

タイトル	Hollywood Considers White Nationalism:Two Films
著者	Patrick, O' BRIEN
引用	北海学園大学学園論集(146): 91-113
発行日	2010-12-25

Hollywood Considers White Nationalism: Two Films

Patrick O'BRIEN

ABSTRACT

The two films *Betrayed* (1988) and *Arlington Road* (1999) fit into what Richard Hofstadter in 1964 called “The Paranoid Style in American Politics.” In Hofstadter’s presentation, only right-wing “conspiracy theories” were deemed “paranoid.” With respect to the two films in question, it is the reverse. Coming from liberal Hollywood, the films reveal conspiracy theories held by the Left with respect to the allegedly white racist Right.

Introduction

In their book *Hollywood’s America: Social and Political Themes in Motion Pictures* (1988), authors Powers, D. Rothman, and S. Rothman document the truism that Hollywood is more liberal than Americans in general. They argue that “certain key changes in American society have produced a cultural elite (broadly defined) that has become critical of bourgeois society and is contributing in important ways to transforming its social values and replacing them with new ones.” They also support the view that “the general atmosphere of Hollywood tends toward paranoia, at least partially because of the personalities of those who make up its population.”¹

This liberal view, mated to paranoid tendencies, is in evidence in two films that purportedly address the state of white nationalists in America and the threat they represent. *Betrayed* (1988) and *Arlington Road* (1999) are both quasi-historical in that they closely access real accounts of violence against targets chosen by the far right or anti-government groups or individuals. Both films also feature major stars — Tom Berenger and Debra Winger in *Betrayed*, and Jeff Bridges and Tim Robbins in *Arlington Road* — meaning they represent a serious investment of Hollywood’s time, money and credibility. While some events they portray are historically accurate, the composite characters and plots the films spin go beyond the disparate assortment of violent acts in recent American history to create an overblown

fantasy world of conspiracy and hatred.

Betrayed

Tom Berenger has won fame in film as both hero and villain. In the 1986 *Platoon*, for instance, he played the murderous rapist soldier Sergeant Barnes, who ambushed and mortally wounded his fellow soldier Elias while out on a jungle mission. In the 1993 four-hour film *Gettysburg*, on the other hand, Berenger appeared as a heroic Lieutenant General James Longstreet. The same year, he appeared in the first of the successful *Sniper* series, in which he worked patriotically (if unorthodoxly) for the U.S. military. His 1988 film *Shoot to Kill* is a good example of the gruff persona Berenger can effect, in this instance as a positive character. He is also capable of comedy, as he proved in his *Major League* series (beginning in 1989). *Betrayed* relies on a mixture of Berenger's sympathetic and savage character portrayals.

Plot

Betrayed opens in Chicago with a Jewish radio talk-show host baiting his Gentile callers. "You have any views on lesbian priests? Any view on masturbation?" Attacking a fundamentalist caller, he claims that "If Jesus came back today, he'd never stop throwing up." Then as we see the hands of two unknown men in a car, a female caller is calmly telling the radio show host that the Holocaust was greatly exaggerated and that "the gas" was used only to rid inmates of lice. As the talk on the radio continues, we see the men in the car loading a pistol. Finally, the host leaves the studio and gets into his car. He drives a Citroën, a rare brand of car in America which acts as a signifier of his outsider status as a Jew (the same was done in Francis Ford Coppola's 1973 nostalgic film *American Graffiti*, where Jewish actor Richard Dreyfus arrives in a blue Citroën, though in this case his Curt Henderson character is not Jewish.)

As he enters a basement parking garage, the viewer follows him from the vantage point of the men stalking him. Then, when he exits his car, he realizes with horror that he is about to die. One of the killers brandishes a massive MAC-10 machine pistol and methodically pumps rounds into the screaming victim, who falls dead against his light-colored car. The killer then takes out a can of spray paint and in large letters spells ZOG on the side of the car. ZOG, as the viewer will learn, stands for "Zionist Occupation Government," which some right-wing groups believe is the true nature of America's government.² This scene shows that *Betrayed* is another film based on the 1984 murder of Denver radio host Alan Berg, who

was gunned down by members of "The Order," a white supremacist group. *Betrayed* joins *Talk Radio* as the other film about Berg's murder. Both films are based on the book *Talked to Death: The Life and Murder of Alan Berg*.³ In *Betrayed*, however, the murder of the radio host is merely an entrée to the larger story, a fictional account of what the murderers of Berg might have been like.

From a close-up of blood flowing into the dead hand of the murdered radio host, the film segues to the American heartland, replete with golden fields of grain. A train of red threshers ambles across the land, then a woman from Texas is forced to stop her combine when she sees an old scarecrow left in the field. It turns out that the owner of the scarecrow, Gary Simmons, had been target practicing with his son and left the target in the field. Angered, the woman swears, showing Simmons what a real farm girl she is. Later, they meet in a bar and dance, where Simmons tells her his wife died three years ago. Gradually, they become close and the woman, Katie, meets his two children and mother.

Twenty-four minutes into the film, however, we find that "Katie" is in fact undercover FBI undercover agent Catherine Weaver, played by Debra Winger. She has been assigned to infiltrate Simmons' community by an FBI superior who has a gut feeling that Simmons' group is responsible for the slaying in Chicago of the Jewish radio host. This mission, juxtaposed with Katie's growing affection for Simmons and his family, provides the meat of the story and its dramatic tension. Will she betray her man or her employer, the FBI? At this point, Katie simply does not believe that the man with whom she is slowly falling in love is a racist murderer. Gradually, however, doubts emerge.

Soon after her secret visit to the FBI office in Chicago, Katie joins Gary and his family at a fundamentalist church, led by a preacher who believes white Americans are the descendants of the lost tribes of Israel and that other races are "mud people." He bemoans the teaching of Darwinism in schools and the spread of disease from sexual promiscuity. Gary shouts heartfelt "amens" to these assertions. Later, after waking up in Gary's bed, she hears the two children playing a game called "Zog." The children, though, do not understand its meaning.

Next, Simmons reveals a new aspect of his personality that gives Katie cause for worry. Temper frayed by a hot sun and a long wait for a broken grain elevator, he loses his composure and begins caviling about A-rabs, commies and so on. Then he provokes a needless argument with his neighbors, insinuating that one neighbor with a large birthmark on his neck is actually suffering from AIDS, like "one of them dyin' spotted faggots."

Thus far, *Betrayed* has been fairly realistic, rarely forcing the viewer to suspend too

much disbelief. Suddenly, however, the filmmakers introduce an egregious scene that gives away their hatred of and paranoia toward working class white Americans like Simmons and his neighbors. For some unexplained reason, Simmons is insistent upon Katie joining him in a hunting expedition. When she finally relents, she finds out it is a nighttime outing. Arriving at the hunting ground, she and Gary meet others from their town and are issued MAC-10 automatic pistols, the same weapon used to kill the radio host. Far worse, she discovers that the game is no wild animal; it is a young black man kidnapped for this purpose. Sportingly, he is given his own weapon with ten bullets and a ten-second start. Then the dogs are let loose and the hunt begins.

