverty Law Center – Intelligence Report*, No. 126 (Summer 2007). Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-report/browse-all-issues/2007/summer/minute-mess>.
- Hsu, Hua. "The End of White America?." *The Atlantic*, January/February 2009. Accessed May 6, 2015.
<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2009/01/the-end-of-white-america/307208/>.
- Hulse, Carle. "Senator Apologizes to Student for Remark." *The New York Times*, August 24, 2006. Accessed May 6, 2015.
<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9505E2DD133EF937A1575BC0A9609C8B63>.
- La Jeunesse, William. "Illegal Immigrant Suspected in Murder of Arizona Rancher." *Fox News*, March 30, 2010. Accessed April 5, 2015.
<http://www.foxnews.com/us/2010/03/30/illegal-immigrant-suspected-murder-arizona-rancher/>.
- Lopez, Mark Hugo et al. "Latino Voters and the 2014 Midterm Elections." *Pew Research Center*. October 16, 2014. Accessed April 5, 2015.
<http://www.pewhispanic.org/2014/10/16/latino-voters-and-the-2014-midterm-elections/>.
- Murray, Sara. "Many in U.S. Illegally Overstayed Their Visas." *The Wall Street Journal*, April 7, 2013. Accessed May 8, 2015.
<http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424127887323916304578404960101110032>.

- Neiwert, David. "Jim Gilchrist Announces Grand Vision for New Minuteman Border Patrols in 2015." Southern Poverty Law Center, July 22, 2014. Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://www.splcenter.org/blog/2014/07/22/jim-gilchrist-announces-grand-vision-for-new-minuteman-border-patrols-in-2015/>.
- Passel, Jeffrey S., D'Vera Cohn and Ana Gonzales-Barrera. "Net Migration from Mexico Falls to Zero—and Perhaps Less." Pew Research Center, April 23, 2012. Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/04/23/net-migration-from-mexico-falls-to-zero-and-perhaps-less/>.
- Pew Research Center. "Arizona: Population and Labor Force Characteristics, 2000–2006." January 23, 2008. Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2008/01/23/arizona-population-and-labor-force-characteristics-2000-2006/>.
- Pew Research Center. "Cable TV: Prime-Time Viewership, by Channel." Accessed May 8, 2015. <http://www.journalism.org/media-indicators/cable-news-prime-time-viewership/>.
- Pitzl, Mary Jo. "Arizona Still One Of The Worst States To Be A Kid." *AZ Central*, July 22, 2014. Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona/2014/07/22/arizona-lags-child-well-being/12980673/>.
- Scherr, Sonia. "Top Minuteman Group Announces Breakup." Southern Poverty Law Center - Intelligence Report , No. 138 (Summer 2010). Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-report/browse-all-issues/2010/summer/lock-and-unload>.
- Stelter, Brian and Bill Carter. "Lou Dobbs Abruptly Quits CNN." *The New York Times*, November 11, 2009. Accessed April 30, 2015. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/12/business/media/12dobbs.html>.
- U.S. Customs and Border Protection. "United States Border Patrol, Southwest Border Sectors: Total Illegal Alien Apprehensions By Fiscal Year." Accessed April 5, 2015. http://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/documents/BP%20Southwest%20Border%20Sector%20Apps%20FY1960%20-%20FY2014_0.pdf.
- Washington Times*. "Bush Decries Border Project." March 24, 2005. Accessed May 8, 2015. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2005/mar/24/20050324-122200-6209r/?page=all>.

Conference Papers

Smith, Margater W. and Linda Waugh. "Covert Racist Discourses on the WWW: Rhetorical Strategies of the Minuteman Project" (paper presented at the Sixteenth Annual Symposium About Language and Society, Austin, April 11–13, 2008). Published in *Texas Linguistic Forum* 52 (2008). Accessed May 3, 2015.
http://studentorgs.utexas.edu/salsa/proceedings/2008/Smith_Waugh_2008.pdf.

Theses

Gradsky, Normajeane. "Vigilant Patriots or Vigilantes: A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps' Web Site" (PhD diss., University of Texas at El Paso, 2007). <http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/dissertations/AAI1448845/>.