The fleeing target kills a dog with one of the bullets, enraging the dog's owner, who presses on with the attack. Soon, with all bullets expended, the African America becomes an easy target and is wounded. Wes, one of the group, has become suspicious of Katie and demands that she kill the wounded man, as this is her first hunt (implying that such racist hunts are rather routine). When she refuses, the others finish off the victim, shooting him multiple times in the back, no less. Leaving the hunt, Simmons tries to console his distraught girlfriend by telling her, "C'mon Katie, c'mon now. It was just a nigger, don't make too much outta it. There's plenty more where he came from." Unlike the actual murder of Alan Berg, however, there is no corresponding truth to such racist hunting in modern America. Other than animus toward such a group of white heartland Americans, what could explain the insertion of this paranoid scene?⁴ Also, why would a man think bonds of love would be cemented by having the woman hunt down and kill an enemy of the group? The film fails miserably on this point, as a reviewer for *The Washington Post* noted when he wrote that the filmmakers "overreach, their dramatic ploy turning into white-bread caricature; their heavy-handedness is relieved only by Berenger's sensitively drawn, sweet and sinister performance."⁵

In addition, Gary reveals on the way home that he's in a war with ZOG, telling Katie that "One thing's for sure. We're going to kick the hell of out ZOG." When she asks what that means, he answers, "The Zionist Occupation Government. It means the goddamn fuckin' Jews are running our country with their nigger police." At this point, needless to say, Katie realizes that her boss was right about Simmons. Repulsed by it all, she flees to an FBI safe area, refusing to meet Simmons again. Her boss, however, insists that she continue her duties. Ever the good agent, she agrees. Then, immediately after returning to her motel, she meets Gary, who insists on sex. As the camera cuts to another scene, there is no suggestion that she refuses. In due course, she moves in to the Simmons household. That

holds some new surprises.

For starters, the two children now trust Katie and tell her they don't need to keep secrets anymore. Little Rachel volunteers that the secrets are about "the niggers and the rabbis." "And the race traitors," her brother adds. Then Rachel mentions ZOG and insists that rabbis and niggers "do it in the butt." In contrast, she believes, "We're the good guys. One day we're going to kill all the dirty niggers and the Jews and everything's going to be neat." Immediately after this, a towel-clad Katie joins Simmons next to his computer, where he has logged on to a secret network whose message reads: "PREPARE YOURSELVES. THE DAY IS COMING. WE WILL EXECUTE ALL FEDERAL AGENTS, CONGRESSMEN, JUDGES..." He then says that, contrary to his father's advice not to rock the boat, "We're going to rock THIS goddamn boat." Subtlety is not *Betrayed's* strongpoint.

Soon, the family is off on a camping trip, but Katie knows it is no typical camp when they are met by armed guards with German Shepherds standing next to a sign that reads: "THE WHITE RACE IS AN ENDANGERED SPECIES." As they drive into the compound, she sees a group of KKK members and Neo-Nazis dressed in uniform, all singing "Amazing Grace" as they burn three large crosses. It is a bit disconcerting when she joins a kindly middle-aged man, Shorty (played by John Mahoney, who became Martin Crane on *Frasier*), around the campfire and they chat about children and Jews and niggers. "I don't even like seein' a fight. But if we don't fight back, they'll take it all away from us, the whole country. The jewboy judges and bankers, and politicians with the nigger police...and orientals." Katie offers that she likes none of it. "I don't either," Shorty agrees. "Hell, I have to close my eyes every time I pull the trigger." To further add a richer dimension to this superficially sympathetic man, the script has him explain why he's embittered and estranged from the Establishment. "The bank took my farm and Vietnam took my son."

Here the film is on firm ground in such a portrayal, for in the late 1970s through the '90s, there were indeed white supremacist groups to be found sporadically throughout America. Scholar Carol Swain has written about them, such as Richard Butler's Aryan Nations and other Christian Identity groups. In essence, they support four beliefs: Opposition to Racial Universalism, a Pre-Adamite Creation of Inferior Beings, the Jews as Children of Satan, and the Jews as Race Mixers and Polluters. She quotes from the Aryan Nation's Creed:

We believe that there are literal children of Satan in the world today. These children are the descendants of Cain, who was a result of Eve's original sin, her physical seduction by Satan. We know that because of this sin there is a battle and a natural enmity between the children of Satan and the children of The Most High

God.

We believe that the Canaanite Jew is the natural enemy of our Aryan (White) Race. This is attested by scripture and all secular history. The Jew is like a destroying virus that attacks our racial body to destroy our Aryan culture and the purity of our Race. Those of our Race who resist these attacks are called “chosen and faithful.”

We believe that there is a day of reckoning. The usurper will be thrown out by the terrible might of Yahweh’s people, as they return to their roots and their special destiny. We know there is soon to be a day of judgment and a day when Christ’s Kingdom (government) will be established on earth, as it is in heaven.⁶

Butler had his headquarters in Hayden Lake, Idaho, which may be a template for the camp in *Betrayed*. At his compound, Butler organized yearly gatherings of white supremacists, which he termed the “Aryan Nations World Congress.” “At their height in 1984-86, several hundred people would attend including most of the well known leaders of the American far right.” Also, in 1987, Butler was “indicted for seditious conspiracy” by the State of Arkansas, but was acquitted when “prosecutors failed to convince an Arkansas jury that Butler and several other prominent racists had conspired to start a race war.”⁷ Swain also notes that James Ellison had a group, Covenant, Sword and Arm of the Lord, which ran a 224-acre compound in northern Arkansas where they “used the land for training like-minded Identity Christians in guerrilla warfare and related skills. . . . Ellison himself was arrested and sent to prison for acts of arson, bombing, and the manufacture of automatic weapons.”⁸

At this point it is necessary to retreat from the film for a moment to further discuss the background of actual white supremacists of the era, for this discussion will inform the remainder of consideration of this film, as well as that of the second film, *Arlington Road*. Much of the planning of these groups for resistance to the Federal Government flowed from the fictional framework for rebellion established by one of the leading white nationalists of the era, William Pierce, who headed the National Alliance based in West Virginia. He is generally considered the most brilliant such leader, having been a tenured professor of physics. To reach the masses, he penned two novels revolving around armed resistance to ZOG and assassinations of non-whites, Jews, and race mixing couples. The first, *The Turner Diaries* (1978), is widely credited with being the inspiration for Timothy McVeigh’s act of blowing up the Murrah Federal Building in 1995 in Oklahoma City. The second, *Hunter*, was published eleven years later. More intellectual, it never received the wide distribution of *The Turner Diaries*.

Pierce assented to an interview for Swain’s book, *The New White Nationalism in*

America, and spoke about his novels. Swain opens that chapter with this introduction from *The Turner Diaries*:

What a blow *that* was to us! And how it shamed us! All that brave talk by patriots, “The government will never take my guns away,” and then nothing but meek submission when it happened.... We should be heartened by the fact that there were still so many of us who had guns...after the Cohen Act had outlawed all private ownership of firearms in the United States. It was only because so many of us defied the law and hid our weapons instead of turning them in that the government wasn't able to act more harshly against us after the gun raids.... Today it finally began! After all these years of talking — and nothing but talking — we have finally taken our first action. We are at war with the System, and it is no longer a war of words.⁹

The best academic treatment of Pierce and his work is Robert S. Griffin's *The Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds: An Up-Close Portrait of White Nationalist William Pierce* (1st Books Library, 2001). For this book, Griffin, a professor of education at the University of Vermont, spent an extended period staying at Pierce's headquarters. The novels were a central part of their discussion, and Griffin ended up writing five chapters on them (10, 11, 12, 18 and 19). Of course, actually reading the novels would provide further background for both *Betrayed* and *Arlington Road*.

Returning to *Betrayed* and the scene at the compound, we see that “school” consists of target practice for the children, where they shoot at cutouts of blacks and Jews. Another scene, based on facts, takes place when Gary has an argument with two men dressed as Nazis. In Gary's view, they are “assholes.” In real life, dissension among white nationalists was and is rampant, and groups are perpetually breaking up into splinter groups or suing each other. Later, when a leading politician enters the camp asking for donations, Simmons confronts him and accuses him of being a loser.¹⁰ The politician's handler, however, turns out to be Simmons' Vietnam War buddy and he hints at more sinister things to come.

Back at the farm, Simmons concentrates on his “real big job” coming up the following week. It turns out to be a bank robbery — and Katie is expected to participate because she has shown her shooting talent with a gun. The group put together for the job consists of members from throughout the country (including a bank manager), suggesting how pervasive these groups are. Once that robbery of the Chicago bank begins, Katie is put in the position of protecting the public while doing a convincing job of being on Simmons' team. When she sees that an aging guard is about to put himself in real danger, she deliberately wounds him in the shoulder. Leaving the bank, convinced they have pulled off a perfect robbery, the men celebrate, but suddenly a fellow FBI agent steps out and kills Wes at short range. It was an

ambush set up to protect Katie's identity because Wes realized she was compromised.

Once safely back in the country, Simmons reveals the plans he has for the stolen millions. They will launch an assault on a power plant that will black out "Jew York City." Then ten men will dress as policemen and randomly shoot "the niggers in Harlem" to foment a race riot. Next, they will kill "faggots" in San Francisco, and for "Sick-cago" they have bigger plans: four cases of dynamite under the courthouse. Seated around the table discussing the plans are Shorty and the sheriff, who is envious of those who will shoot the blacks. "That is FUN!" he tells them.

Just before the first attack, Gary's Vietnam friend, chief aid to a rising but racist white politician, arrives in a military helicopter to meet Gary. With him is "Katie's" FBI file, blowing her cover. Simmons is devastated but keeps this information from Katie. He then lies to her that the attack will be on Denver, which she conveys to the FBI, but in fact it is on Chicago. Unfortunately, the story breaks down at this point. Despite knowing that Katie is actually Catherine Weaver of the FBI, he takes her to the spot where he is to assassinate the racist politician. (It is best not to think too hard about this unlikely plot development.¹¹) When he does reveal what he knows, Weaver pulls her gun and puts him under arrest. Ignoring her command, he prepares to kill Jack Carpenter, the politician on the street below, forcing Katie to shoot Gary. In any case, there is a second team in position and they kill Carpenter, leaving Weaver to wander the streets alone, reliving what she has just done.

Why, though, would Simmons have ever gone through with this? He confesses that he loved her, but what about his own children, not to mention the cause of white nationalism that was supposedly so important to him? He essentially commits suicide by bringing Weaver along. Worse, Weaver now appears to be torn between her feelings for Simmons and his family, and the FBI because she was in fact in love with Simmons. But when had she re-fallen in love with him? After all, she was appalled and sickened when she learned that he was the vicious racist, anti-Semitic killer who had murdered non-whites and planned to murder countless more in upcoming attacks. Had love somehow allowed her to overlook all that? Then, at the end, she blames her boss Michael for what happened. She argues that the FBI had betrayed her, but she had learned far earlier in the film who Simmons and his group were. Where did the film even once show that Weaver had become sympathetic to the group's aims? None of this is remotely convincing. As Roger Ebert wrote, he was torn by "the fundamental doubts" he had about the plot.¹²

Still, as part of the subtext, where creating and showing to millions a world of vile racist

whites is the intent, the movie succeeds because it posits a national network of saboteurs and revolutionaries, many of whom the FBI began apprehending thanks to the computer printout Weaver had stolen from Simmons. Despite the mass arrests of those on the list, Weaver inserts the paranoid point that “They’ve got friends all over. We’ll never get ‘em. Anyway, we’ll never get all of ‘em.” Next, she inserts an even deeper message: “You can’t stop ‘em by waiting for them to commit a crime each time, Michael.” Is she suggesting subverting the U.S. Constitution by allowing preventive arrests and round-ups of suspected dissidents? In 1988 such a suggestion was wild, but over the next two decades, particularly after September 11 and the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, it is no longer so far fetched.

Finally, the film closes with a scene reaffirming the regnant multicultural message of the American Establishment, one that the fictional white nationalists in the film abhorred. This scene, too, however, makes no sense. Lost, Weaver wanders across America, finally returning to Gary’s home and church, where she encounters the racist preacher and congregation leaving after mass. Gary’s daughter Rachel is thrilled to see her, even though the congregation has told her that “Katie” is really Cathy Weaver of the FBI. They must also know that she killed Gary in the line of duty. How is it conceivable that Rachel would overlook such a thing, even if she is only about five? But here the filmmakers want to make a point, so the message overrides plausibility. When the preacher demands that Weaver leave, Rachel defends her, saying, “This is America, Reverend, she can do anything she wants.” The scene shows a moral victory over the racist whites. To add one final message, the film closes with Steve Earle’s country and western song, “The Devil’s Right Hand,” where the refrain is “Mama said a pistol is the devil’s right hand.” Violence, one must understand, is never the right answer. Unless, of course, it is to kill racists.

Arlington Road

Arlington Road bears many similarities to *Betrayed*. First and foremost, it posits the existence of conspiratorial white supremacists who have no qualms about committing mass murder to further their racist cause. As with *Betrayed*, it features major stars, in this case Jeff Bridges, Tim Robbins, and Joan Cusack, meaning Hollywood was willing to invest money and prestige in sending a message to a wide audience. Further, both films draw on William Pierce’s novel *The Turner Diaries*, with *Arlington Road* doing so quite specifically.

The two films also have differences, a primary one being that *Arlington Road* was conceived of and filmed long after a string of incidents pairing government agencies and disaffected Americans in violent confrontations occurred. As will be discussed below, Ruby

Ridge took place in 1992, followed by the Waco inferno in 1993, and the Oklahoma City Bombing in 1995. *Arlington Road* borrows the plot line from *Ruby Ridge* in particular. In addition, the genres are different: *Betrayed* is a love story with an undercover theme. As such, it demands of its leads that they inject complex emotions into their characters, which Berenger achieves superbly. *Arlington Road*, in contrast, is a more traditional thriller lacking romance or character development any deeper than Robbins' character's motivation for revolution.

In *Arlington Road* Jeff Bridges stars as Michael Faraday, a history professor at the George Washington University. His wife was an FBI agent killed in a botched raid, leaving Faraday to raise their son on his own. His scholarly specialty is domestic terrorism, which provides the justification for his interest in neighbors who may or may not be involved in just that. His new neighbors, the Langs — Oliver (Tim Robbins) and Cheryl (Joan Cusack) — also have a son. As the film opens, the son is seen wondering the streets, hideously burned in an accident. Faraday sees him and rushes him to the emergency room. Reportedly, the boy's injuries are a result of a fireworks accident.

This provides an entrée for Faraday to meet the Langs. Oliver, an architect, is working on a new mall and has blueprints for such. When a letter is delivered by mistake to Faraday's home, he brings it to Oliver and sees blueprints on the table, but they do not look like those for a shopping mall. Thus begin his nagging suspicions. That he is a suspicious man we learn from one of his lectures. He tells his class that fourteen months earlier, over sixty federal agents were killed when a bomb went off at the Roosevelt Federal Building in downtown St. Louis, an unmistakable reference to the destruction of the Federal Murrah Building in Oklahoma City in April 1995. The slide Faraday uses is almost identical to a frontal shot of the Murrah Building and the use of a bomb-laden truck parked in front of the building is also the same, though the bomb material is different. Sadly, there were also day care centers in both the real and fictional buildings.

After a thorough federal investigation, a lone bomber (who died in the blast) was blamed, but Faraday is unconvinced. "One man, no conspirators, right?" He suspects the government elected to pin all the blame on one man so as to give Americans a sense of safety again. In fact, Faraday believes, the 33-year-old bomber was more likely a pawn in a conspiracy. While providing the necessary ingredients for the plot's unfolding, this suspicion also mirrors that surrounding the Oklahoma City bombing itself. Primary suspect Timothy McVeigh was executed for his role, and co-conspirator Terry Nichols was sentenced to life in prison. Two others were involved but entered into a plea bargain with prosecutors in return for their

testimony against the other two. As with other such attacks, conspiracy theories abound.¹³

While Faraday's suspicions are still weak, there is a scene where the story could have taken a different direction. Faraday, Lang and their significant others are having dinner together, and separate discussions turn toward lost loved ones. Lang's father, we learn, died in a "farm accident," while Faraday's wife died in a botched FBI raid. Both men have grudges against the government, Lang because politicians are not honest, Faraday because government agents are not accountable. These grudges could have grown into a common bond. It was not to be. Instead, Faraday's suspicions grow further when he begins to investigate Oliver's past, finding that in fact he was William Fenimore and that when he was a teenager he built a pipe bomb with the intention of using it to get revenge on the government for ruining their family farm, which resulted in the suicide of his father.

Another scene educates the viewer further on the circumstances of Faraday's wife's death. He takes members of his class on terrorism on a field trip to West Virginia, site of a gun battle between FBI agents and a suspected right-wing extremist thought to be stockpiling weapons. National Alliance leader William Pierce famously maintained a compound in West Virginia, but this scene is drawn directly from the botched (or criminal, depending on one's views) gun battle and stand-off at Ruby Ridge, Idaho, in 1992. That complicated incident is hard to summarize, but in essence a man named Randy Weaver was recruited by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, or ATF, to inform on right-wing supporters. He refused and was subsequently targeted himself. Next, "ATF agents posed as broken-down motorists and arrested Randy and Vicki Weaver when they stopped to assist." A long series of trial dates and miscommunication ensued, resulting in U.S. Marshals getting involved in a stakeout of the Weavers' rural property.

Eventually, there was a nighttime confrontation and Weaver's son Samuel was shot in the back and killed, and a federal agent was killed by Weaver's neighbor. The Weavers were able to retrieve their son's body and place it in a guest cabin on their property. The Marshals then reported to the FBI that a marshal had been killed, so the FBI sent its hostage rescue team from Quantico, Virginia. As a later U.S. Senate report confirmed, the federal agents had adopted a virtual "shoot on sight" policy, almost unprecedented in such situations. The results were tragic. FBI sniper Lon Horiuchi ambushed Weaver, hitting him in the back. When Weaver, his daughter and neighbor ran back toward the house, Horiuchi fired a shot that went through wife Vicki Weaver's head as she held her infant. She was unarmed. Later,

The Department of Justice Office of Professional Responsibility Ruby Ridge Task Force Report (June 10, 1994) stated in section I, Executive Summary subhead B, Significant Findings, that the second shot did not satisfy constitutional standards for legal use of deadly force. The OPR review also found the lack of a request to surrender was “inexcusable,” since Harris and the two Weavers were running for cover without returning fire and were not an imminent threat. The task force also specifically blamed Horiuchi for firing through the door, not knowing whether someone was on the other side of it. While controversy exists as to who is responsible for approving the ROE that were being followed by the sniper, the task force also condemned the so-called “rules of engagement” allowing shots to be fired with no request for surrender.¹⁴

Weaver was ultimately acquitted of all charges, while Japanese-American sniper Horiuchi was indicted for manslaughter by an Idaho prosecutor, but the federal government claimed “sovereign immunity” for the agent and he never went to trial.

The case attracted major attention in the mass media. CBS ran a mini-series called *Ruby Ridge: An American Tragedy*, which aired in May 1996. Later it appeared in movie form as *The Siege at Ruby Ridge*. In addition, there was *Atrocities at Ruby Ridge: the Randy Weaver Story*, and an A&E “Deadly Force” episode hosted by Bill Kurtis. In 1995, Nightline ran *Ruby Ridge Investigation*, while The Learning Channel showed *Ruby Ridge*, which included interviews with Weaver, FBI Site Commander Eugene Glenn, negotiator Fred Lanceley, and civilian negotiators Bo Gritz and Jackie Brown. The siege also resulted in a slew of books about the attack, including Alan Bock’s 1995 *Ambush at Ruby Ridge: How Government Agents Set Randy Weaver Up and Took His Family Down*; Jess Walter’s *Ruby Ridge: The Truth and Tragedy of the Randy Weaver Family* (originally published as *Every Knee Shall Bow* 1995); and Gerry Spence’s *From Freedom To Slavery: The Rebirth of Tyranny in America* (1996). The tendency here was to see the Weavers as victims of a threatening government.

In the reenactment scene in *Arlington Road*, there is also an implicit critique of the actions of FBI agents, beginning with their failure to identify themselves when the 10-year-old son of suspect Parsons happens by. Trained by his parents to resist, the boy runs back to the house to alert the family. Incautiously, two agents in fatigues pursue him, so the boy begins firing at them in self defense. Alerted by the gunfire, the mother comes out to take her son out of the way of danger but is shot in the back. Two older sons join the firefight and in the battle an agent kills the ten year old. The two older boys are wounded, as are two agents. Then, from the background, comes a young woman with babe in one arm, a shotgun in the other. Conflicted about shooting another woman but seeing her dead 10-year-old

brother- and mother-in-law on the ground, she shoots Faraday's wife at point blank range. In reliving this tragedy, Professor Faraday castigates the federal system for its faulty methods, for incorrectly flagging Parsons as a domestic terrorist, when in fact he had used a family inheritance to begin legally collecting weapons for his soon-to-open gun shop.

Over the next fifty minutes, Faraday continues to investigate neighbor Lang's past, eventually confirming his identity as a terrorist. Unfortunately, Lang has managed to arrange a scouting trip for Faraday's son, effectively rendering the boy a hostage. The conspiracy to kidnap him and move forward with the bomb plot is large, as viewers see when Faraday goes to the Langs' house to confront them. That evening the Langs are hosting a large party, with many (or all?) of the guests terrorists, white to a person.

The climax of *Arlington Road* is a stretch. It turns out that the Langs have been manipulating Faraday all along, even getting him to chase a van into the basement of the FBI headquarters in Washington. Faraday's car, not the van, we learn, is the one carrying the enormous bomb, and when it explodes, one hundred and eighty-four people, including Faraday, die. This scene is done in slow motion and we see the aftermath, where dead and dying litter the streets. Faraday is blamed for being the sole bomber, motivated by revenge against the FBI for the death of his wife. The Langs are never suspected. As the movie ends, they are seen standing together in their front yard, a "For Sale" sign next to them. Dutifully, they await their next assignment from the malicious terror group for whom they work.

This fictional creation of the destruction of the FBI Building naturally evokes memories of the Oklahoma City bombing, but it also puts on screen a re-creation of the original template for that bombing, allegedly William Pierce's novel about a character named Earl Turner, who in a future 1991 plays a role in destroying the federal government. Turner writes about this in the so-called "Turner Diaries" that become a record of the white nationalist revolution. This long quote from the novel shows how both the actual Oklahoma City Bombing and *Arlington Road's* version draw from Pierce's imagination:

September 30, 1991. When George and Henry finally got back this evening, we found out what they'd been doing all day: casing the FBI's national headquarters downtown. Our unit has been assigned the task of blowing it up!

The initial order came all the way down from Revolutionary Command, and a man was sent from the Eastern Command Center to the WFC briefing George attended Sunday to look over the local unit leaders and pick one for this assignment.

Apparently Revolutionary Command has decided to take the offensive against the political police before they arrest too many more of our "legals" or finish setting

up their computerized passport system...

The plan, roughly, is this: Unit 8 will secure a large quantity of explosives — between five and ten tons. Our unit will hijack a truck making a legitimate delivery to the FBI headquarters, rendezvous at a location where Unit 8 will be waiting with the explosives, and switch loads. We will then drive into the FBI building's freight-receiving area, set the fuse, and leave the truck....

October 13, 1991. At 9:15 yesterday morning our bomb went off in the FBI's national headquarters building. Our worries about the relatively small size of the bomb were unfounded; the damage is immense. We have certainly disrupted a major portion of the FBI's headquarters operations for at least the next several weeks, and it looks like we have also achieved our goal of wrecking their new computer complex.

My day's work started a little before five o'clock yesterday, when I began helping Ed Sanders mix heating oil with the ammonium nitrate fertilizer in Unit 8's garage. We stood the 100-pound bags on end one by one and poked a small hole in the top with a screwdriver, just big enough to insert the end of a funnel. While I held the bag and funnel, Ed poured in a gallon of oil.

Then we slapped a big square of adhesive tape over the hole, and I turned the bag end over end to mix the contents while Ed refilled his oil can from the feeder line to their oil furnace. It took us nearly three hours to do all 44 sacks, and the work really wore me out.

Meanwhile, George and Henry were out stealing a truck. With only two-and-a-half tons of explosives we didn't need a big tractor-trailer rig, so we had decided to grab a delivery truck belonging to an office-supply firm. They just followed the truck they wanted in our car until it stopped to make a delivery. When the driver — a Negro — opened the back of the truck and stepped inside, Henry hopped in after him and dispatched him swiftly and silently with his knife....

George and I headed for the FBI building in the car, with Henry following in the truck. We intended to park near the 10th Street freight entrances and watch until the freight door to the basement level was opened for another truck, while Henry waited with "our" truck two blocks away. We would then give him a signal via walkie-talkie.

As we drove by the building, however, we saw that the basement entrance was open and no one was in sight. We signaled Henry and kept going for another seven or eight blocks, until we found a good spot to park. Then we began walking back slowly, keeping an eye on our watches.

We were still two blocks away when the pavement shuddered violently under our feet. An instant later the blast wave hit us — a deafening "ka-whoomp," followed by an enormous roaring, crashing sound, accentuated by the higher-pitched noise of shattering glass all around us.

The plate glass windows in the store beside us and dozens of others that we could see along the street were blown to splinters. A glittering and deadly rain of glass shards continued to fall into the street from the upper stories of nearby buildings for a few seconds, as a jet-black column of smoke shot straight up into the

sky ahead of us.

We ran the final two blocks and were dismayed to see what, at first glance, appeared to be an entirely intact FBI headquarters — except, of course, that most of the windows were missing. We headed for the 10th Street freight entrances we had driven past a few minutes earlier. Dense, choking smoke was pouring from the ramp leading to the basement, and it was out of the question to attempt to enter there.

Dozens of people were scurrying around the freight entrance to the central courtyard, some going in and some coming out. Many were bleeding profusely from cuts, and all had expressions of shock or dazed disbelief on their faces. George and I took deep breaths and hurried through the entrance. No one challenged us or even gave us a second glance.

The scene in the courtyard was one of utter devastation. The whole Pennsylvania Avenue wing of the building, as we could then see, had collapsed, partly into the courtyard in the center of the building and partly into Pennsylvania Avenue. A huge, gaping hole yawned in the courtyard pavement just beyond the rubble of collapsed masonry, and it was from this hole that most of the column of black smoke was ascending.

Overtaken trucks and automobiles, smashed office furniture, and building rubble were strewn wildly about — and so were the bodies of a shockingly large number of victims. Over everything hung the pall of black smoke, burning our eyes and lungs and reducing the bright morning to semi-darkness....

According to the latest estimate released, approximately 700 persons were killed in the blast or subsequently died in the wreckage. That includes an estimated 150 persons who were in the sub-basement at the time of the explosion and whose bodies have not been recovered.¹⁵

Conclusion

Arlington Road is far less explicit about white racism and supremacy than is *Betrayed*. Yet a viewer is given consistent visual cues that it is a group of very white, very bad, people. More important are the links to actual Americans who are opposed to living among other races, such as the Weaver family who left Iowa to escape the world's ills. The link to William Pierce and the attack on FBI headquarters, however, makes it unmistakable what the beliefs of the Langs and their group is in *Arlington Road*. By all accounts, Pierce was among the foremost white nationalists in the United States in the postwar period. His writings, speeches and conferences explicitly referred to the superiority of whites and inferiority of non-whites. *Arlington Road* is thus a movie intimately linked to such beliefs. *Betrayed*, though it has such links, does not need them to signal to the viewer what the beliefs of Simmons and his crowd are. In both films, though, the conclusion is the same: these people are everywhere and they are an immediate threat to the nation.

This, however, would appear to be paranoia, as the impact of white racist groups (as opposed to lone attackers) in America has been minimal to nil. The most violence prone group, for instance, The Church of the Creator, “began a steady decline and process of fragmentation” when its leader Matt Hale was imprisoned in 2005, with its chapters falling from eighty-eight to five. As one scholar notes, “the American extreme right is currently marginalized.” In addition, in recent years “the revolutionary racist right has experienced several setbacks, as groups such as the Aryan Nations, National Alliance, and the World Church of the Creator have all lost important leaders to death or imprisonment.”¹⁶

The U.S. government now chases groups of disempowered Americans and labels them “terrorists.” Scholar E. Michael Jones mocked this tendency in his article “The Great Hutaree Bust: Dogpatch Calls for Armed Insurrection, Antichrist Dodges a Bullet” in his magazine *Culture Wars*:

These “Nine alleged members of a Christian militia group,” we are told, who were “girding for battle with the Antichrist,” were charged Monday with “plotting to kill a police officer and slaughter scores more by bombing the funeral — all in hopes of touching off an uprising against the US government.” US Attorney General Eric Holder underscored the gravity of the situation when he announced that the FBI had just dealt “a sever blow to a dangerous organization that today stands accused of conspiring to levy war against the United States.”

The visuals which accompanied the story, however, did little to reinforce the high drama which the press conference hoped to inspire. The front page story was accompanied by a picture of the rusted trailer which Hutaree leader David Brian Stone called home, and there leaning next to a washing machine in the front yard was a lone rifle. Missing from the picture was a jug of moonshine. Similarly, Daisy Mae and Li'l Abner were nowhere to be seen. In spite of that, the caption under the photo could have read: “Dogpatch calls for armed insurrection!” But that would have undermined the high seriousness of the US attorney’s press conference and the sense that we had all dodged a serious terrorist attack, which was palpable in Attorney General Holder’s remarks.

Jones labels the case “prima facie preposterous,” noting that the mother of one of the suspected terrorists took away his two guns. Would such a man “have toppled the United States government if the FBI hadn’t intervened?” He also makes a useful point in acknowledging that the United States in general is a violent place, the inference being that there is a high degree of subjectivity in focusing so intently on a group like the Hutaree, who hurt no one: “Americans of all stripes run amok periodically and kill lots of people, and the FBI can’t seem to stop them.”¹⁷ He concludes that the FBI and media dealt with the Hutaree Christian

Militia so severely because “the FBI is still busy creating mythical villains to distract us from the criminal activity that is deemed acceptable by the people who control our government.” Quoting a 1907 observer, he writes, “the public heeds the little overt offender more than the big covert offender.”¹⁸

The point was made in an article in the *New York Times*, which reported about the Hutaree that on May 3, 2010 a federal judge “ordered that nine members of an extremist militia accused of plotting to kill police officers be freed on bond until their trial, saying that prosecutors did not demonstrate that the defendants would pose a danger if released.”¹⁹ This is hardly consistent with a belief that this group posed a grave danger to anyone. More emblematic of those who attack the government are individuals like Timothy McVeigh, who alone was executed for the Oklahoma City Bombing. For whatever reason, such people become estranged from society or have a personal reason for hating the government. Another is Andrew Joseph Stack III (Joe Stack), who in early 2010 flew a small private airplane into IRS offices in Austin, Texas, killing himself and one in the office, and injuring two others seriously.²⁰

Contrary to the Hollywood stories just discussed, it is more the white nationalist groups who are victimized. For instance, in early 2010 the group American Renaissance had its 2010 conference in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area cancelled four times due to threats from various anarchist groups to commit violence to stop the conference. Despite ample testimony about these threats, the FBI and other police declined to investigate. American Renaissance has never remotely been associated with violence and has held eight biannual conferences since 1994.²¹ The same was true two years earlier when David Duke organized the 2008 European American Unity and Rights Conference (EURO) in Memphis, Tennessee. Death threats were made to the manager of the hotel at which the conference was to be held, yet no investigation, let alone arrests, was made.²² Duke may be unpopular, but the rule of law is supposed to be blind to popularity contests.

Obviously, these groups are anathema to liberals, but one struggles to rationalize how they have forfeited their basic rights as Americans. In Hollywood’s eyes, however, it is not only such groups that elicit suspicion, it is broad swaths of the American public, particularly white Christians from the heartland, such as those portrayed in *Betrayed* and *Arlington Road*. There are reasons for this.

Three decades ago, Hollywood insider Ben Stein analyzed this situation and proffered an explanation. In his 1976 essay “Whatever happened to small-town America?” he explored television’s pronounced hostility toward rural Americans such as those in *Betrayed* and

Arlington Road. In an assessment that concurred with Powers et al., he identified a television elite and argued that this elite imagined that small-town Gentiles naturally meant harm to such liberal types. “As a result, when he [a TV writer] gets the chance, he attacks the small town on television or the movies.” Because of this, he concluded, “A national culture is making war upon a way of life that is still powerfully attractive and widely practiced in the same country.” The upshot is that “in the mass culture of the country, a hatred for the small town is spewed out on television screens and movie screens every day.”²³

Yale University computer science professor David Gelernter made a similar point when he argued that in America “the old elite used to get on fairly well with the country it was set over. Members of the old social upper-crust elite were richer and better educated than the public at large, but approached life on basically the same terms.” The new elite, however, is not only different from the masses, “it loathes the nation it rules.”²⁴ Thus, this hate and fear of the masses may well result in exaggerated feelings about the ordinary Americans who tend to live in the so-called “red states” which comprise much of “fly-over country,” i.e., states between the two coasts. These red states tend to be more conservative and vote Republican, while the blue states are more liberal and vote Democratic. Hollywood — and therefore its elites — is very much a blue state phenomenon.²⁵

The DVD cover of *Arlington Road* reads: YOUR PARANOIA IS REAL. If “Your” refers to typical Hollywood types, this statement may well be true. Perhaps, however, those with paranoid fears should seek professional treatment. In any case, the views of the paranoid are generally unreliable descriptions of reality. Both *Betrayed* and *Arlington Road* take disjointed episodes of real events and construct a narrative that reveals the reigning paranoia in Hollywood itself. As Hollywood is part of the Establishment now, its paranoia must be taken seriously, for it could have unhappy consequences based as it is on lack of fairness and objectivity. Films other than *Betrayed* and *Arlington Road* partake of this bias, but few others are so blatant in their unfounded fears of “the Other.”

Notes

1. Stephen Powers, David J. Rothman, and Stanley Rothman, *Hollywood's America: Social and Political Themes in Motion Pictures* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996), xv and 80, 13ff. They also write that “[I]t seems clear that, in the aggregate, movie content reflects more sophisticated and cynical views than people in the audience would independently hold (194). The literature on Hollywood and its views of America is immense. See, for example, Neal Gabler, *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1988); Michael Medved, *Hollywood vs. America: Popular Culture and the War on Traditional Values* (New York:

HarperCollins, 1992); Ben Stein, *The View from Sunset Boulevard: America As Brought to You by the People Who Make Television* (New York: Basic Books, 1979). Since Powers et al. are interested in the broader question of American society's intersections with Hollywood, see also Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), particularly his new preface in the paperback edition (1st Books, 2002).

2. See George Michael, *Confronting Right-Wing Extremism and Terrorism in the USA*, (New York: Routledge, 2003), 64, where he suggests the genesis of the term emerged with the publication of Henry Ford's serial *The International Jew*. The term itself became prominent in the early 1980s.

3. Stephen Singular, *Talked to Death: The Life and Murder of Alan Berg* (Beech Tree Books, March 1987). The new cultural elite identified by Powers et al. has its prerogatives about honoring martyrs. In addition to being a major film, *Talk Radio* was first a 1987 Pulitzer Prize-nominated play by Tad Savinar and Eric Bogosian (who played the radio host in the film as well). The play made its Broadway premiere in early 2007 and has received Tony, Drama Desk, Outer Critics Circle, and Drama League award nominations for Best Revival of Play and Best Actor in a Play. Oliver Stone directed the film version of *Talk Radio*. Similarly, when Jewish American Leon Klinghoffer was murdered by PLO terrorists aboard a ship in 1985, his killing also received outsized attention. For instance, it was made into a television movie in 1990, *Voyage of Terror: The Achille Lauro Affair*, starring Burt Lancaster and Eva Marie Saint. Composer John Adams also wrote an opera about the incident, but it elicited controversy over what some called "excessive understanding" of the terrorists' situation.

In contrast, rarely are the murders of individual Majority Americans so feted. In fact, when in late 2000 two African Americans in Wichita, Nebraska, terrorized, raped, then brutally murder four Majority Americans, the entire mass media entirely ignored the story. The thought of a Broadway show or major film is out of the question in such instances.

4. In my studies of white nationalists, as well as of racism in America, I have discovered nothing remotely suggestive of such a hunt. While lynching was a fact of life for decades, such behavior has long since ceased. Also, the 1998 dragging murder of African American James Byrd was committed by three (or two, depending on the version) white racists, but it was an anomaly in modern America. Further, there is reason to suspect that much of the motivation for such a heinous crime was revenge for being gang raped by black inmates in prison. See <http://www.amren.com/search.html?cx=009148206432049679303%3Aublljeli10&cof=FORID%3A11&q=james+byrd&sa=Search> for a long selection of articles on this case. To emphasize how rare and highly condemned this crime was, it was credited with the passage of a Texas hate crimes law. Further, it later led to the "Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which was signed into law in 2009 by President Obama.

Interestingly, Roger Ebert was also appalled at this scene, though for a different reason. About the hunt of the black man, he writes, "It is reprehensible to put a sequence like that in a film intended as entertainment, no matter what the motives of the characters or the alleged importance to the plot. This sequence is as disturbing and cynical as anything I've seen in a long time — a breach of standards so disturbing that it brings the film to a halt from which it barely recovers. I imagine that Costa-Gavras, whose left-wing credentials are impeccable, saw this scene as necessary to his indictment of the racist underworld he was exposing. But 'Betrayed' is not a small, brave political statement like 'Z,' it is a Hollywood entertainment with big stars,

and vile racist manhunts have no place in it.” Odd that a movie expert like Ebert would suggest Hollywood films are primarily entertainment when in fact they operate on various levels with far more impact on society. What is wrong with this scene is that it is a vile defamation of white Christian people in America. See Roger Ebert, “Betrayed,” August 26, 1988 (<http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/19880826/REVIEWS/808260301/1023>).

A larger point is that in fact far more interracial crime is committed by blacks against whites. A pro-white group reported that “Although Americans most often think of ‘hate crimes’ as acts by whites against racial minorities — such as last year’s killing of James Byrd in Texas by three white ex-convicts — the majority of violent crime across racial lines are committed by blacks against whites, [a] study finds. Black-on-white crimes were almost nine times as frequent as white-on-black crimes, the study reports” (<http://www.amren.com/search.html?cx=009148206432049679303%3Aublljeli10&cof=FORID%3A11&q=james+byrd&sa=Search>). Further muddying these waters is the fact that “Hispanics are considered a victim category for hate crimes but not a perpetrator category. A Mexican who is attacked because of ethnicity is recorded as Hispanic, but if the same Mexican attacks a black or white for racial reasons he is considered white. This inflates the figure for ‘white’ hate crime perpetrators . . .” (*The Color of Crime: Race, Crime, and Violence in America*, [Oakton, VA: New Century Foundation, 1998], 1; See also Michael Levin, *Why Race Matters: Race Differences and What They Mean* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1997), 294-295).

The egregiousness of this hunting scene in *Betrayed* is on a par with the fictitious rape and attempted lynching of a young black girl in *A Time to Kill*. See my discussion in “Role Reversal in Hollywood: The Noble Black vs. the Fallen White Male” (*The Journal of Hokkai-Gakuen University*, No. 107, March 2001). See also my discussion of the “snuff scene” murder of a young woman commissioned by one “Mr. Christian” in the Nicolas Cage film *8mm* (“Falling Down: Images of the White Majority in Peril,” *The Journal of Hokkai-Gakuen University*, No. 111, March 2002). More recently, the 2010 *Machete*, a film about a Mexican avenger who slaughters scores of racist whites, shows a politician, John McLaughlin, played by Robert De Niro. As one critic of the film writes, “McLaughlin is no sympathetic dupe, however. He is introduced hunting down illegal aliens with his friends, a posse of border vigilantes clearly supposed to be the Minutemen. The vigilante leader Von Jackson (Don Johnson) shoots a pregnant Mexican woman while making a speech about the anchor baby problem, and then shoots the woman’s boyfriend. He has the whole incident filmed to show it to his ‘big money donors.’” (see <http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/09/machete/>). Another critic writes, “No, it is not surprising that White men are depicted as spasmodically hateful people that will do anything to hurt someone of another race just for the sheer pleasure of it” (<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/authors/Thornton-Machete.html#PT>).

5. Desson Howe, “Betrayed,” *Washington Post*, August 26, 1988.
6. Carol Swain, *The New White Nationalism in America: Its Challenge to Integration* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 50-52. See also Michael Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994).
7. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Girnt_Butler.
8. Swain, 51. See also Michael, *Confronting Right-Wing Extremism*, for a discussion of the militia movement (46-52), as well as his most recent book *Theology of Hate: A History of the World Church of the Creator* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2009) where he writes that members of what is known as the “Creativity movement” or “Church of the Creator” were

- responsible for sporadic acts of violence. Though started by Ben Klassen in 1973, a decade and a half prior to the release of *Betrayed*, the episodes of violence did not surface until well after the film was already made. In 1993, for instance, the FBI “uncovered a plot hatched in California that involved some members of the church who planned to provoke a race war by assassinating prominent Jewish and African American figures.” This would lend weight to the argument that the makers of *Betrayed* were prescient in their portrayals. Then, in 1999, member Benjamin Smith went on a shooting rampage in apparent retaliation for the refusal of the Illinois Bar Association to admit Matthew Hale, leader of the World Church of the Creator when Smith was a member. On his rampage, Smith wounded six Jews outside a synagogue, then killed an African American executive. Next, he wounded an African American and Asian-American, then fatally shot a Korean doctoral student (vii–viii, 154). Finally, see Leonard Zeskind, *Blood and Politics: The History of the White Nationalist Movement from the Margins to the Mainstream* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009) for a broad overview of the entire topic.
9. Swain, 36. For unexplained reasons, she transposed the order of these words and was otherwise sloppy with the quotation.
 10. For a comprehensive view of these fights, see George Michael, *Willis Carto and the American Far Right* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2008).
 11. Apparently, the filmmakers are trying to show that the aide to the politician — Simmons’ Vietnam friend — has set up the assassination to get himself elected by garnering the sympathy vote. In other words, Simmons and the other team were deliberately trying to create a martyr to their cause. Hollywood types seem to think that this is a favored tactic of racist white politicians, for we see it again in the 2010 film *Machete*, where Robert De Niro plays a racist politician who insists on calling Mexicans “parasites.” As in *Betrayed*, we see the same plot device: “His venal, corrupt advisor/campaign manager hires our hero, Machete, to shoot the De Niro character, get the pity vote and so guarantee a landslide win” (see <http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/authors/Thornton-Machete.html#PT>).
 12. Roger Ebert, “Betrayed.”
 13. See, for instance, *Others Unknown: The Oklahoma City Bombing Case and Conspiracy* (New York: Lorenz Books, 1998) by defense lawyer for Timothy McVeigh, Stephen Jones. In it, Jones claims that the bombing was a conspiracy, and that McVeigh was not its mastermind. “I’m not trying to say he was innocent. He has exaggerated his guilt to protect others. He played a role, but he was a foot soldier, a mule, not the general,” says Jones. Jones also points a finger at Elohim City, a white supremacist group in Oklahoma whose members were planning to bomb the federal building. His suggestion that McVeigh and Nichols may have been part of a larger conspiracy with foreign terrorist connections cannot be dismissed out of hand.
 14. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ruby_Ridge.
 15. Andrew Macdonald (William Pierce), *The Turner Diaries* (New York: Barricade Books, 1978 [1996]), 30, 38–41. The book is available for free download at <http://ia341242.us.archive.org/2/items/TheTurnerDiaries/TurnerDiaries.pdf>.
 16. Michael, *Theology of Hate*, 189, 194, 197. For an account of Hale’s trial and sentencing, see chapter 13.
 17. By way of comparison, he notes how a university professor, Amy Bishop, killed a number of people of color, thus becoming “the ideal candidate for a hate crime prosecution, but then it turned out that [she] was Jewish and at that point all talk of her crime as paradigmatic of anything other than mental illness suddenly ceased” (E. Michael Jones, *Culture Wars*, Vol. 29, No. 7 [June 2010],

27).

18. Jones, *Culture Wars*.

19. Nick Blunkley, Militia Members Released Until Trial in Michigan Plot, the *New York Times*, May 3, 2010.

20. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joe_Stack.

21. See http://www.amren.com/mtnews/archives/2010/02/the_saga_of_ame.php.

22. See http://www.davidduke.com/general/euro-2008-we-overcame-and-endured-against-all-odds_5579.html#more-5579.

23. Benjamin Stein, "Whatever happened to small-town America?" *The Public Interest*, Summer 1976, 22. Soon after, he developed this thesis into the book *The View from Sunset Boulevard*.

24. David Gelernter, "How the Intellectuals Took Over (And What to Do About It)," *Commentary*, March 1997, pp. 33-37.

25. Roger Kimball has made a career out of writing about the deformations of liberal thinking. His *Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education* (New York: Harper & Row, 1990) is typical. See also Kevin MacDonald, "Why Are Professors Liberal?" *The Occidental Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer 2010). As a sample of writing about liberal world views, a young writer for the "race realist" magazine *American Renaissance* wrote a cover article called "The Wages of Idealism: A white woman who wanted to change the world." In it, she relates how she was a typical white from the suburbs, raised by parents who were not bigoted. In college, however, she encountered what she claims to be the norms taught by multiculturalism:

I have a bachelor's degree in sociology. Looking back, all my professors were white and very liberal. College was the first place I ever heard race discussed seriously, and the message was constant: diversity was vitally important and whites were guilty. My fellow students had been brought up just as I had been, so my professors had very fresh meat to feast on. I graduated from college the perfect racial liberal.

I think some whites find the ghetto environment exciting, and consider the racial abuse to be just another interesting facet of their adventurous new life. Popular culture certainly plays a part in pushing people in this direction. Some suburban whites idolize blacks and see their ghetto world as a playground for the imagination. Popular music, movies, sports, and television are largely black oriented, and white children come to believe that white is lame. In fact, I can remember white friends, during my teenage years and even to this day, criticizing something by saying, "That's so white." People from the suburbs may think they are missing something, and that they can live tragically hip lives among ghetto blacks.

Whites in these situations accept astonishing abuse, yet they are proud of their work and think they are improving the world. It seems that "white privilege" is an extremely powerful concept that makes some people believe they deserve humiliation. It leads to a bizarre form of cultural suicide, and an inability to defend one's own interests. (Tracy Abel, "The Wages of Idealism," *American Renaissance*, Vol. 21 No. 9 (Sept. 2010).

Abel worked at a shelter that overwhelmingly served minority clients, but as this trailer shows, the public face is of a white abuser. See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WGR7e-1J7IA>. This case sounds similar to the one I wrote about in 2001, this time in Hawaii. Here the headline read: "Crisis shelter settles 'multiculturalism training' suit." In this suit, seventeen former employees of the Family Crisis Shelter settled with a payment of \$120,000 and "a formal apology by the present and past management of the shelter." This 1993 suit "was filed in 1993 alleging that shelter management divided the staff into 'white women' and 'women of color.' Manage-

ment then allegedly discriminated against the Caucasian staff by accusing them of inherent racism, ordering them to be subservient to non-Caucasian staff and prohibiting their contact with non-Caucasian spouse abuse victims at the shelter. Former Executive Director Allegra Perhaes said in 1993 that the division was done only as a means of training staff to be sensitive to racism." ("Multiculturalism in America: Problems and Portrayals," Hokkai Gakuen University's *Studies in Culture*, No. 18, March 2001).